Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Evaluation Criteria		
Absolute Priority 1		
1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
Absolute Priority 2		
1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Evaluaton Criteria		
Absolute Priority 3		
1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Requirement		
Requirement		
1. Requirement	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Evaluation Criteria		
Core Element 1		
1. Core Element 1	0	0
Core Element 2		
1. Core Element 2	0	0
Core Element 3		
1. Core Element 3	0	0
Core Element 4		
1. Core Element 4	0	0
Core Element 5		
1. Core Element 5	0	0
High Quality Professional Development		
1. Professional Development	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Need for the Project		
1. Need for Project	10	8
Project Design		

1. Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1. Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1. Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	86

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Competitve Priority 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Competitive Priority 2	5	1
Sub Total	10	6
Total	110	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

   Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

   General:

   The applicant gives a concise description of the method proposed to measure student growth (value added). The resultant student growth measure will be a significant factor in calculating teacher PBCS awards. Observation assessments will also be a major part of that calculation. Principal and assistant principal incentive awards will also be based on such assessment.
   The applicant offers an in-depth discussion of differentiated compensation calculations (pp 19-20) but no definitive scale of PBCS awards is provided.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

(a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and
(b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

General:

The applicant has prepared a comprehensive budget projecting the costs of the development and grant implementation (p 44, budget narrative).

IPS commits to providing an increasing share of the PBCS paid to the teachers in years 2-5 (p 44) However, the budget does not indicate any non-federal funds designated for PBCS stipends, or for any other budget item during the five year grant.

Iberville Parish Schools commits to providing an increasing share of the PBCS paid to the teachers in years 2-5 (p 44). However, the budget does not indicate any non-Federal funds designated for PBCS stipends, or for any other budget item during the five-year grant. Iberville Parish Schools (IPS) has considered the problem of fiscal sustainability of the TIF project (BOOSTER) at length. There is district level commitment to sustain the program. The district will increase its portion of funds dedicated to PBCS past the grant funding period to the point of raising district millage (taxes). Other considerations are to reallocate a portion of federal and state funds and in-kind resources. A detailed plan for PBCS sustainment displayed in table form is provided (p 46).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant proposes the implementation of TAP, a nationally recognized, integrated and coherent system for strengthening the (IPS) educator workforce (p16). The TAP program utilizes four elements of success: Multiple career paths, on-going applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance based compensation - all of which support the TIF objectives. "Value Added", as applied to student growth, is an integral part of the evaluation process as it applies to performance based compensation. In-house professional development led by well-trained Master Teachers is a regularly scheduled part of the teacher's week.

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:

   Primary additional responsibilities and leadership roles discussed are that of Master Teacher and Mentor Teacher (p 22). In each case, a monetary incentive is provided. These positions are an integral part of the TAP program.

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:

   MET
   The applicant has a communication and outreach plan in place - it will be implemented in year one. A detailed description of the plan and its implementation is provided, with goals and objectives and assessment included (p 27). Numerous methods of communication are to be utilized, depending on the audience targeted.

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:

   MET
   Numerous letters of support, from the superintendent and the principals of the schools involved in the project, are included in the application's appendix. The community -at-large is supportive (p 30) of improved educational achievement and has been willing to support increasing teacher salaries through higher local taxes. However, the level of teacher support for the project is not documented. They will vote on the implementation of TAP in March.
   Unions and collective bargaining are not part of the IPS system.

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 LEAÃ¢ÂÂs 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:

   NOT MET: PLAN WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.
   The applicant follows the guidelines of the TIF program in the discussion of planning and designing the PBCS evaluation process (pp 31-32). The primary sources of evaluation data will come from student growth and multiple classroom observations by qualified observers. TAP incorporates a PBCS evaluation system; that system will guide IPS in the evaluation design. The plan will be finalized in year 1 of the grant. Similar evaluation will be planned in the first year planning period for principal and assistant principal PBCS incentives. A third party observer will provide oversight to the classroom observation process.

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:

   NOT MET: PLAN WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.
   There will be a serious effort in the first year planning period to link the two data systems now being used by the district and add a third link to the TAP Comprehensive Online Data Entry (CODE) system (p 33-35). The three systems combined will give the project leaders the ability to link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems as well as be an important tool in program evaluation.

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:

MET
The team leaders of BOOSTER will inform the teachers and principals of the measures applied for PBCS participation. The comprehensive project communication plan includes strategies to inform teachers and principals of those specific measures. They will receive on-going, high-quality professional development that will enable them to use data generated to improve their teaching (p 35).

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 TAP system has an integral on-going, job-embedded professional development element. It is one of the four elements driving TAP. BOOSTER will implement the TAP professional development design, which emphasizes consistently involving all staff in the process. A Leadership Team, consisting of school administrators and master and mentor teachers analyses student achievement data and sets achievement goals which are then used as the topics of PD groups. Student growth will be tracked and correlated with instructional strategies discussed within cluster groups (p 36, 37). Although the PBCS PD plan will be

fine-tuned during the planning year, the applicant is able to define a clear outline of what will be done.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--
(i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and
(ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant cites extensive research, local and national, that shows IPS is a district of low student achievement and student failure. IPS is ranked 60th out of the 69 state school districts in student performance. The ten schools in the district are all classified as "high need" by virtue of the high percentage of free and reduced lunch data (p 4). Statistics supporting that need are presented, with further details in the appendix. Teacher statistics are equally distressing. The applicant presents a detailed argument supporting that concept (p 6) - It is stated that it is difficult to recruit and retain "high-quality" teachers (as opposed to "highly qualified" teachers, or those with extensive educational credentials) - particularly those certified to teach in hard-to-staff subjects - in rural areas because of lower pay, geographic and social isolation, difficult working conditions, and NCLB requirements for highly qualified teachers. The district has managed to raise the teacher pay scale to a more competitive level, but the difficulty remains. The district has battled its low student achievement rating but has not been successful at this point. The plan presented to the TIF initiative is aimed at preventing academic, economic, and personal failure across the district.
A definition of "comparable school districts" is provided. Comparison of student achievement with IPS show IPS with lower scores than those in the districts chosen as "comparable". A table provides the comparisons (pp 4, 5).

Weaknesses:

"Comparable schools", not "comparable districts", were to be defined and used for comparison.
Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas of concern are not clearly defined.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The strategy proposed to implement the BOOSTER (Balanced, Objective, Observable, Specific, Timely, Enhancing, and Rigorous) project is based on TAP with added communication and outreach components (p 11). TAP is a nationally recognized program and has been adopted across the state of Louisiana, primarily serving schools with high-need students - statistics show schools (stats are from South Carolina, Louisiana and Texas) that are served by TAP greatly exceeded the state averages. Student growth achievement is particularly impressive. The four "Elements of Success" implemented by TAP: Multiple Career Paths, Ongoing Professional Growth, Performance Based Compensation, and Instructionally Focused Accountability (abstract, p 16) mirror the requirements and expectations of TIF.

The applicant presents 4 goals that include 12 objectives (p 14), all of which start with

the verb "increase." It is stated these 12 objectives form the basis of the local evaluation plan.

There will be a serious effort in the first-year planning period to link the two data systems now being used by the district and to add a third link to the TAP Comprehensive Online Data Entry (CODE) system (p 33-35). The three systems combined will give the project leaders the ability to link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems as well as be a strong tool in program evaluation.

The incentive pay criteria and the differentiation process of the PBCS are explained (p 21 -22).Master and Mentor teachers are an integral part of TAP - they lead weekly PD sessions and become trained teacher evaluator. They lead cluster groups and collaborative planning. They are key to the concept of multiple classroom observations. These positions are compensated over the career teacher salaries (p 22).

The TAP teacher evaluation procedure, which highlights student growth and multiple classroom observations, easily leads to the differentiated levels of compensation. The methods used to decide the dollar amounts overall to budget for PBCS compensation is described (p 21).

BOOSTER, as described, is basically an implementation of the TAP system. All activities and strategies are centered on that program. It is a well-organized project.

Weaknesses:

Several of the 4 goals and 12 objectives are not clearly tied to the into the strategies and activities as they are described in the narrative. Expected outcome measures are not provided.

Differentiated compensation is discussed at length, with ranges of compensation stated, but the applicant does not provide a formula or schema that will be used to define the levels of compensation.

There is little indication of teacher input.

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:

Those in the two top management team positions are in place (p 37) - The project director (5% time commitment) will be the Superintendent of IPS. The Co-Project Director will be the CEO of Advance Innovative Education, a partner in the BOOSTER project. A job description is given for the Project Coordinator which will be a 100% position (p 38). Curriculum vita are provided for the two lead positions (appendix) which indicate impressive education and professional credentials.
A detailed management plan is provided (p 45). It ties activities, timeline, resources, person responsible, and milestones to project goals.

Iberville Parish Schools (IPS) has considered the problem of fiscal sustainability of the TIF project (BOOSTER) at length. There is district level commitment to sustain the program. IPS will provide non-Federal funds during the grant period toward an increasing share of the PBCS awards (p 45).
The district will increase its portion of funds dedicated to PBCS past the grant funding period (p 45) to the point of raising district millage (taxes). Other considerations are to reallocate a portion of federal and state funds and in-kind resources. A detailed plan for PBCS sustainment displayed in table form is provided (pp 46-48) The budget presented indicates careful consideration of the fiscal requirements of the project as described (budget narrative).

Weaknesses:

The qualifications expected -academic and professional credentials - of the project coordinator are not addressed.

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:

An external evaluator will be employed to conduct the program evaluation. A data collection and reporting plan is presented that ties the goals and objectives to summative and formative evaluative data and procedures in chart form ((pp 49-55). Benchmarks will be established. The leadership team will use the formative indicators to guide program adjustments as required. The plan as presented is an acceptable evaluation plan outline that will be refined by the external evaluator and the team leaders during

the planning year.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant follows the guidelines of the TIF program in the discussion of planning and designing the PBCS evaluation process. The primary sources of evaluation data will come from student growth and multiple classroom observations by qualified observers. TAP incorporates a PBCS evaluation system which emphasizes value added as a way to establish student growth (p 20-21); that system will guide IPS in the evaluation design. The plan will be finalized in year 1 of the grant. Similar evaluation will be planned in the first year planning period for principal and assistant principal PBCS incentives. Student growth is an integral part of the evaluation.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant states BOOSTER will assist schools to attract teachers in hard-to-staff subjects. The success of the TAP program will encourage such teachers to consider IPS (p 23).

Weaknesses:

There are no clear directions to determine which subjects and specialty areas are to be considered hard-to-staff. Although the applicant states BOOSTER will assist the schools in IPS to staff those positions, there are no strategies provided that would provide that assistance.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)
Reader #2: **********

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

1. Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1. Adequacy of Support	25	21
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1. Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	78

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Competitve Priority 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Competitive Priority 2	5	1
Sub Total	10	6
Total	110	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)

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:

   Incentive payments for teachers, principals, and assistant principals will range from zero to $5,000 or $6,000, which at the top end of the range is a substantial amount. These amounts are consist those recommended by TAP (p. 22). Student achievement growth and classroom evaluation results will be factored equally to determine the amount of each teacher's incentive. A combination of classroom-level student growth and school-wide growth will be used (p. 21). More information is needed concerning incentives for principals and assistant principals. The factors for determining principal incentives are unclear. Student achievement growth is listed as a factor, but the application does not indicate the weight it will be given in determining the incentives.
   TAP's evaluation system will be implemented, which includes multiple classroom observations by multiple trained observers (p. 19). Teachers will be evaluated based on an instructional-based rubric which assesses performance on 26 indicators on a 5-point scale. Principals and assistant principals will be evaluated using a set of leadership standards (pp. 31-32).
   The project will provide teachers the opportunity to earn incentives for additional responsibilities and leadership roles by becoming mentor or master teachers, $8,000 and

$15,000 respectively. Teachers in these roles will provide professional development and conduct classroom observations.

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:

   Costs associated with developing and implementing the proposed project are projected in the budget narrative; however, projections are not included beyond the grant period. The application states that costs beyond the grant period have been projected and references the budget and budget narrative; however, this information is not provided. The budget and budget narrative reflect only the 5-year grant period.
   The application states that since the salaries in this rural district are already relatively high, it is difficult to dedicate more funds to salaries, calling into question the districts' commitment to funding the PBCS. The narrative includes plans for garnering additional funds to support the PBCS (pp. 45-48), and objective 2.1 calls for increasing the percentage of the district's personnel budget used for performance-related payments (p. 54). However, the budget narrative does not reflect an increasing share of incentives to be paid by the district. In fact, the amount of grant funds budgeted for incentives increases each year, and objective 2.1 does not quantify to what degree the district's percentage share will increase each year (budget narrative, pp. 12-13, p. 54).

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 proposed PBCS includes all schools in the district, and, therefore, represents a district-wide strategy. It is also consistent with a new state law requiring teacher evaluations to equally weigh classroom observations and student achievement gains (p. 21). Data will be used in professional development through the school-based cluster

groups led by master and mentor teachers. These groups will meet weekly to examine student data and instructional strategies (pp. 17-18). The application references tenure laws that have "constrained the district from replacing ineffective teachers who had been long-term employees." These laws have not changed. (p. 10).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

   General:

   The project will provide teachers the opportunity to earn incentives for additional responsibilities and leadership roles by becoming mentor or master teachers, $8,000 and $15,000 respectively. Teachers in these roles will provide professional development and conduct classroom observations.

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 application meets Core Element 1. The communication includes strategies that are web-based, face-to-face, and printed. Web-based communication will be on-going. Meetings with educators and various stakeholder groups will be conducted throughout the year (p. 28).

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 application does not meet Core Element 2. No documentation is provided concerning the involvement and support of teachers in the proposed project. In fact, the timeline for the planning year (year one) includes sharing information with staff in October - November and faculties voting whether to participate in March (pp. 25-26). The application states that beginning in year 1 through year 5 and beyond, the project "will strive to obtain, and then maintain, teacher and principal support and involvement," suggesting that support and involvement are not currently in place (pp. 30-31). Letters

of school commitment provided by principals do not mention teacher support or involvement.

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 LEAÃ¢ÂÂs coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

General:

The application meets Core Element 3. TAP's evaluation system will be implemented, which includes multiple classroom observations by multiple trained observers (p. 19). Teachers will be evaluated based on an instructional-based rubric which assesses performance on 26 indicators on a 5-point scale. Principals and assistant principals will be evaluated using a set of leadership standards that define what successful school leadership should look like (pp. 31-32). Inter-rater reliability will be monitored thorough the Comprehensive Online Data Entry system, which will flag cases where discrepancies in evaluation scores are suspected (p. 34).

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 application meets Core Element 4. The applicant describes 3 data systems that are used for student growth and teacher evaluations. Based on a compatibility review, these systems appear to be compatible with the payroll and human resources systems, and a link will be established during the planning year. A programmer will be hired to ensure that the systems are functioning individually and collectively (p. 34).

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 application meets Core Element 5. The communication plan for year 1 includes regular district- and school-level meetings to disseminate information. The applicant plans to survey teachers and administrators at the beginning, middle, and end of the planning year to evaluate their knowledge about the project (pp. 28-29). Weekly cluster meetings and on-going support offered by master and mentor teachers will enable teachers to understand and use data to improve instruction (p. 36).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. **High Quality Professional Development:**

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

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

General:

Professional development will be based on the needs assessed at each school. It will be provided by school-based master and mentor teachers through cluster groups that will meet weekly to examine student data, plan collaboratively, and explore instructional strategies, and through model lessons taught in individual classrooms (p. 18).
The teacher evaluation rubric identifies 26 indicators relative to effective instruction. Teachers receive information concerning how well they met each of these indicators on a 5-point scale and concrete examples of strategies to address these areas. This system is

applied to all teachers (p. 18).
The effectiveness of professional development will be tracked and monitored through the TAP Training Portal offered by the state's TAP office (p. 37).

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:

Of the 69 districts in the state, the applicant district ranked 60 in student achievement (p. 3).
None of the applicant's schools received more that 2 stars on a 5 star scale, based on state assessments (p. 3).
In 2007-08, 6 district schools were in some level of Academic Assistance (p. 3).

Weaknesses:

Most of the data provided is from the 2007-08 school year. More current academic achievement data would be helpful to demonstrate need (pp. 3-5).
The application does not compare student achievement in the participating schools to that in comparable schools. The comparison of the district to other districts is not sufficient to demonstrate need in each of the 10 schools. In addition, one district identified as comparable, West Feliciana Parish, is dissimilar to the applicant district in free and reduced lunch rate (35.1 percent lower), size (half as many schools), and demographics (minority population 32.1 percent less). Student achievement in the other district identified as comparable is not significantly higher (3.2 percent) than the applicant district, as measured by the district performance score issued by the state (pp. 4-5).
No student achievement or teacher recruitment/retention data are provided for the two new Math and Science Academies although they are included as participating in the proposed project (p. 2-6).
Two district schools seem to have a high poverty, high performing designation by the state, calling into question academic need at these sites compared to other high poverty schools (p. 46).
The application states that the attrition rate for teachers is less than 10 percent and that "there are few vacancies for highly qualified staff positions in hard-to-staff subjects" (p. 7). Need based on recruitment and retention is not adequately demonstrated.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed project would be implemented in all 10 of the district's schools, resulting in a district-wide strategy for compensating teachers and principals for effectiveness (p. 12).
The district will use TAP methodology for determining the effectiveness of teachers and principals and for calculating differentiating compensation (pp. 20-21).
The project will adopt TAP's definition of effective teacher and effective principal (pp. 31-32). Effective teacher/principal is defined as one who scores positively on multiple

annual observations and has a positive impact on students' academic achievements and the school's overall progress, using value-added measures (p. 31).
Incentive payments for teachers, principals, and assistant principals will range from zero to $5,000 or $6,000, which at the top end of the range is a substantial amount (p. 22).
Student achievement growth and classroom evaluation results will be factored equally to determine the amount of each teacher's incentive. A combination of classroom-based student growth and school-wide growth will be used (p. 21).
TAP's evaluation system will be implemented, which includes multiple classroom observations by multiple trained observers (p. 19).
Professional development will be provided by school-based master and mentor teachers through cluster groups that will meet weekly to examine student data, plan collaboratively, and explore instructional strategies, and through model lessons taught in individual classrooms (p. 18).
A letter of commitment from each school's principal is provided (Appendix).
The applicant describes 3 data systems that will be used for student growth and teacher evaluations. These systems appear to be compatible with the payroll and human resources systems, and a link will be established during the planning year (p. 34).

Weaknesses:

The application does not adequately explain how the differentiated incentives payments will be calculated. More information is needed concerning how different levels of compensation (zero to $5,000 - $6,000) will be calculated (p. 21).
The factors for determining principal incentives are unclear. Student achievement growth is listed as a factor, but the application does not indicate to what degree this factor will determine the incentives. "Other measures determined locally" are included as part of the methodology for principals, but the application does not indicate what these measures will be (p. 22).
No documentation is provided concerning the involvement and support of teachers in the proposed project. In fact, the timeline for the planning year includes sharing information with staff in October - November and faculties voting whether to participate in March (pp. 25-26). The application states that beginning in year 1 through year 5 and beyond, the project "will strive to obtain, and then maintain, teacher and principal support and involvement," suggesting that support and involvement are not currently in place. The application does not address union support and involvement, if applicable (pp. 30-31).

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:

The project director (district superintendent) and the co-project director are well qualified to implement innovative strategies. The application attributes the following innovations to these individuals: developing an incentive program for teachers to become highly qualified, working with community members to develop a "Blueprint for Successful Schools," piloting the state's value-added initiative, closing 2 extremely low-performing schools, and serving as Senior Vice President of Edison Charter Schools (pp. 10-11; 37-38).
The application outlines the timeframes for setting student goals, analyzing data, and making incentive payments (pp. 41-43).
The applicant indicates that it will dedicate to the project the state funds two schools will receive for being designated as high-poverty, high-performing (p. 46).
The requested funds seem adequate to support the proposed project. The budget includes costs associated with performance-based incentives for teachers and principals, stipends for mentor and master teachers, state-level TAP support, public relations and communication, travel to required TIF meetings, and district staff to administer the project. The budget narrative indicates how each expenditure relates to project success (budget narrative).

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not specifically address training required for teacher and principal evaluation systems or the selection process and training for master and mentor teachers (pp. 41-43).
The qualifications for the position to be filled, project coordinator/district TAP liaison, are not provided (pp. 38-39).
No information is provided concerning the credentials of the project coordinator and communications specialist employed by Eval Incentive and paid through the grant (p. 10).
It is not clear whether any key positions currently filled or to be filled will offer expertise specifically in a PBCS or in an evaluation process of this scope.

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes 4 project goals and 12 measurable objectives (pp. 49-50).
The evaluation will produce quantitative data such as student assessment results, as well as qualitative data such as teacher/principal evaluation results and satisfaction surveys (pp. 49-60).
Monthly meetings are planned for the project staff and external evaluator for the purpose of monitoring the project's delivery and results using formative indicators and benchmarks to determine what adjustment might be needed. Teachers, principals, and the state's TAP office will provide input annually for possible program modifications. Data will be reported to the evaluation team quarterly (p. 60).

Weaknesses:

The objectives do not establish expected performance measures. Instead they indicate trends to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement without quantifying the expected gains (pp. 49-60).
It is unclear whether both program coordinators will be involved in the monthly meetings (district and external), p. 60.

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 project will use a value-added measure of student growth, in which each student's scores are compared to previous scores and individual characteristics, socioeconomic status, and family conditions are separated. Fifty percent of the incentives will be based on student achievement growth. The applicant is participating in the state's pilot implementation of a value-added system (p. 21). Communicating the project to school faculties is part of the implementation plan for year 1 (pp. 24-26). The project plans to develop a website with pages designed specifically for teachers and principals, produce a paper and e-newsletter for teachers/administrators, and conduct monthly school-based meetings and 3 district-wide meetings per year. Teachers and principals will be surveyed at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to evaluate their understanding (pp. 28-29).

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:

   The project will use TAP methodology to determine teacher effectiveness when recruiting and retaining personnel (p. 23).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant does not identify any subject areas that are hard to fill. In fact, the application states that the attrition rate for teachers is less than 10 percent and that "there are few vacancies for highly qualified staff positions in hard-to-staff subjects" (p. 7).
   More information is needed concerning how the project will change the recruiting and retention policies in the district, and how these change the quality of the teaching force (p. 23).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)
Reader #3: **********

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

1. Project Design	60	48
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1. Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1. Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	82

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Competitve Priority 1	5	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Competitive Priority 2	5	3
Sub Total	10	6
Total	110	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Iberville Parish School District -- , (S385A100124)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

   Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

   General:

   The applicant addresses the implementation of TAP, "comprehensive school reform system that provides powerful opportunities for career advancement, professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and competitive compensation for educators in high -need schools (based on performance as measured by student growth)" (pg. 12). Teachers are evaluated based on 26 indicators identified in the program. Fifty percent of supplemental compensation is based on the evaluation system; thirty percent based on classroom student achievement; and twenty percent based on school-wide student growth. Adequate compensation could be garnered as teachers increase effectiveness based on TAP's multiple measures evaluation system - $0 - $6000. (a) The TAP program recommends a significant percent (50%) of annual teacher bonuses be based student achievement growth (pg. 21). (b) A strong observation plan is denitrified in the application. Through the TAP program a team is developed and trained to conduct observations and rate teacher effectiveness based on indicators identified on the TAP Instructional Rubric (pg. 23). During the year multiple observations will be conducted by the TAP Leadership Team (principal, assistant principal, and master teachers), who must participate in annual training and certification (pg. 23). (c) The applicant presents an appropriate plan to

hire master and mentor teachers who have proven to be effective teachers through the TAP evaluation system. They must have expert knowledge, instructional skills, and adult learning skills. They are provided with a competitive incentive for taking on these responsibilities - $5,000 to $15,000 (pg. 17). Supplemental compensation for principals will be "calculated based on school-wide
student achievement growth and other factors including principal evaluations, graduation rates or other measures determined locally." The plan addresses a competitive compensation range - $0 - $6,000 (pg. 22). The applicant address twenty-six descriptors teachers are evaluated on to determine level of effectiveness; however, these descriptors are not addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

   Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

   (a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and
   (b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

   General:

   a) The applicant provides a thorough outline of budget expenses associated with the program. It also provides narrative descriptions of those expenses, including compensation awards. (budget narrative). According to the TAP organization, the additional compensation awards are sufficient.

   b) The applicant outlines the sustainability of the program through year 5 (pg. 44). It identifies a decrease in TIF funds each year - but not substantial decreases. The applicant also indicates that it is hard to predict at this time how much the district will be able to provide to support the program. The applicant lists additional resources that the school district can leverage to support and sustain the project: in-kind resources, federal and state grant funding, and a plan to request an increase in local tax millage (pg. 45).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

   Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant addresses research that has been conducted on the program to support it's effectiveness on increasing achievement and teacher instruction (pg. 12). Analysis from teacher evaluation data by NIET show that TAP improves teacher skills. According to the applicant, preliminary data show that TAP teachers who remain in TAP schools have higher evaluation results (pg. 14). According to the applicant, state laws prevent the school from modifying tenure. However, the state did mandate a value added assessment of teacher effectiveness (pg. 10). According to the applicant, retention is not an issue in the district. However, principals in the TAP program state that it makes it attractive for effective teachers to stay at the school. They also report that it has makes it easier to higher effective teachers (pg. 14).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant presents a system to hire master and mentor teachers who have proven to be effective teachers through the TAP evaluation system.

"Master and mentor teachers are hired through a competitive, rigorous, performance-based selection process, from within the school or from outside schools or districts. They possess expert curricular knowledge, outstanding instructional skills and the ability to work effectively with other adults. They take on additional responsibilities and authority, and are required to work a longer school year. Master and mentor teachers are held to higher performance standards than career teachers, thus are compensated according" (pg 17).

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:

Core Element 1 has been met.

The applicant addresses the Communication and Outreach plan (C&O Plan) as a source to communicate the PBCS to teachers, administrators, other school personnel and community at-large. The Communication and Outreach plan is not a component of the TAP model, but is included to ensure that communication with stakeholders is maximized (pg. 27).
The applicant provides an extensive list of communication tools that will utilized to effectively communicate its BOOSTER (Balanced, Objective, Observable, Specific, Timely, Enhancing, and Rigorous) (PBCS) plan to stakeholders: facebook, twitter, electronic and paper-based newsletters, PTA meetings, BOOSTER website, etc. (pg. 27-28).

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:

   Core Element 2 has not been met.

   The applicant has commitment letters from all 10 principals who will participate in the project.
   The applicant feels that support from labor unions is not needed. "In IPS, teachers unions are not designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining; this group is not a target for garnering support" (pg. 31). Weakness: According to the applicant, teacher support will not be garnered until year 2.

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 LEAÃ¢ÂÂs 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:

   Core Element 3 has not been met.

   To assist with the term teacher and principal effectiveness, the applicant has defined "effective teacher" and "effective principal."

   Effective Teacher - (1) scores positively on multiple annual observations of their professional practices using TAP methodologies and (2) who has a positive impact on their students' academic achievements and the school's overall academic progress during the school year, as measured by a value added analysis" (pg. 31).

   Effective Principal - "one who (1) scores positively on multiple annual observations of

their professional practices and (2) who has a positive impact on the school's overall academic progress during the school year, measured by a value added analysis" (pg. 31).

(1) The TAP program utilizes an evaluation system (rubric) that rates teachers on 26 descriptors aligned to SKR (Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities) performance standards. (2) "Teachers are evaluated four to six times a year in announced and unannounced classroom observations by the school level TAP Leadership Team (principal, assistant principal(s), master and mentor teachers)" (pg. 32), which ensures a high degree of inter-rater reliability (4). The state mandated that value-added measure be used for teacher effectiveness. This will be launched in year 2 of the PBCS.

Weakness: Applicant doesn't describe the rating and evaluation of principals. The applicant states that the principals will be evaluated but doesn't provide many specifics.

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:

Core Element 4 has not been met.

The applicant addresses multiple data management systems that the schools will utilize: EdPerformance, PowerSchool and the TAP Comprehensive Online Data Entry system (CODE) (pg. 33-34). The applicant identifies how each system will be utilized (pg. 34-35). "CODE allows TAP Leadership teams to monitor inter-rater reliability of evaluators, scoring inflation or deflation, and will flag cases where there appear to be discrepancies in teachers assigned evaluation scores." EdPerformance will be utilized. It is a web-based diagnostics system that allows teachers, at the classroom level, to recognize individual student needs and to provide each student with individualized instruction targeted at his or her proficiency level.
Weakness: The applicant doesn't address the link between student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. However, the applicant does state that this will be addressed in the planning year.

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:

Core Element 5 has been met.

The applicant states that in year 2 communication with teachers and principals will focus

on teacher and principal effectiveness and the TAP process.

Through some of the systems identified in the management section, data will be collected in variety of ways that can be utilized individually or by schools to determine areas that need to be strengthened.

The applicant identifies there will be weekly cluster meetings at the school level to reinforce this information, and TAP Leadership Teams at the school level will serve as a resource to determine professional development needs. These needs will be based on the evaluation rubric.

"Technical assistance from LATAP will ensure the quality of the professional development, and the external evaluator will collect and analyze data to confirm this" (pg. 35).

Each week master and mentor teachers will lead the "cluster group."

Each school in the district will be installing "data rooms" beginning in 2010-11. The purpose of these rooms is to track student growth and correlate this with instructional strategies.

The TAP Training Portal will be utilized to track and monitor progress. "The system will allow for regular assessments of the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness" (pg. 37).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. **High Quality Professional Development:**

   Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

   (3) Provide --
   (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
   (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
   (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
   (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional

development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

The applicant identifies there will be weekly cluster meetings at the school level to reinforce and garner support for the program and disseminate this information. TAP Leadership Teams at the school level will serve as a resource to determine professional development needs. These needs will be based on the evaluation rubric.

"Technical assistance from LATAP will ensure the quality of the professional development, and the external evaluator will collect and analyze data to confirm this" (pg. 35).

Each week master and mentor teachers will lead the "luster group."

Each school in the district will be installing "data rooms" beginning in 2010-11. The purpose of these rooms is to track student growth and correlate this with instructional strategies.

The TAP Training Portal will be utilized to track and monitor progress. "The system will allow for regular assessments of the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness" (pg. 37).

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--
(i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and
(ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.

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

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

Strengths:

1) According to the applicant, schools recently implemented a high salary base to attract effective teachers, but it does not appear to attract them (pg. 7). For this reason the application is focused on a PBCS developed by TAP to increase teacher effectiveness.

2 & 3) The applicant provides a detailed description of the need for the project in these schools. The applicant takes into account the number of students in free and reduced lunch programs, poverty, and student achievement (pg 1, 3). The applicant defines "comparable schools" as "districts similar in terms of several characteristics:

rural geography, number of students, number teachers, number schools, and poverty levels. Student achievement in IPS is much lower than in comparable districts." Class size averages about 15 per teacher. Dropout rate is higher than the state average (pg. 9). According to TAP principals, the program helps for retain teachers in the school.

Weaknesses:

Weakness: The applicant does not really address the issue of attracting highly effective teachers and principals to the schools. The applicant does note that a higher salary base does not attract them.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the

Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

Strengths:

(1 & 3) The applicant has identified TAP as the system implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and principals with 50% based on student achievement. Additional compensation is based on the level of effectiveness identified on the rubric. Teachers who score well on the rubric may apply to become master teachers or mentors. With these two roles come additional compensation. According to the TAP organization, the awards are of sufficient size (pg. 14). (3) An evaluation system (rubric) that rates teachers on 26 descriptors aligned to SKR (Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities) performance standards will be used to rate a teacher's effectiveness. By the time the PBCS is implemented the state mandated value-added model will be launched (pg. 10). (2) The 10 principals in the PBCS have provided commitment letters to the project. (3) Multiple data management systems will be used in the project: PowerSchool, EdPerformance, CODE. CODE allows leadership teams to monitor inter-rater reliability. EdPerformance an online diagnostics system to assist teachers in identifying individual student needs to address instructional targets. (4 & 5) The applicant identifies the use of the rubric to drive professional development. Leadership teams will meet regularly to review strengths and weakness with schools and individual teachers. They will act as a resource to assist schools with professional development needs. According to the applicant, professional development is ongoing and job embedded.

Weaknesses:

According to the applicant support from teachers will be garnered in the second year. Union support was felt not to be necessary for this project. Since the application addresses the use of TAP, it doesn't go into a lot of specifics about rating teachers on the rubric. The rubric has 26 descriptors, but they were not identified. The applicant doesn't address the link between student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. However, the applicant does state that this will be addressed in the planning year.

Reader's Score: 48

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Project directors appear qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their commitments appear to be appropriate and adequate (pg. 37). The applicant addresses their roles and in-kind support. Resumes are provided in the application.

The applicant has identified other funds to support the project. These include in-kind resources, federal and state grant funding, and a plan to request an increase in local tax millage (pg. 45).

A detailed timeline with defined responsibilities and milestones are outlined (pg. 40). The applicant provides a detailed outline and narrative of cost associated with the project. According to these projections the budget is sufficient.

Weaknesses:

Director and management staff are from outside the school building (Suprogram. perintendent, Board, Office of Innovation Education). No school staff appears to be identified as key personnel.

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:

(1) The applicant has provided clear and measureable goals and objectives. The data collection and reporting form will be used to determine if the goals and objectives have been met (pg. 14). (2) The TAP evaluation will produce quantitative and qualitative data. IPS will hire an independent, external evaluator to conduct the program evaluation. As of yet the external evaluator has not been hired. External evaluator qualifications: a doctoral degree in education or statistics, and extensive expertise in research methodology, qualitative and quantitative methods, and program evaluation (pg. 49). The applicant has provided a data collection and reporting form (49-50). (3) Leadership teams will be setup to ensure feedback and continuous improvement. An external evaluator will be hired to initiate a formative evaluation process for assessing the effectiveness of the professional development to improve practice (pg. 18). Surveys will also be utilized to gather feedback.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

   Strengths:

   The state recently implemented a law mandating value added assessment of teacher effectiveness (pg. 10). This model will be in pilot phase the 2011-12 school year. This is also the time the applicant indicates that the proposed performance-based compensation system will be launched (pg. 11). The PBCS will be tied to this new value-added system. This data accounts for half of teacher and principal annual bonuses under TAP (pg. 21). Since this is a state mandate, these schools will have to implement the value-added model. Goal 3 addresses increased student achievement based on value-added measures. Since this one the PBCS goals, the implementation plan identifies meetings and communication to provide information about the PBCS.

   Weaknesses:

   The capacity to explain the value-added model is not specifically addressed.

   The applicant addresses in broad terms what some of the value-added measures may be, but doesn't indicate how they will be measured

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Strengths:

According to the applicant, a high salary base is not working in their schools to attract and retain effective teachers. It addresses the fact that there is not a high mobility rate in the schools. Many of the teachers and principals remain in the district. Although a majority of the teachers are deemed "highly qualified" the achievement scores are still low. The applicant addresses the need to then focus on teacher effectives to increase student achievement. Based on teacher effectiveness feedback they will try to recruit these teachers into the high-need areas. To do this they have proposed using BOOSTER and TAP.

It is stated in the application that - BOOSTER - "will assist the schools in IPS to serve high need students, attract highly qualified and effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition as well as retain those new teachers, and fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective" (pg. 23)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide enough detail about how BOOSTER will assist schools to fill hard to fill positions.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM