

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

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	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	3
Sub Total	100	86

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	10	9
------------------	-----------	----------

Total	110	95
--------------	------------	-----------

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

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 met absolute priority 1, with reservations. The applicant commits to the following: giving significant weight to student growth when determining teacher effectiveness, conducting multiple observation-assessments of teacher performance, and using the Individual Development and Effectiveness Scorecard (ID&E) and Educational Value Address Assessment System assessment system to determine the effectiveness of teachers, principals and other personnel (p. 3). The applicant will use the first year of the project as a planning year and, as such, has not included many of the accompanying details beyond a commitment to execute these TIF requisites. The incentive offered (\$1,000-\$4,000) per teacher is substantial and is likely high enough to create a change in behavior.

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 met absolute priority 2. While the applicant does not indicate funding sources to cover the increasing share of costs associated with the PBCS (p. 40), it does commit to providing supporting resources. The submitted budget includes all major activities referenced in the narrative. The amount of district financial support devoted to the PEAK project indicates district intent to sustain and develop the program (p. 4, 38-39).

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 met priority 3. The applicant is building the PBCS based on the district's PEAK pilot project, designed to connect teacher incentives and rewards to student performance. The PBCS is also built on two statewide efforts to strengthen the workforce: Texas Educator Excellence Grant and District Awards for Teacher Excellence. The applicant refers to the legislated programs as one of the largest investments in performance-based incentives in the nation. The proposed system does use data and evaluations for professional development. Tenure is not mentioned in the application.

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 met this requirement. On page 16, the applicant states that building-level coaches will be employed. The applicant further states that teacher mentors will be released to serve as mentors to new teachers (i.e., funding for release time), but additional details regarding compensating for additional responsibilities are lacking. The applicant does not clearly address how it will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1.Core Element 1:

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

General:

The applicant documents that the following activities will be used to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the district's PBCS plan: district task force, online surveys, campus meetings, local news statement, email messages, and the PEAK Core Advisory (p. 26).

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 demonstrated a high degree of community involvement via the communication strategies listed on p. 25. References to program development on p. 2, evidence the participation of diverse community groups and input from stakeholders from the district, school and community-level groups (p. 2). Union participation and support is referenced on p. 40 and in the attachments.

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 has provided information regarding its plan to complete a formal evaluation plan. During the planning year, the applicant intends to finalize the scoring rubric, and choose validity and reliability measures (p. 22). The applicant does, however, have a schedule in place to observe teachers and principals at least two times each year (p. 2). Additional evidence, beyond what's collected during formal and informal evaluations is not noted.

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 intends to use SAS Educational Value Added Assessment System (EVAAS), Battelle for Kids, Tyler Mullins, and DataSmart to work cooperatively as data-management system. The applicant intends to connect the system to payroll and human resources function. The pilot was connected to the both systems with no major issues noted (p. 28). These programs, specifically EVAAS, have experienced success in the PEAK pilot program (p. 28). They are also district-sponsored programs currently used by practitioners across the district.

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 will use grant year one to create a plan to develop and communicate the components of the proposed PBCS to all district employees. The applicant makes several statements that it intends to fully explain all developed PBCS processes to staff in the 15 impacted schools. But beyond the statement of intent, no plan has been developed.

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:

Professional development opportunities on p. 30-32 reflect training on the SAS Educational Value Added Assessment System (EVAAS), Principles for Learning, ID&E Scorecard training, Teacher Induction and Mentoring, and the National Institute for School Leadership. Teachers who receive differentiated compensation are required to continue learned practices in the their classroom and share information with other teachers in the school via mentoring, coaching, etc.

Each framework shows a direct link to needs of teachers in high-need schools and were used in the PEAK pilot schools (p. 16-25, 30).

The professional development plan addressed on p. 16-25 will address teachers and principals in the 15 impact schools and those in schools across the district. Whether assigned to a PEAK school or not, the use of these professional development tools provide an opportunity for teachers to embrace student-growth, through a focus on EVAAS and other professional development tools.

