

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/28/10 4:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

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

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

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	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
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	9
------------------	----	---

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

### 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:

All items of this priority - A, B, and C - are adequately addressed in the proposal. There is a use of the value added assessment systems SAS and EVAAS (p.12), a teacher performance system with observation based incentive plans is outlined (p.20), and teachers assuming leadership roles are rewarded monetarily (17-20). Incentive amounts are substantial enough to foster participation.

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 proposal meets the criteria cited. Having used the model - Mission Possible - in other district schools, the applicant has been utilizing key elements of this priority (funding, performance based compensation). The TIF proposal seeks to expand the existing model (p.45-47). Beginning in 2015, the district will assume all funding for the project (p.46).

**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:**

Specific evaluation procedures and sample evaluation instruments are included in this proposal which impacts teacher retention and tenure decisions.. A plan for specific professional development addressing teacher needs/deficiencies exist. p. 9

**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:**

Monetary incentives and additional training are provided to principals and teacher leaders as outlined on pp20-21.

**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 proposed grant timeline includes communication about the plan with stakeholders during year one of the grant. Letters of support for the TIF grant from union leaders and principals are included in the proposal. Less detail is provided regarding communication with parents and community leaders.p. 1 and 21

**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:**

Letters of support from teacher union leaders and principals for the TIF proposal are included in the proposal (p.23-24). Proposed funding appears adequate to support the initiative.

**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:**

In the 2010-2011 school year, the district will implement Core Element #3 components with principals and master teachers using multi-rater evaluation rubrics involving instruments measuring teacher effectiveness. Other elements of this criteria will be addressed in the planning year of the TIF grant (p.25-26). An appendix includes sample instruments with rubrics and observation protocols.

**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 district will use a planning year to develop and populate a data management system that will link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and HR. Once in place, the system will be used as part of a PBCS (p.27).

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:

Professional development will be provided in local schools by trained effective master teachers and teacher leaders. Professional development will address identified teacher weaknesses and ensure program understanding. An evaluation system of professional development efforts will exist (p.27-29).

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

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

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore,

receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice); (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

**General:**

The proposal outlines a professional development program based on the "Mission Possible" model. Identified teacher needs will inform professional development activities. Teacher mentors and leaders will be utilized to deliver professional development. A differentiated compensation system will be used to reward teacher performance as it relates to value added criteria (p.27-29). A system to assess professional development activities will be addressed during the planning year.

**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 proposal cites data identifying comparable low performing schools and the success of similar district schools employing a "Mission Possible" model (p.17-21). Comparable schools external to the district with similar demographics/test scores will be identified during the planning year. Schools targeted for grant participation have student achievement levels placing them in high-need categories (academic achievement and poverty levels).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant needs to provide more information regarding how it plans to address teacher retention and recruiting/retaining teachers in hard to staff areas.

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:**

Each of the five elements present in selection Criteria B is adequately addressed in the proposal. The project abstract provides a design overview that cites monetary incentives for teacher performance, monetary incentives for teachers assuming leadership roles, and school wide performance incentives. Stakeholder support for the TIF grant is present in proposal documents and plans for a data management system that links student achievement to educator pay are described. A detailed evaluation instrument addressing elements to determine teacher and principal effectiveness will be used and is included in

the appendix. A sample evaluation instrument meeting this criteria exists in the document. Professional development activities related to enhancing teacher effectiveness are outlined. Surveys will be used to assess professional development quality.

**Weaknesses:**

A data management system that links student achievement to teacher and principal payroll will be developed, but is not currently in place. Criteria used for "one time" teacher bonuses is not clearly outlined. More detail is needed on teacher/principal compensation enhancement schedules is needed. Individual course assessment timelines may be too ambitious.

**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:**

A detailed budget and timeline is provided. The project director and key staff resumes are included in the application and indicate that they are qualified to carry out their responsibilities. Letters of support from stakeholders are included in the proposal. Funding appears adequate and sustainable in the proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

Sources of local funds to sustain funding after the TIF project funds end need to be identified in more detail. Projected funding for part of the project is based on teachers voting to withdraw from the NC state salary plan which may be a problematic source of funding given the unknown outcome of the teacher vote.

**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:**

A description of the local evaluation plan is included in the proposal. Quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered and analyzed. Some measurable milestones are cited (p. 12-16). After establishing the need for the initiative, the applicant offers clear performance objectives with cited, measurable attainment criteria. Teacher evaluation procedures provide a feedback and continuous improvement plan for individual teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

Performance objectives focus more on teachers than on student academic growth. Retaining and recruiting teachers in hard to staff positions was not adequately addressed.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The widely used SAS-EVAAS value added instrument is already in use in many district schools. The district has the capacity to implement the model via resources cited and commitment from key stakeholders. The applicant has a plan to expand the use of the instrument to other district schools via TIF funds. A communication plan will be developed in year 1 to assist staff in understanding this value-added model.

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

A clear outline of monetary rewards to recruit and retain educators for hard to staff positions is outlined in the proposal. Page 19 outlines additional monetary rewards for teachers selected to work in high-need schools and specific hard to staff vacancies. Related incentive bonuses are cited.

**Weaknesses:**

More proposal detail is needed for hard to staff areas like math. A more detailed communication plan is needed related to communicating to district teachers which of the district schools that are classified as "high need."

Reader's Score: 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/28/10 4:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/28/10 2:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

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

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

1.Project Design	60	46
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	19
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	81
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

### 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:

Mission Possible is an extension project and readily meets this priority. Applicant already has developed and implemented an established PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement as part of the coherent and integrated approach of the LEA to strengthening the educator workforce.

Significant weight is given to student growth in this model via a value-added measure as well as a minimum of 4 observations per year.

What would have strengthened this application is to have included some of the actual data from the past 3 or 4 years of implementation to support and justify this application. For example, data that demonstrates that the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments in the past did provide incentive amounts that are substantial and enough to change teacher behavior would be great justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen for this grant.

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 projected cost for the grant period and demonstrated the use of non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period as an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers and principals (p.46). The sustainability plan for after the grant period is to use local funds for a performance-incentive only model across ALL 40 schools (20 schools in this TIF grant as well as the original 20 project schools and 2 Cumulative Effect Schools p. 47). Though, the Applicant has not specifically identified which local funds will be used to sustain incentive awards.

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:**

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

Applicant already has an established PBCS that addresses these components and meets this priority with a comprehensive value added model and evaluation process (pp 12-16).

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:**

Applicant provided an array of increasing teacher responsibilities and leadership roles for teachers determined to be "effective" (p. 21). Though, there was no evidence of these opportunities for principals and other staff.

**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 will use Year One of the grant as a planning year to develop a plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, classified staff and the community about the Mission Possible program, its features and requirements (Budget Narrative -Page 1).

Though, it is unclear why a planning period is needed to develop a communication plan as Applicant states on page 40 that they have already "developed a Communication Plan of Action", and Figure 5 on page 34 notes that the Communication Plan is 25% complete. This will need to be clarified.

**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 demonstrated a research-based approach with the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel to be served by the grant in The Chronology of PBCS Project Team Activities (Table 14, p. 24).

Applicant has invested substantial time and effort in teacher/constituent involvement as evidenced by Table 14 and letters of support from participating school principals, the education association, PTA, and the legislature (Appendix).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

Applicant provided evaluation process that use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with the NC professional teaching standards.

A strength of this application is the proposal to conduct four teacher observations throughout the year. On the weak side, Applicant makes no mention of principal observations.

Applicant will be using Year One to calibrate scores and work on inter-rater reliability of observation instruments. Taking the time to calibrate scores and inter-rater reliability provides for a greater potential for success over the long term use of this PBCS.

Applicant has a well established (5 year) PBCS for educators which is very strong in the teacher portion, though, less established in the principal portion.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The Applicant will use Year One of the grant to work with a programmer to develop a data tracking system that links student achievement data to educator performance (Budget Narrative, Page 1). Thus, this core element has not yet been addressed.

**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 Year One of the grant to provide in depth training to program staff, teachers, and administrators in both measures of effectiveness ensuring that they understand the specific measures of effectiveness (Budget Narrative, Page 1). As such, the Applicant has adequately met this core element.

**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:**

Applicant plans to provide professional development to both those teachers and principals who are determined effective and ineffective with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (pp. 27-29).

The Applicant will use Year One of the grant to provide in depth training to program staff, teachers, and administrators in both measures of effectiveness (Budget Narrative, Page 1).

The Applicant will regularly assess the effectiveness of the professional development in improving teacher leadership and practice through end of course surveys and student test outcomes (p. 29).

**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 inclusion of tables with the necessary data provided clarity in the description of the required criteria. For example, Table 2 District versus School High Needs Student Percentages (p. 3), and Table 4, Effective Teacher Screening Process (p.5).

Applicant currently has in place a Hard to Staff and Highly Effective Teacher incentive program, as well as a screening process that facilitates selecting the best fit candidate for each position (p. 4).

**Weaknesses:**

While the Applicant spoke to difficulties in recruiting highly qualified teachers in hard to staff subjects or specifically areas, there was no specific information other than one anecdotal principal comment, as to why they experienced these difficulties and/or, past strategies for recruitment. Additionally, Applicant noted successful recruitment and retention incentives under the current PBCS, but did not provide any specifics as to how long these incentives have been in place or how effective they have been (pp.17-21) thus, it is still unclear why there are still recruitment and retention difficulties.

Regarding Table 3 (p.4), while the highly qualified status of the applicants is unknown and the applicant numbers do not meet the district's "10 candidates to every open position criteria", the data do not necessarily indicate a difficulty in recruiting staff. For example, there are 2 ESL vacancies with 10 applicants, 17 Science vacancies with 59 applicants, and 19 English LA vacancies with 48 applicants. It appears as if the Applicant has a viable candidate pool.

Only three or four of the identified schools have a turnover rate that is significantly higher than the district. Applicant has not provided significant data to demonstrate that retention is a difficulty. Applicant notes that the current TIF I "grant efforts have achieved stated goals in recruiting and retaining the achievement of high-need students in hard to staff schools" (p. 43).

Applicant minimally addressed the definition of comparability (p. 8), and did not address student achievement and the comparable schools in terms of size, grade and poverty

levels.

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:

Applicant already has an established PBCS that addresses these components and meets these criteria with a comprehensive value added model and evaluation process (pp. 12-16). The goal of this project is to expand and more closer to having a district wide PBCS.

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

Applicant provided five standardized measures of effectiveness to measure, determine and reward educator effectiveness. Each measure was described and aligns with the state standards and accountability system (p. 15).

The value-added model presented in this application has the ability to accommodate team teaching and departmentalized instruction. As well, it can use all historical data, regardless of the presence of missing data. This is a practical and useful attribute of the model (p.14).

The Applicant offers five different kinds of incentives to educators and differentiates at all levels in a building. Table 9 effectively lays out all five incentives, the expected behavior change and the rationale behind the incentive.

Table 13 on page 22, aptly demonstrates how teachers can reach the highest incentive level (3 times that of the lower level).

In Table 14 The Chronology of PBCS Project Team Activities, the Applicant demonstrated a research-based approach with the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel to be served by the grant (p. 24). Applicant has invested substantial time and effort in teacher/constituent involvement as evidenced by this table and letters of support from, school principals, the education association, PTA, and the legislature (Appendix).

The Applicant proposes to use the first year of the grant to allow Master Teachers to get to know the rubric and provide the necessary professional development on the evaluation instrument, and for principals to calibrate their scoring on the rubric. Teachers will be evaluated a minimum of four times throughout the year.

Applicant will use Year One to work with a programmer to design a web-based system to collect, analyze, and synthesize program information, and integrate with the Human Resources Management system (p. 27).

The Applicant demonstrated in Table 15 (pp. 28-29) a high-quality professional development system with activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement. More specifically, the professional development activities are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

**Weaknesses:**

The goal noted on page 11 is not measurable. It is unclear what increased percentage of teachers receiving performance incentives will be needed to meet the goal. It is unclear why LEA has not used data from past implementation to provide a baseline for a measurable goal.

All three objectives are teacher/principal centric. It still remains unclear the tie to improved student growth and being "effective". It is unclear how teachers and principals are determined "effective" (how much growth a student needs to make, observation ratings, etc.).

While Applicant provided incentive amounts for various groups of educators, data from past implementation years would have provided justification and support for the incentive amounts being sufficient for behavior change. There was no evidence or data presented for how well this model has worked in the past. On page 18, Applicant notes that the "most significant awards are for student growth", though, provides no data on the amount of student growth or numbers/percentages of awards going to this incentive. On page 23, Applicant alludes to experience in implementing the model - though, provides no data.

Table 13 on page 22 demonstrates how to reach the highest incentive level, though, it remains unclear why only certain groups of educators receive the one time spot bonus for Historically Effective Teachers (p19). As well, it is unclear how the Applicant made the determination that 6-8 grade math teachers (Group B) have the greatest incentive opportunities.

One of the requirements for the incentive awards is that an educator must agree to participate in observation-based assessments of their performance (p. 18). It is unclear what the LEA does for teachers who do not wish to participate.

While the Applicant demonstrated a high-quality professional development system with activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement, in terms of sustainability, it is unclear why all teachers would not be encouraged to participate in the courses on Teacher Leadership, Diversity, Content, Instructional Practice, and Reflection on Practice.

**Reader's Score: 46**

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

Applicant provided clearly defined responsibilities of key project personnel. At 1.0 FTE each, these positions appear to provide adequate amounts of FTE to achieve the stated objectives.

While the Applicant did provide a timeline, it proposes to use Year 1 to develop the five core elements. Figure 5 on page 34 provides a good graphic of where the LEA is in terms of achieving the goal to fully develop each of the core elements.

Resumes indicate that the Project Director and key personnel have the experience and capacity to carry out their responsibilities. Of particular note, the Project Director has had three years experience managing a \$20 million PBCS - the LEA's current TIF fund.

The five Master Teachers will each have one matched set of schools. This seems reasonable and workable.

The Applicant also provided a detailed Communication Plan of Action (pp.41-42) aligned to 4 communication goals.

Applicant proposes to use local, Foundation and federal funds to support the proposed

project (pp. 45-47) through 2014. After that, the District will use local funds, which may work out in the case of this applicant - as they started their first PBCS with local funds in 2005.

The requested grant amount and projected costs appear reasonable and enough to attain the stated project goals.

**Weaknesses:**

While the Applicant did provide a timeline (p.35-38), said timeline is given in yearly increments with no detail. Providing Year One planning tasks and activities on a weekly or monthly basis would have more clearly delineated the plan. As well, a more defined timeline allows for benchmark and milestone checks. It is unclear if the Year One planning activities, or, subsequent yearly activities will be accomplished within the time frame, as specific and detailed timelines were not provided.

Applicant proposes to document each milestone, though, did not provide measures to determine if and when milestones would be accomplished (p. 39).

It is unclear why the Applicant indicates the communication plan (Core Element 1) is only 25 % complete when they provided a detailed Communication Plan of Action.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Applicant provided performance objectives.

A strength of this Applicant are the key learnings, experience, and insights from previous evaluation finding of the original programs. This information puts the Applicant in a unique position to successfully implement the stated objectives of the program (p. 49).

In addition to the competition evaluation Applicant proposes to conduct a "local evaluation" that will qualitatively document differences across schools in terms of leadership and structure. Individual schools will receive their own reports.

Applicant has provided a matrix with evaluation questions and both quantitative and qualitative measures for each question. As well, the evaluation questions appropriately

relate to fidelity to implementation, outcome data and sustainability.

**Weaknesses:**

While the Applicant did provide performance objectives - they were not specific and measurable nor, were they necessarily tied to raising student achievement. The six main activities were not measurable, making it unclear when or by what standard they will have met these objectives.

While the Applicant proposes to conduct a "local evaluation" in addition to the competitive evaluation, this adds almost a million dollars (\$913, 800) to the cost of the grant. Based on the information provided is not clear if this may be a duplication of services if the applicant receives the competitive evaluation funds. This will need to be clarified.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant ably demonstrated, that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals, and other personnel would use a value-added measure of the impact on student growth as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel.

Applicant plans to use Year one to more fully develop a plan to clearly explain the chosen value-added model to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices, and to develop data systems.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Applicant provided a new screening process which has the potential to ensure that teachers selected to fill vacancies are the most likely to be effective in achieving student growth in high needs students (p. 4).

On pages 17-21 the Applicant addressed a process for effectively communicating to teachers and principals incentives for hard to staff positions and high needs schools.

**Weaknesses:**

While the Applicant generally addressed recruitment of highly "effective" staff, Applicant did not specifically address the recruitment and retention of effective teachers in teaching positions for hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. Nor did Applicant provide specific data to demonstrate difficulty in any one specific content or speciality area.

Reader's Score: 1

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/28/10 2:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/28/10 8:16 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

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

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

1.Project Design	60	52
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	87

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	97
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Guilford County Schools -- Talent Development, Human Resources (S385A100071)

### 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:

Five different types of incentives will be offered to teachers, principals, and other personnel, the most significant of which is the Individual Performance Incentive that recognizes student growth according to value-added scores (p. 17). Performance Incentives are substantial because at the highest level, they are three times greater than those at the lower level, and can represent up to 25% of an individual's salary (p. 20).

In total, school personnel can receive incentives ranging from \$750 to \$26,500, demonstrating that incentive amounts are differentiated by various levels, and should certainly have an impact on the behavior of educators in the system.

Observation-based assessments are required for teachers who want to be eligible for performance incentives.

Since this applicant is seeking an Evaluation grant, the designated incentives pertain to the treatment group, while all others in the control group will receive a 1% salary incentive across the board (p. 18).

Student growth is factored into the value-added data for individual incentives for areas that are tested, and for schoolwide incentives for the entire classified staff at a school.

Teacher Leadership Incentives are offered to those who demonstrate high value-added scores and/or historically exceptional ratings according to the NC Professional Teaching Standards rubric; these individuals can be nominated for a teacher leadership role and/ or serve as a mentor teacher (p. 21), for a maximum incentive of \$3000 per year. Various leadership roles are available, such as the EVAAS and VAD teacher leader, the Teaching Standards teacher leader, the Model Classroom teacher leader, and the Mentor Teacher.

Principals can receive up to \$20,000 in incentives, with a significant portion (\$15,000) of that amount potentially coming from schoolwide performance incentives that reflect high growth in students (p. 22).

**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:**

GCS began implementing their first PBCS in 2005 with the use of local funds, demonstrating their early commitment to such an evaluation system (p. 45). The proposal includes a table (p. 46) to succinctly demonstrate the transition of funding from federal to local funds upon completion of the grant period. By phasing out the recruitment and retention incentives and keeping the performance incentives in place, GCS plans to use local funds in a way that will meet the needs of the most educators.

Based on the number of students and teachers to be reached through the project, and the comprehensive nature of the PBCS that has been created, it appears that the project costs are reasonable and will adequately meet the needs of the project design.

**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 project is part of a larger overall plan to strengthen the educator workforce and increase student achievement in GCS; recruitment, hiring, professional development, and performance based compensation systems are all components of the GCS Strategic Plan for Human Resources (p. 9).

For those educators who do not meet baseline measures of effectiveness, growth plans will be used to set expectations for improvement and offer professional development options; if progress is not made over time, the effectiveness data can be used to support non-renewal and non-tenure decisions.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

Teachers who are deemed effective will have opportunities to serve as Master and Lead teachers, who support their colleagues in various ways (p. 27-8).

Teacher Leadership Incentives are offered to those who demonstrate high value-added scores and/or historically exceptional ratings according to the NC Professional Teaching Standards rubric; these individuals can be nominated for a teacher leadership role and/ or serve as a mentor teacher (p. 21), for a maximum incentive of \$3000 per year. Various leadership roles are available, such as the EVAAS and VAD teacher leader, the Teaching Standards teacher leader, the Model Classroom teacher leader, and the Mentor Teacher.

There is no evidence that leadership opportunities are available for other educators.

**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 proposal outlines a comprehensive communications plan that will serve a number of purposes involving both internal and external constituents (p. 42). By both communicating information and soliciting feedback, the communication plan will allow project leaders to engage in collaborative and effective decision-making that will positively impact the overall success of the project.

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:

Over the last year, GCS has had a project team in place, "whose role it was to develop an ideal PBCS" (p. 23) for the organization. Team members included a teacher, a classified employee, a special education specialist, a principal, a regional executive director, and the NC Association of Educators president. Through various activities and events over the last year, this team has gone through various steps to research and develop a PBCS for GCS. By seeking outside support and guidance throughout the process, the community is on board with the implementation of the new model for the upcoming school year.

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:

GCS plans to measure educator effectiveness in five ways: value-added data, NC Professional Teaching Standards and Evaluation process, NC School Executive Standards and Evaluation process, teacher turnover rates (for principals), and the NC ABC Accountability Model (p. 12-16). These five components are described in detail and offer a clear, multifaceted picture of the applicant's description of an effective educator.

The new NC standards and evaluation instruments for principals and teachers include objective evidence-based rubrics that are used four times a year and are aligned to professional standards for leading and teaching (p. 14). By using self-assessment, reflection, presentation of artifacts, and classroom demonstrations, the evaluation process involves multiple lenses from which to view a teacher (p. 25).

The planning year will be used for GCS to become more proficient in the use of the new instruments to assess teachers and leaders; Master Teachers will provide training on the instrument and principals will use the time calibrate their ratings and ensure inter-

rater reliability (p. 26).

The value-added component, as well as the NC ABC Model for school improvement, both allow for effectiveness to be based on individual and schoolwide student growth data.

**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 proposal briefly outlines a plan to develop a web-based system that will be used to collect, analyze and synthesize program information, including student achievement data, that will also have the capability to interface with the Human Resources and payroll systems (p. 27). Additional details are needed to fully understand the development of this plan.

**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:**

Through stakeholder meetings and other forms of communication at the district level, as well as school-level communication and planning, GCS has engaged stakeholders around the notion of effectiveness. Further, through professional development opportunities at the district and school levels, educators are given options for learning and applying strategies that will promote effectiveness in the classroom. Various other efforts, such as the use of Master Teachers and other school based teacher leaders, are being made by GCS to provide multiple and varied supports for teachers to improve their effectiveness.

**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:

An extensive list of professional development options (both schoolwide and need-based individual options are available) is provided (p. 28-9), evidencing the quality of the offerings and the efforts being made by GCS to provide multiple and varied supports for teachers to improve their effectiveness. There are plans to link professional development quality data (as determined through surveys) with student testing outcomes, to further ensure that the professional development activities are promoting effectiveness.

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 proposal defined the hard-to-staff areas for GCS as principals, math, science, special education, ESL, upper elementary, and middle grade language arts (p. 4, 19). Recruitment incentives for any of these areas range from \$2500 to \$5000. Additionally, a Historically Effective Teacher Incentive is offered to teachers who are recruited with experience and have the ability to demonstrate at least 2 years of high value-added scores.

In addition to offering recruitment incentives, GCS has a specific recruitment and selection process to ensure that they are hiring the most effective candidates (p. 5).

In terms of retention, GCS will continue with the hard-to-staff incentive for teachers willing to remain in those positions, and the leadership incentive, which "creates organizational buy-in and motivation to remain in the school," (p. 6).

Ten high-need schools were selected to participate in the current project; they were selected through the use of a Comprehensive School Index which generated a score for each school using teacher turnover percentages, ineffectiveness data based on value-added scores, and the school's historical performance composite scores (p. 1-2, 6-8). All selected schools meet the free or reduced-price lunch criteria.

Multiple tables demonstrate that student achievement in the 10 project schools is lower than the district average (p. 7-8).

Comparable schools are those outside of GCS with similar rates of teacher turnover, free or reduced lunch percentages, and performance scores. In particular, propensity score matching will be used during the planning year to identify 20 comparison schools so that each project school can be matched with two other schools (p. 8).

**Weaknesses:**

Comparable schools were not defined according to size, grade level and poverty levels.

The applicant has not adequately described the teacher retention challenges that are faced within the district.

**Reader's Score: 9**

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

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

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

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

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes

to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The project is part of a larger overall plan to strengthen the educator workforce and increase student achievement in GCS; recruitment, hiring, professional development, and performance based compensation systems are all components of the GCS Strategic Plan for Human Resources (p. 9).

GCS plans to measure educator effectiveness in five ways: value-added data, NC Professional Teaching Standards and Evaluation process, NC School Executive Standards and Evaluation process, teacher turnover rates (for principals), and the NC ABC Accountability Model (p. 12-16). These five components are described in detail and offer a clear, multifaceted picture of the applicant's description of an effective educator.

The new NC standards and evaluation instruments for principals and teachers include objective evidence-based rubrics that are used four times a year and are aligned to professional standards for leading and teaching (p. 14). By using self-assessment, reflection, presentation of artifacts, and classroom demonstrations, the evaluation process involves multiple lenses from which to view a teacher (p. 25).

The planning year will be used for GCS to become more proficient in the use of the new instruments to assess teachers and leaders; Master Teachers will provide training on the instrument and principals will use the time calibrate their ratings and ensure inter-rater reliability (p. 26).

Five different types of incentives will be offered to teachers, principals, and other personnel, the most significant of which is the Individual Performance Incentive that recognizes student growth according to value-added scores (p. 17). Performance Incentives at the highest level are three times greater than those at the lower level, and can represent up to 25% of an individual's salary (p. 20). Principals can receive up to \$20,000 in incentives, with a significant portion (\$15,000) of that amount potentially coming from schoolwide performance incentives that reflect high growth in students (p. 22).

The value-added component, as well as the NC ABC Model for school improvement, both allow

for effectiveness to be based on individual and schoolwide student growth data.

For those educators who do not meet baseline measures of effectiveness, growth plans will be used to set expectations for improvement and offer professional development options; if progress is not made over time, the effectiveness data can be used to support non-renewal and non-tenure decisions.

An extensive list of professional development options (both schoolwide and need-based individual options are available) is provided (p. 28-9), evidencing the quality of the offerings and the efforts being made by GCS to provide multiple and varied supports for teachers to improve their effectiveness. There are plans to link professional development quality data (as determined through surveys) with student testing outcomes, to further ensure that the professional development activities are promoting effectiveness.

Over the last year, GCS has had a project team in place, "whose role it was to develop an ideal PBCS" for the organization (p. 23). Team members included a teacher, a classified employee, a special education specialist, a principal, a regional executive director, and the NC Association of Educators president. Through various activities and events over the last year, this team has gone through various steps to research and develop a PBCS for GCS. By seeking outside support and guidance throughout the process, the community is on board with the implementation of the new model for the upcoming school year.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal briefly outlines a plan to develop a web-based system that will be used to collect, analyze and synthesize program information, that will also have the capability to interface with the Human Resources and payroll systems (p. 27). Additional details are needed to fully understand the development of this plan.

The Historically Effective Teacher incentive (p. 4, 22) does not appear to be adequately defined; criteria is not provided and there is no explanation as to why only certain hard-to-staff subjects will receive this incentive, as demonstrated on the table on p. 22.

**Reader's Score: 52**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

There are various levels of leadership within the current project, ranging from district level project management, school level leadership (principals and teachers), and schoolwide involvement (p. 31). The eight district level project team members will oversee the project, taking on a range of responsibilities, and ensure that project objectives are met. The distinct roles, responsibilities, and qualifications of each key personnel member are described (p. 32-4, 43-4).

The proposal provides a clear representation of the status of each of the core elements, offering justification for the planning year and an idea of where time and funds will be spent during that year (p. 34).

A clear timeline of project activities by year is included; this table offers extensive insight into the projected tasks and time commitments involved in completing those tasks (p. 35-8). Furthermore, a list of milestones is included to serve as an ongoing set of benchmarks toward meeting project objectives (p. 39).

GCS began implementing their first PBCS in 2005 with the use of local funds, demonstrating their early commitment to such an evaluation system (p. 45). The proposal includes a table (p. 46) to succinctly demonstrate the transition of funding from federal to local funds upon completion of the grant period. By phasing out the recruitment and retention incentives and keeping the performance incentives in place, GCS plans to use local funds in a way that will meet the needs of the most educators.

Based on the number of students and teachers to be reached through the project, and the comprehensive nature of the PBCS that has been created, it appears that the project costs are reasonable and will adequately meet the needs of the project design.

An extensive number of letters of support are included (appendix) and demonstrate the community's commitment to being involved in the current project. From school principals to community organizations to state education officials and political representatives, the range of support is widely documented.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would be strengthened by incorporating the list of milestones and the responsible individuals/ groups into the table of project activities. By seeing all related items in one table, there would be a clear picture of the overall management plan that the project intends to undertake.

The proposal would be strengthened by the inclusion of sources for local funds that will be used.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**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 logic model is used to depict the overarching goal of the project, aligned with three primary objectives and six related activities (p. 11). This logic model, along with several implementation, outcome, and sustainability questions serve as a guide for the project evaluation that will take place.

"The current proposed evaluation will not only focus on gathering data related to the performance measures and program objectives, but will focus significantly more resources on qualitatively documenting differences across schools in terms of leadership and structure" (p. 50). Based on previous success with a TIF project, GCS has the ability and expertise to engage in a high-quality local evaluation that gleans useful information in moving forward with this and other PBCS projects.

Several evaluation activities and data sources are planned and will be used to gather both qualitative and quantitative data for use in the evaluation and to inform professional development planning (p. 50-2).

Feedback and continuous improvement procedures include the use of individual school reports, quarterly updates, and annual reports. The individual school reports will be extremely useful for principals in comparing their school's progress to that of the other comparison schools that were selected, and in making decisions on a school-level basis.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would be strengthened by aligning strong and measurable performance objectives with the primary objectives and activities that are central to the project.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The SAS EVAAS value-added measures will be used to assess student growth and to calculate differentiated compensation.

Having worked with SAS EVAAS for over 10 years, GCS has the resources and experience to fully implement this component of the evaluation system. Over that time, administrators and teachers in GCS have engaged in extensive professional development to thoroughly understand the system being used (p. 13). Particular attention has been paid to the connection between instructional practice and student learning. Administrators have learned how to better analyze and use data to promote strategies that will lead to educator effectiveness.

A Data Quality Plan is in place to regulate teacher and student data and is then incorporated into the personnel database for payment of differentiated compensation.

The use of teacher leaders to act as Value-Added Data experts is a wise use of human resources and will create motivation for schoolwide learning around mechanisms to support student growth.

**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 proposal defined the hard-to-staff areas for GCS as principals, math, science, special education, ESL, upper elementary, and middle grade language arts (p. 4, 19). The determination about these hard-to-staff positions was made based on counts of vacancies, applications, and an application shortage needed to adequately fill the positions according to the district's screening and selection process.

Recruitment incentives and a Historically Effective Teacher Incentive are offered to teachers who are beginning employment in one of the GCS project schools. The Historically Effective Teacher Incentive uses value-added data from a teacher's previous experience to determine whether they will be effective in GCS.

Recruitment incentives for hard-to-staff areas remain as long as teachers remain in the position from year to year, becoming a retention incentive.

Ten high-need schools were selected to participate in the current project; they were selected through the use of a Comprehensive School Index which generated a score for each school using teacher turnover percentages, ineffectiveness data based on value-added

scores, and the school's historical performance composite scores (p. 1-2, 6-8). All selected schools meet the free or reduced-price lunch criteria.

Multiple tables demonstrate that student achievement in the 10 project schools is lower than the district average (p. 7-8).

The proposal offers various mechanisms for communicating with teachers regarding recruitment and retention strategies.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/28/10 8:16 AM