A process for regularly assessing professional development is not clearly stated in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant states on p. 6 that it has trouble recruiting staff to serve in project schools because of the location of schools in high poverty regions, low parent involvement and large numbers of ELL and special education students. The applicant provides student achievement data on p. 7 that shows schools are underperforming (i.e., unacceptable state accountability rating, high school dropout rate, and high number of at-risk students).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly address recruitment of teachers to serve hard-to-staff subject areas classrooms (i.e., difficulty recruiting math, science, English and special education teachers). The applicant also does not clearly address principal retention in the narrative. Also, the applicant does not provide enough data on comparable schools. The applicant mentions the phrase "comparable schools" on p. 10, but does not provide more information on comparable demographics, achievement data, etc.

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 proposed PBCS builds upon the Public Educators Accelerating Kids (PEAK) project, a pilot project currently in operation in the Fort Worth Independent School District. The current pilot project awards teams of teachers (campus, grade-level, vertical or horizontal teams, p. 17) for improvement in student academic achievement. Currently the PEAK pilot project impacts 15 campuses. Early success in the PEAK program (p. 11, 18) is an indicator that the proposed PBCS can avoid many of the pitfalls of new program implementation.

The applicant intends to use year 1 of the grant to plan and establish the proposed PBCS, which will add individual teacher and principal incentives to PEAK's team-based incentive (p. 15).

The applicant notes that current components of the PEAK pilot will be used in the PBCS. The applicant intends to use PEAK's methodology and process for determining effectiveness (i.e., SAS Corporation Educational Value Added Assessment System, p. 17) and PEAK's teacher incentives (\$10k for principal and \$13K for teachers, p. 25) in its PBCS.

Newly developed Individual Development and Evaluation Scorecards for principals and teachers will be developed during planning year one to guide annual evaluations. Team Scorecards reward teams of teachers who accelerate student achievement and Individual Scorecards reward personal professional development. Total performance incentive takes both scorecards into account. In alignment with the PEAK initiative, PBCS participants will also engage in multiple evaluation-based observations throughout the year (p. 21). The overview of proposed evaluation components on p. 20-24 provides evidence that forecasted evaluation components will align with TIF expectations.

The applicant notes on p. 2 that the pilot PEAK program was developed with input from stakeholders and that the expanded PBCS program will also involve district, school and community-level input (p. 2). Union participation and support is referenced on p. 40 and in the attachments.

The successful distribution of \$2.5 million in PEAK incentive payouts is commendable (p. 28) and exhibits capacity at the district level to handle PBCS technical-logistical tasks.

Weaknesses:

The applicant lists a number of data-management tools currently being used in the pilot Peak program but does not clearly articulate how they may interact with each other to form comprehensive PBCS-directed measures of teacher and principal effectiveness (p. 28-30).

Professional development opportunities on p. 30-32 reflect training on the SAS Educational Value Added Assessment System and the incentive framework, but stops short of identifying other pedagogical or instructional areas of interest. The applicant mentions Principles of Learning training already in process across the district and teacher induction and mentoring as tier one interventions to support improvements in student achievement.

Overall the use of these strategies seem vague and not prescriptive enough to realize the degree of change sought by the district and the goals of the TIF project.

Reader's Score: 55

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

Page 34 provides a summary of the management plan the applicant intends to use to execute the project. A calendar-type format clearly delineates proposed management activities by semester, with project closure activities during the final quarter. District personnel and job descriptions noted in the narrative are appropriate and ensure qualifications for for program development and implementation (p. 36-38). The sustainability chart on p. 41-43 is clearly defined and provides targeted supports for program implementation and sustenance. The budget listed is reasonable and sufficient to cover known costs.

Weaknesses:

While the budget address major activities in the grant, it is unclear if the management plan will achieve its objective because the applicant does not know how many teachers will meet requisites for incentives, nor how many reward types an individual teacher may qualify for. So, the budget can either overshoot expectations with a large remaining balance or underfund the PBCS if all teachers qualify on all four levels (p. 25). A more defined evaluation tool may help the district further fine-tune costs.

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 provides a discussion on qualitative and quantitative data anticipated from evaluation efforts on p. 45-46. The applicant also provides a description of the project's intended "Process Capability and Maturity" model (p. 47) that will provide interim feedback on program implementation and student achievement. The applicant provides a chart on p. 44-45 with goals of principal and teacher effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant has detailed objectives on p. 44-45, more detail is needed on general project goals provided on p. 3.

Goals included on p. 44-45 are broad and would be more clear if written to reflect PBCS intent for teacher and principal performance. While the "highly effective" designation for both teachers and principals (p. 44) is present, the levels of targeted student performance improvement and evaluation requisites "highly effective" refers to (p. 20-22) are not included in the articulated performance objectives. The presence of appropriately worded performance objectives are absent from the rest of the narrative, despite the anticipation of objectives to be determined in planning year 1.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates the capacity to use SAS Corporation Educational Value Added Assessment System as its value-added measurement tool. The applicant intends to expose all district employees (PBCS and non-PBCS employees) to the SAS Corporation Educational Value Added Assessment System as a way to investigate student growth (p. 4, 17-18). The district provided system-wide training on its value-added model during the PEAK pilot project to all PBCS and non-PBCS teachers and administrators.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant has chosen 15 schools in high-need areas with demographic factors that indicate high-need students (i.e., low SES, high ELL, and at-risk students)(p.6). On pages 6-12 the applicant provides data to support statements regarding the socio-economic and academic challenges facing the project's 15 schools. The PBCS is sufficient to increase the likelihood that effective teachers and principals will not only accept positions in these 15 schools, but will remain employed in a "high-need" school.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not appropriately define which schools are high-need and which subjects are considered hard-to-staff. The absence of this data may hinder applicant activities designed to recruit teachers to address acute vacancy and retention needs in specific school sites from the beginning of the project.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	6
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	82

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	90
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

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 met all requirements for this priority.

A) The applicant demonstrates it will create a PBCS that meets the requirements of the TIF grant. The proposal includes a plan to give significant weight to student growth, as measured by EVAAS with support from Battelle for Kids and the district's Accountability and Data Quality staff (pg 3). Teachers can between \$2,000 -\$13,000 in bonuses depending on individual, grade level and team content area performance. Principals can bonus between \$5,000 -\$10,000 depending on campus wide student achievement and growth. These amounts are significant enough to change behavior.

B) The applicant demonstrates that it will include observation-based assessments, at multiple points in time and by trained evaluators, with the launch of Individual Development and Effectiveness Scorecards (pg 3).

C) The applicant will develop a separate scorecard to measure the effectiveness of

principals.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant meets the criteria for Priority 2.

A) The applicant demonstrates, with great detail, its budget and costs for the project period and beyond. The district has committed to accepting the responsibility of the program beyond the TIF project period.

B) The applicant provided commitments to use non-TIF funds over the course of the next five years. The district will gradually increase responsibility to 25% of the total costs by year 5.

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 meets the criteria for Priority 3.

The applicant states that its PBCS is aligned to a coherent strategy (PEAK), centered around human capital management. The applicant states it will use differentiated effectiveness criteria for the PBCS and that criteria will also be used in other organizational decisions around professional development, retention and promotion. There is little detail given beyond that.

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 met this requirement. The applicant proposes that high performing teachers will be enticed to accept leadership positions, such as mentor teachers and school-site coaches. However, the applicant does not state the proposed compensation levels for these 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 applicant demonstrates a solid plan for effectively communicating the components of its PBCS using multiple modes of communication. The applicant will use task force meetings, online surveys, targeted campus visits, a website for the PBCS, email/video, and external media. The district used these strategies while launching its PEAK program, which appeared to be successful.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant states that the district and its teachers will be working upon the good will of their previous PEAK joint venture (pg 25). It appears that the teachers and staff are supportive. The district will form a task force and working committees to design the final plan. The task force will have teachers and principals as members (pg 26). The teachers union supplied a letter of support, which accompanied the grant.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

1) The applicant demonstrates a compliant but vague plan to create a fair, rigorous evaluation system that can differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories. The applicant will create an Individual Scorecard (ID&E) that will track student growth, but the plan is silent as to what the goals of student growth are and how much that will be weighted in the final evaluation.

2) The proposal includes observations of the teacher and principal, occurring at least twice per year.

3) Teachers will also be evaluated through observation and proxy data for grades and subjects not included in standardized testing. Observations will be done by administrators and possibly external specialists (pg 22). Observations will be incorporated in the final evaluation.

4) A standardized rubric will be created to ensure inter-rater reliability.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant does have a plan to implement a data-management system that can link student achievement to human resources. The district currently uses EVAAS, which can track value added measures to individual teachers. The district plans to expand its capabilities by contracting with Battelle for Kids, which has a data linking system (pg 28). The district will also utilize the programs Tyler Munis, Data Smart, Harvard Strategist Data Project, and Data Coaching Pilot to successfully track and link data to payroll. It is unclear as to who will coordinate these various endeavors.

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 is not clear as to the specific measures that teachers and principals will be evaluated on. Therefore, the applicant's plan to ensure that the teachers and principals understand the specific measures is also unclear. However, teachers and principals will be represented on the taskforce to determine those measures. After those measures are clarified, the district will provide training on the EVAAS system, which will enable them to better use data to improve student achievement. Both teachers and principals will be given tailored professional development around individual needs to raise student achievement.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

General:

- 1) The professional development plan will be implemented in high need schools.

2) Professional development will be targeted to the specific needs of the educator, based on evaluation results. This section is fairly vague because the evaluation metrics have not yet been determined. Because the goals are not clear and the measurements are not well defined, the applicant struggled to clearly demonstrate what the professional development will focus on.

3) All teachers will receive prescriptive professional development, whether they are eligible for differentiated compensation or not.

4) There is a professional development program in the works. It will focus on EVAAS training, teacher induction, and will use data from the Individual Scorecards to provide targeted assistance (pg 31). The professional development will focus on helping educators gain a better understanding of the EVAAS system, so they can understand and use the data to drive instruction.

5) The applicant states it will develop a process for regularly assessing effectiveness of the professional development 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:

1) The applicant identified 15 high priority schools that have specific subject areas that are hard to staff. The district has a hard time staffing schools in poor, ELL schools and neighborhoods. The applicant's proposal details significant performance bonuses for teachers that perform well at these schools. The bonuses are designed to improve teacher and principal retention at these schools.

2) The applicant identifies 15 high priority schools. Each has a high-need student body, with below average student achievement, particularly college readiness (pg 7). These schools score significantly lower than other district schools.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not identify comparable schools.

The applicant does not give statistics as to what the teacher retention rate is in the high need schools.

The applicant does not clearly articulate a plan for improving teacher recruitment and selection.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

1) The applicant demonstrates that TIF funds would support an existing district initiative, called Public Educators Accelerating Kids (PEAK), which is a team-base rewards model based on student growth (pg 13). PEAK was launched in 2008 and has shown positive early results. PEAK does valid measurable tests to gauge student growth. It

utilizes EVAAS to measure value-added data.

2) The applicant demonstrates that was significant consultation of stakeholders prior to PEAK's implementation and similar consultation would be followed for TIF funding. A committee of district personnel and teachers will work together to define the program. Local meetings will be held, and information will be distributed via website and email. Efforts will also be made to gain earned media to reach to the community at-large. The teachers union provided a letter of support that accompanied this grant.

3) The district demonstrates that it has an innovative evaluation system for its existing PEAK program and will implement an Individual Scorecard evaluation system that will differentiate effectiveness, taking student achievement under consideration. The Individual Scorecard will also reflect observations, that will be performed at multiple points in the year, and will incorporate multiple reviewers.

4) The applicant demonstrates that is has a data-management system, EVAAS, that can effectively track student growth. Programs will be built during the intitial planning year to link that data to payroll.

5) There is a professional development program in the works. It will focus on EVAAS training, teacher induction, and will use data from the Individual Scorecards to provide targeted assistance (pg 31).

Highly effective teachers at PEAK schools could earn a total of \$10,000 - \$13,000 if all participating teacher's teams had a successful year. Principals could earn between \$5,000 - \$10,000 (pg 25).

Weaknesses:

There is no specific plan for professional development or training teachers at high need schools as to how to use data to drive instruction. The overall professional development plan is under construction.

Principal and teacher selection and recruitment measures are not fully addressed.

Principals have less to gain in terms of bonuses. Teachers can earn \$10,000 - \$13,000, while principals can earn only \$5,000 - \$10,000 (pg 25).

The overall program lacks detail as to how student achievement or student growth will be measured to determine individual educator effectiveness. The district has a team oriented compensation system currently, but much must be done to move to an individual evaluation system.

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

1) The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives on time and within budget. There is a timeline with defined responsibilities for accomplishing major tasks (pg 42).

2) The key personnel are highly qualified, and have committed to spending large amounts of time on this project (pg 38). There are a number of positions that will focus solely on the implementation of this grant. Based on resumes provided, the applicant demonstrates that it has an experienced team on board to implement this program.

3) The applicant will support the proposed project with non-TIF funding during the five year project, using private grants and earmarked district monies, and has committed itself to funding the program thereafter.

4) The requested amount is sufficient to plan and implement the program.

Weaknesses:

Because the program is in its infancy stages of development, it is not clear the applicant has a firm grasp on actual costs for the project period or beyond. The budget assumes every teacher and principal will achieve the maximum bonus. Because the metrics for bonus are still vague, the district is not able to accurately predict just how many employees may earn a bonus.

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 applicant demonstrated an evaluation plan to judge the effectiveness of the program.

1) It includes the use of measurable performance objectives (pg 44).

2) The plan will produce quantitative data (student outcomes, surveys, district data) and qualitative data (classroom observations and interviews).

3) The data collected will allow district personnel to adequately evaluate the PEAK program and make continuous improvements, as needed. Teacher and principals will serve on a taskforce to review the program and make suggestions.

Weaknesses:

The measurable performance objectives are vague.

There is little effort to evaluate programs focused on teacher recruitment at high need schools.

There is no mention of an outside evaluator.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the system it will use (EVAAS) to determine value-added measures. The applicant has a plan to build capacity among all its schools to use this system, so that its schools may better use data to drive instruction (pg 4). It is a positive that the applicant has already identified the value-added system it will use. EVAAS was chosen because of its track record of solid results (pg 17). After the criteria for measuring teacher effectiveness is defined, the district will train principals and teachers as to how to use EVAAS effectively, to improve their teaching.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that it intends to use TIF funds to serve high need students by offering incentives for effective teachers to stay at those schools. The district will also use TIF funds as signing bonuses to attract teachers needed for hard-to-fill positions like math, science and special education. There is some evidence that this program is working in the district's PEAK schools (pg 5).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address how it will implement a process to effectively communicate to teachers what the high needs subjects and school sites are. The applicant does not explain how it will judge a potential applicant to see if the applicant will be effective before hiring. Perhaps a more robust recruitment effort could be formulated to inform teachers of high-need schools and develop a thorough screening process for those jobs.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

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
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	8
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
Sub Total	100	85

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	92
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Fort Worth Independent School District -- School Leadership, Chief of Schools
(S385A100138)

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:

Met

The proposed project will reward teachers and principals for demonstrated effective performance at differentiated levels based on student growth. Observation-based assessments will be utilized and carried out multiple times by trained evaluators. The school district currently has a process in place to measure team-level effectiveness and this project proposes to further develop the system at the individual level.

This assessment for principals, the Individual Development and Effectiveness Scorecard (ID&E, in development), will be aligned with the Leader Performance Standards Framework to ensure the measure is valid for determining effective leaders (p 3). The ID&E will be developed based on eight essential domains of eight essential dimensions of school leadership. The appropriate actions, activities, and performance indicators are included that are indicative of highly effective principals; however, measures other than student growth and observations to determine individual principal effectiveness are not

identified. The standards for effective leaders assisted in the development of the Leadership Academy principal training for assessing leadership effectiveness.

The development and structure of the ID&E planned for teachers is much the same; however it is unclear in the narrative what teacher related competencies are being measured (p 19). In addition, it is not evident that significant incentives for leadership opportunities are made available for teachers.

A clear delineation of awards for teachers and principals is presented in the table on page 25. Each layer of awards in the model is intended to be significant but no justification for the size of the rewards is included. Work to be completed on the ID&E will facilitate further guidelines for determining rewards. In addition, bonuses are provided for teachers and principals who come to and remain in the targeted schools for this proposal. This includes teachers for hard-to-staff subject areas. The sizes of these awards are deemed sufficient to recruit and retain teachers and principals to the target schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

Met

Although the table on page 40 demonstrates the activities to be funded through non-TIF funds, there is no indication on the budget sheet the increasing amount to be paid by these funds each year.

The budget indicates that the FWISD has projected costs of the project for the 5 year span of grant funding and has established a plan to sustain the project following completion of the funding period. The district has already committed \$15 million in non-TIF funds to testing and piloting the current PBCS Model. The district is committed to leveraging state and other federal funds to sustain the project and provide for fiscal sustainability (p 4). In the past, the district has been successful in identifying funding sources to support initial phases of the reform process, including federal grant opportunities, support from local foundations, organizations and corporate sponsors, and state funding opportunities. This record provides evidence of the capability of this district to sustain the project (p 39).

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:

Met

The current PBCS is a pilot which serves as a cornerstone component of the district's work toward developing an aligned human capital management system for teachers and principals. The TIF grant provides the opportunity to expand upon the pilot and develop tools necessary to measure individual teacher and principal effectiveness (p 13). The ultimate goal of this process is to ensure that every classroom and school is staffed by highly effective teachers and principals. The initial Public Educators Accelerating Kids (PEAK) is a team-based rewards model based on accelerated growth. The TIF grant monies will allow the district to expand upon promising best practices piloted as part of the PEAK pilot. The next step forward in moving towards the district's goal is to build upon the pilot project by developing an individual measure of effectiveness and development for principals and teachers (p 15).

Through the support of TIF grant funds, the district will build upon the solid foundation to develop the ID&E Scorecard upon which to award performance based compensation. The scorecard would be based on clear definitions of practices, behaviors, and values which contribute to highly effective teaching/leading as well as an individual measure of student growth. It will be a powerful construct to develop targeted feedback and professional development for individual improvement of principals and teachers. Over time, it is also envisioned to be a meaningful source of trend information when aggregated across campuses, seniority and focus to better inform professional development, recruiting, and promotion decisions (p 19).

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:

Met

The initial PEAK project focused on team results. Each building selects teacher coaches (secondary lead content teachers/elementary content and cluster coaches) to support teams (p 16). In addition, each new teacher is assigned a full release teacher mentor to provide support and guidance (p 31). However, the compensation for these positions is not clearly determined.

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:

Training has been provided for teachers and principals related to the value added model and the SAS-EVAAS portal to build higher levels of confidence in these aspects of the performance system. The initial PEAK program has been acknowledged across the state as one of the most comprehensive and innovative approaches to PBCS within the Texas District Awards for Teacher Excellence. This recognition has raised the awareness of the community about the components of the PBCS. In addition, the table on pages 26-27 denotes specific approaches used that have provided opportunities to learn about and participate in the design and implementation of PEAK.

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:

Stakeholder involvement was a critical priority in the PEAK pilot project and will be in the current proposal. The table on pages 26 and 27 outlines outreach vehicles of engagement utilized in the pilot project that will also be carried out in the proposed project. Examples of involvement include: district task force which included school personnel and union representation, online surveys, in-person meetings, PEAK website and email, video and email messages, and external news media.

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 evaluations of team efforts initiated in the pilot PEAK project have been implemented with success (p 15). The focus for the proposed project is to develop, field test, and implement assessments for evaluation of individual teachers and principals to assist in providing meaningful feedback to grow teacher/principal-level talent within a PEAK high-need school.

These components will need to be further defined throughout the planning period: weighting of student outcomes, definition of teacher practices and values that contribute to effective teaching, use of an extensive objective and evidence-based rubric supported by a scoring guide which will assist teachers in understanding what is required to improve, plan for multiple reviewers and frequent observations throughout the year when needed, and stronger training and support tools to ensure inter-rater reliability (pp 20-22). It is unclear what means of evidence other than student test results and observations will be utilized.

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:

During the PEAK pilot project, a number of operational support and data systems were put into place. These efforts have ensured that the district has the capacity, commitment, and support to implement the comprehensive value-added model. In addition to partnering with SAS-EVAAS, the district also engaged in a partnership with Battelle for Kids, Linkages and Awards Verification. In 2008-09, the district implemented a robust Enterprise Resource Planning System for human resources and financial applications called Tyler Munis. In addition, the district has developed and engaged in a number of partnerships to support the use and provide capacity to use data effectively that will increase district, campus, and individual power around the use of data to drive instruction. (pp 28-29) Coordination of the data management applications that link student achievement to payroll and human resources is not evident.

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:

There are examples of professional development modules included in the proposal (pp 30-31) that are planned to assist teachers and principals in understanding measures of effectiveness included in the PBCS. Professional development modules to provide training and information on the use of the value added model at the as well as the ID&E are included. The district will create additional professional development opportunities as more targeted individual teacher and principal needs are identified. Professional

development to ensure that teachers and principals are able to utilize data to inform and improve instructional practice is not currently evident.

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:

A professional development component that provides guidance and training to ensure that teachers and principals are effective as outlined in the PBCS is being planned. These components will be based on the needs of the teachers and principals, determined through the evaluation process and dependent to a great extent upon student achievement. This focuses the professional development on the needs of the high-needs schools identified for the proposed project. As more targeted individual teacher and principal needs are identified through the use of value added data and the ID&E scorecard evaluation process, better targeted and tiered professional development can be fully implemented. A list of key professional development opportunities to support teacher and principals to improve their effectiveness is included (pp 30-31).

Because the professional development will be based on individual needs of teachers and principals, opportunities will be provided for those who are deemed effective as well as those who need assistance in improving. However, no specific plan is identified that will differentiate the professional development opportunities for the effective and not effective teachers and principals. Within the current PEAK pilot initiative, there are leadership opportunities for teachers through secondary lead content teachers and

elementary content and cluster coaches (p 16). There is no indication whether this opportunity will be continued in the current proposal.

There are opportunities for teachers and principals to provide their perceptions of the professional development provided at the TIF schools and the rate of professional development implementation in their school (p 45); however, there is no indication that this information will be used to assess the effectiveness of professional development in increasing student achievement.

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:

Schools targeted in this proposal are located in areas for which the district has trouble recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers, particularly in hard to staff subject areas due to the location of the schools. These schools are in geographic locations of high poverty, with minimal parental involvement, and high percentages of students identified as ELL and special education (p 6). Tables, graphs, and charts are used to provide statistical data and to justify the need to recruit and retain effective teachers and principals to these schools (pp 6-9). Student achievement scores for the 15 target schools on state level testing resulted in the schools receiving an unacceptable state accountability rating. Student achievement at PEAK campuses is lower than other schools in the district and state. A table lists data from other schools as compared to the PEAK schools (p 10).

The PBCS is designed to retain effective teachers in hard to staff subjects and specialty areas through incentives to attract teachers in math, science, special education and English language learners. Reward payouts on student growth are currently effective in retaining these teachers in the schools (p 5). After the first year of the PEAK pilot project, teacher absentees were down 25% and retention rates were on the rise. It is anticipated that the same trend will hold true in the FWISD for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

There is no criteria provided that justifies why the schools in table 3 (p 10) are considered comparable schools. In addition, there appears to be no plan to recruit teachers to these schools and hard to staff subject and specialty areas. Recruiting teachers is not a concern of the district.

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 PEAK scorecard, based on a value added student growth model, currently rewards teams of teachers for accelerated student growth by utilizing the SAS-EVAAS (p 18). The proposed project intends to further develop this approach to include individual teacher and principal differentiated rewards.

Student growth is measured using the Texas student performance achievement test (TAKS). A table outlining the award ranges for the current PEAK team initiative is provided on page

25. Each layer in the PEAK model is intended to be significant and aligned to the intensity of collaboration required to achieve. A similar approach will be implemented to reward individual teachers and principals; however, further discussion and analysis will be required to understand how to split these award amounts between the team and individual efforts. In addition to rewards, teachers, principals and other instructional campus staff are offered financial incentives for coming to and staying at targeted high-need schools.

In the pilot PEAK project which was based on team success, the teams were deemed effective if certain criteria were evident on the PEAK scorecard. The current proposal outlines a process for developing the Individual Development and Evaluation scorecard for teachers and principals (p 19). This scorecard will be based on clear definition of practices, behaviors, and values which contribute to highly effective teaching as well as an individual measure of student growth. Specific criteria will be determined by the task force made up of stakeholders.

Involvement and input in the pilot PEAK project is outlined in a table on pages 26-27. Stakeholder engagement vehicles include a district task force comprised of school personnel at all levels as well as employee association representatives, online surveys, in person meetings, website and email, videos, news media, and a core advisory group comprised of a teacher representative from each campus (p 26-27).

Evaluation procedures are already in place for "campus teams", however, the proposed project will develop and implement an evaluation process that focuses on individual teachers and principals with differentiated incentives available based on multiple rating categories that takes into account student growth. An individual score card will be developed which takes into consideration student outcomes, measures of teacher practices which contribute to effective teacher using a rubric and scoring guide, multiple reviewers and frequent observations, and training for reviewers to ensure inter-rater reliability (p 22).

During the PEAK pilot project, a number of operational support and data systems were put into place. These efforts have ensured that the district has the capacity, commitment, and support to implement the comprehensive value-added model. In addition to partnering with SAS-EVAAS, the district also engaged in a partnership with Battelle for Kids, Linkages and Awards Verification. In 2008-09, the district implemented a robust Enterprise Resource Planning System for human resources and financial applications (payroll) called Tyler Munis. pp 28-29).

As more targeted individual teacher needs are identified through the use of value added data and the ID&E scorecard, the more likely it is that targeted and tiered professional development can be fully implemented. A list of key professional development opportunities which can support teacher and principals to improve their effectiveness is included (pp 30 -31). In addition, all principals will be trained on the National Institute of Leadership curriculum, a high-quality, research based professional development program. Principals will also receive training to understand the ID&E scorecard and be better prepared reviewers of observations, rubrics and form as well as how to provide high quality feedback to teachers and other staff.

Weaknesses:

There is currently no plan in place to assess "individual" teachers and principals based on student scores (p 30).

A principal maximum incentive award of \$10,000 is the same as the base incentive award for teachers. This doesn't appear to be a significant award for principal's to participate (p25).

It is not clear how the data management applications in use will be linked to student achievement data to provide the most affective results.

The professional development plan is a bit vague on specifically how professional development training opportunities will be developed and provided.

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

FWISD serves as the fiscal agent, monitoring grant activities on a day-to-day basis to ensure that proposed project objectives are completed on time and within budget. The district will create a dedicated office with the primary responsibility for supporting the campus school improvement efforts. In addition, each campus will have an Operations Manager to assure constant communication between stakeholders and district office of full implementation of the activities to be performed in the grant (p 32).

The members of the management team have clearly defined responsibilities and are qualified to complete the work assigned as indicated in their resumes. A timeline of activities is included (p 32).

The budget indicates that the FWISD has projected costs of the project for the 5 year span of grant funding and has established a plan to sustain the project following completion of the funding period. The district has already committed \$15 million in local funds to testing and piloting the current PBCS Model. The district is committed to leveraging state and other federal funds to sustain the project and provide for fiscal sustainability (p 4). In the past, the district has been successful in identifying funding sources to support initial phases of the reform process, including federal grant opportunities; support from local foundations, organizations and corporate sponsors; and state funding opportunities. This record provides evidence of the capability of this district to sustain the project (p 39).

The grant amount is sufficient for carrying out the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

A table is included on pages 44-45 that outlines the measurable objectives that clearly address the goals of the project, the output, the instrument used to measure the output, and the outcomes. It is anticipated that the awards based on student growth will be significant enough to retain teachers in the hard to staff subject/specialty areas and the high needs schools.

Qualitative data collected includes: classroom observations, interviews, and logs and minutes.

Quantitative data includes: student academic measures, surveys, district data, and ID&E Scorecards (p 45).

Data will be gathered and analyzed to track, communicate, and improve campus performance. Three types of data (internal measures, output measures, and satisfaction measures) will be used by various campus groups and the grant advisory committee to evaluate the implementation of the grant and the improvement of student success (p 46).

Weaknesses:

A well defined plan for recruiting teachers to the hard to staff subject areas isn't evident (p 5).

In addition there is no strong link between the program goals on pages 2-3 and the local evaluation measures and outcomes on page 44. To strengthen the local program evaluation, evidence should be provided to demonstrate that overall goals of the program are met or not met.

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:

FWISD will use a value-added measure to determine the impact of instruction on student growth including building the capacity to implement EVAAS and clearly explain EVAAS utilizing professional services from Battelle for Kids to develop tools to help teachers more readily understand growth analysis and use data results to improve student achievement (pp 4, 17-18). The PEAK Team Score card and the yet to be developed Individual Development and Evaluation Scorecard will be used to determine levels of performance based compensation(p 15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed PEAK Model, implemented in high need schools serving high needs students, is effectively designed to recruit effective teachers in hard to staff subjects and specialty areas through incentives to attract teachers to math, science, special education, and ELL and has demonstrated that these incentives help fill vacancies with teachers of these subjects. Reward payouts on student growth will serve to retain these same teachers over time (p 5).

Schools targeted in this proposal are located in areas of the district that have trouble recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers; particularly in hard to staff subject areas due to the location of the schools in geographic locations of high poverty, minimal parent involvement, and high percentages of students identified as ELL or special education (p 6-12).

Weaknesses:

The proposal provides no information to explain how the district will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective (p 5). In addition, no mention was made in the proposal of communicating to teachers which schools are high need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard to staff. Defining these key areas would provide evidence that the applicant has considered every aspect of recruitment and retention.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM