

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education,Policy  
(S385A100108)

**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
-----------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1.Need for Project	10	9
--------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	58
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	91

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	8
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	99
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education, Policy  
(S385A100108)

### 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 proposes on page 11 to conduct observation-based assessments several times a year, to ensure effective incorporation of their goals by the project teachers. They plan on using informal and formal classroom observations to be conducted by a mentor and master teachers and principals. The applicant has developed through their TAP Program (A System for Teacher and Student Advancement) research based evaluation system that will differentiate the teachers across four levels (ineffective, fair, effective, and highly effective).

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:**

In the budget narrative, the applicant proposes to utilize over \$313,000 in-kind contributions for the over 1,500 teachers expected to be involved in raising student achievement for the targeted high school students. The majority of the in-kind contributions come from the salaries of the proposed staff.

**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 states that the TAP system has in place an integrated data and evaluation component to measure effectiveness of teacher and principals. The applicant proposes to offer incentives for teachers who take on leadership roles (page 24).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

The applicant provides a detailed description of how the proposed PBCS will provide incentives for the teachers, and principals at the target schools. The participating schools are to receive a \$500 bonus on top of the performance incentive pay of up to \$2,500 which would be above the 5% money (page 24). Incentives will also be offered under the project for teachers who take on leadership positions.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1:

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

General:

The applicant stated that they have to have a 75% buy in for program implementation. During this phase they will be talking with the teachers and principals about the components of its PBCS to see if they would be willing participants. The applicant discusses the different types of weekly meetings and trainings that will take place among the school personnel but does not discuss how communication will flow to the community at large (page 26). According to the applicant on page 30, communication begins before the elements of the TAP system and its components are in the school. However, the applicant does not provide details on elements of the communication plan. An online professional development course is in the developmental stages for all Indiana educators about the student growth model in relation to the application (page 30).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant states on page 11, that 75% of the staff must vote for the implementation of the new TAP system. They believe this ensures sustained support for the PBCS (page 11).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

**General:**

The applicant proposes to hire master teachers and mentor teachers through a competitive, rigorous, performance based selection process (page 24). The master teachers and mentors will lead the training and leadership with the project.

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:**

On page 40, the applicant mentions that the CODE data system will be used to determine award payouts and is merged with the schools payroll. Indiana's student achievement and growth data is centrally stored in a secure facility, according to the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1.Core Element 5:**

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

**General:**

The applicant states that they are working to develop an evaluation tracking system to align with the teaching standards; and link student data, teacher data, professional development, and the human resources systems. The data management system is only generally described and does not describe in detail how it will be aligned with these other systems.

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 professional development track allows for master teachers and mentor teachers to lead career teachers in cluster groups for small professional development sessions which are embedded in the school schedule. The sessions will be focused on instructional improvement (page 41). The cluster groups are divided by grade level, content area or a mixture of the two. They are proposed to meet for 60 to 90 minutes each week if necessary. Details on what constitutes a session being necessary are not described. The applicant states that support will continue for the teachers (professional development) in the classrooms as well. However, how often this is to occur is not highlighted in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 0

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to serve all high need schools. According to the applicant, all of the participating schools in the project have a minimum of 50% free and reduced lunch eligible students with many having up to 95% free and reduced lunch (page 2). The applicant provides a comparative chart in Appendix C. In order to increase student achievement, the applicant states that there are unmet needs in the schools. On pages 1-2, the applicant lists that none of the target schools for the project have a PBCS in place, do not provide career advancement opportunities for teachers; and are not providing teacher-led, weekly, job embedded professional development. The applicant proposes several types of professional development to help curb attrition rates.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provides a list of schools they believe is comparable to the target schools for the project. However, a few of these schools do not meet the high-need definition. Their free and or reduced lunch percentage is below the 50% threshold.

Reader's Score: 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The TAP network will meet quarterly as a whole group and smaller groups are to meet via the phone (page 47). The applicant is a part of comprehensive statewide strategy to improve student achievement with regard to teacher and principal effectiveness. The project is designed for teacher effectiveness; a teacher must earn a minimum score of 2.5 on the SKR portion of the project evaluation design. A TAP score of 3 shows the students in the classroom or school have met a year's worth of growth. The award pool design for career, mentor and master teacher will be allocated as: (1) 50% skills, knowledge and responsibilities; (2) 30% of classroom achievement gains; and 20% school achievement gains (page 19).

**Weaknesses:**

Clear description of all activities in relation to objectives and goals is not apparent in the narrative.

**Reader's Score: 58**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

A timeline is provided on page 49, which outlines some of the activities in relation to project objectives, the person responsible for carrying out the activity and the time of year it will occur. Resumes are included for the key project personnel which highlights each one's abilities to carry out the project successfully based on their past experiences. The applicant identified in-kind monies for the project in the budget (appendix). The money identified is to be used for the salaries of some of the key personnel.

**Weaknesses:**

A timeline is provided on page 49, which outlines some of the activities in relation to project objectives, the person responsible for carrying out the activity and the time of year it will occur. Resumes are included for the key project personnel which highlights each ones abilities to carry out the project successfully based on their past experiences. The applicant identified in-kind monies for the project in the budget (appendix). The money identified is to be used for the salaries of some of the key personnel.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant plans on using an outside evaluation partner to design surveys to measure the six goals they have established for their project (page 61). The plan is to have the surveys take place once a year.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant offers simply explanations as to how the evaluation will measure quantitative data (page 63). Although the applicant states that they will work with the evaluator to collect regular summary reports, they do not indicate how often this will occur to ensure feedback and program improvement.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant plans on offering performance bonuses each year to the teachers and principals based on instructional performance and student growth to be measured by an Indian student growth model (page 11). The model is said to be a value-added measure of student achievement. Some of the methods to be evaluated for effectiveness are: classroom observation scores, achievement growth, and school-wide achievement growth. The participating schools are to receive a \$500 bonus on top of the performance incentive pay of up to \$2,500 which would be above the 5% money (page 24).

**Weaknesses:**

The value-added assessment for high school students is not included in the narrative. A timeline for how often these measurements will occur is not clearly defined.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has identified areas as having shortages of teachers for the subject areas. According to the applicant, of the eleven LEA's and five charter schools, six have shortages one or more special education license areas, five have shortages in math, four have shortages in sciences, four in world languages, and three have shortages in areas of technology education.

**Weaknesses:**

A detailed recruitment strategy for attracting teachers for the shortfall areas is limited in scope.

Reader's Score: 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education,Policy  
(S385A100108)

**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
-----------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1.Need for Project	10	9
--------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	58
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	94

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	8
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	102
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education, Policy  
(S385A100108)

### 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 proposal addresses all the areas of Priority 1: develop and implement a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement as part of the coherent and integrated approach of the local educational agency (LEA) to strengthening the educator workforce. They give significant weight to student growth based on objective data on student performance and 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 are a part of a coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce. The proposal includes multiple measures of effectiveness and gives significant weight to student growth.

The incentive amounts that are substantial and the proposal provided justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen.

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:

IDOE has a well-thought out plan to fiscally sustain the project beyond the grant period. (See pages e 54-59). For example the funds will come from Title II and in-kind.

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 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 during and after the end of the TIF project period.

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 application is thorough in its description of how incentives will be used to encourage teachers to take on additional responsibilities. On pages e 9-12 the proposal includes descriptions of multiple career paths, including a new Master Teacher role, on-going applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and finally performance based compensation.

**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:**

IDOE has a thorough plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system. (see e 30-32). Indiana will use CELL to garner interest in the TAP system. NIET will hold on-site initial development visits. Indiana is in the process of developing on-line, in-depth training and professional development.

**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 proposal clearly involves input from multiple stakeholders, including unions. This support is outlined in both the narrative and in the letters of support.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1.Core Element 3:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with**

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

**General:**

This is perhaps the proposal's strongest area. IDOE has a 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 as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation is aligned with or will be aligned with professional teaching or leadership.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The proposal outlines a plan to continue with existing efforts to link student achievement and HR systems. (see pages e38-39). TAP provides state, district and school leaders with data and technology tools for real-time monitoring of system implementation. Indiana will use CODE to create reports to summarize teacher performance broken out at the individual, classroom, grade level and whole school. CODE also offers additional checks and balances to ensure inter-rater reliability and will be used to determine award payouts and is merged with the school's payroll.

**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 proposal includes a detailed description of the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and includes a professional development plan that should enable them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

**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 proposed PD addresses all the required elements. A particular strength is the individualized supports for classroom teachers provided by the master teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools

whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

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

**Strengths:**

The IDOE application included 46 high-need schools with 50% + of the students eligible for free or reduced lunch and student achievement that is lower than comparable schools (see pages e4 and e5). The proposal explained that the schools have difficulty recruiting and retaining highly-qualified and effective leaders and teachers (with turnover rates in the 20s) especially in hard to staff subjects. IDOE defined (on page e 5) what it considers a "comparable" school and made a compelling case for the need for the project.

**Weaknesses:**

According to appendix C the comparative schools do not meet the federal definition of high need, the 50% threshold.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

IDOE's proposal is part of a proposed statewide strategy to establish a PBCS that rewards teachers, principals in high-need schools based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth.

The IDOE proposal includes the use of valid and reliable measures of student growth that are likely of sufficient size (at least 5% of base salary, see rationale on page e18) to affect the behavior of teachers and principals and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school (see page e6). IDOE establishes guidelines for effectiveness that are clear and measurable (at least one year of academic growth per student per year, see page e 6).

IDOE's model (TAP) has the potential to enhance both teacher effectiveness and job satisfaction and collegiality. The TAP approach includes multiple career paths, on-going applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability (teachers are observed several times a year both formally and informally by trained, certified evaluators and are rated using a 4-level system that can differentiate effectiveness, see page e10), and performance-based compensation using multiple measures that include classroom observation scores, classroom achievement growth and school-wide growth using Indiana's value-added student growth model.

Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (75% or more must vote to use TAP), including input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs (see page e25). The AFT and NEA have both supported TAP.

The proposal uses the Common Core State Standards and includes a clear approach to measuring growth in student learning at the individual student level (page e12).

IDOE has incorporated an extensive data-management system, consistent with the LEA's proposed PBCS, that by the end of 2010 should be able to link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems (e 13). Moreover, IDOE is establishing a data system that will allow for the evaluation of teacher preparation programs by linking IHEs with the academic performance of the academic performance of students taught or led by their graduates (see page e15). Indiana also has partnerships with TFA and New Teacher Project's Teaching Fellows, and Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows to build human capital in education in Indiana.

Another strength of this proposal is that it includes areas beyond the core subject areas (page e 17) and the compensation is differentiated based on performance (range of 0 -\$5000).

The proposal includes bonuses for hard-to-staff subjects (e 22-23). Evaluations of leaders are based on well-accepted national standards (ISLLC) - see page e20.

The proposal includes incentives for teachers to take on leadership roles (page e 23) and earn significant additional amounts (\$5000 to mentor and master teachers \$10,000).

The proposal includes a description of high-quality professional development activities that should increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS (see pages e39-42).

**Weaknesses:**

The explanation of the performance bonus pool on page e 20 is unclear.

The proposal includes bonuses for hard-to-staff subjects (e 22-23), but \$500 might not be sufficient incentive.

**Reader's Score: 58**

**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:**

**STRENGTHS:**

The IDOE 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 (pages e 43-48 with additional information on e 49-54). The project director and other key personnel seem qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively.

IDOE will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and in-kind resources (pages e54-55). The requested grant amount and project costs seem sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal fails to fully explain how they will sustain the project using non-TIF funds.

The job description of the project manager is not included and this is a key position for the success of the project.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

IDOE's proposal includes the use of strong and measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement, increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel (see pages e 59-63). The proposed evaluation will produce evaluation data that are quantitative and qualitative and the proposal includes adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (e 63).

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

IDOE appears to have the capacity to implement the proposed value-added model and the proposal clearly explains the chosen value-added model. Planned PD for teachers will enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Weaknesses:**

The description of the value-added measures for high school students are not clearly defined.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal includes incentives for teachers and leaders to work with high-need students, 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 fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant provided an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective (using the value-added model) and that teachers would take on subjects or specialty areas that are hard-to-staff. The proposal includes 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 (see pages e 29-31).

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not include a rationale for why they believe that the \$500 bonus would be sufficient to recruit teachers to hard-to-staff subjects.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education,Policy  
(S385A100108)

**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
-----------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	48
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	17
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	76

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	8
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	84
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Indiana Department of Education -- Indiana Department of Education, Policy  
(S385A100108)

### 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:

Applicant adequately addresses and meets Absolute Priority 1 with demonstrated differentiated bonuses for effective teachers, principals and assistant principals based on 3 components: student academic growth (by at least one year) in the classroom, at the school level and observed mastery of Skills & knowledge as defined and delineated in TAP observations and evaluations of pedagogy.

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 does an adequate job of projecting costs associated with the PBCS for the project period, but does not provide projected costs beyond the 5-year grant award period.

(b) Applicant increases non-TIF funds over the course of the project period, but does not demonstrate an articulated plan for assuming an increased share of PBC pay to teachers and other school personnel beyond the grant period. (See Appendix C:Other Documents: Pages e38 through e48 inclusive.)

(c) The applicant proposes to allow sites to wait until the final year to identify the funding streams to sustain the program beyond the grant period (p. 63 - Performance objective 6). This suggests a limited institutional commitment to continuing the TIF bonuses to educators rather than the reformed compensation approach TIF seeks to implement.

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's strategy presents an aligned and integrated approach for strengthening the human capital through use of student performance data at the K-8 levels but has yet to develop a comprehensive strategy for assessing high school student performance at a minimum of two different periods of time (p. 34 of Project Narrative).

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:**

IDOE cites the TAP program as developed by the Milken Family Foundation and currently administered by NIET as its approach to inciting career educators into leadership roles as mentor and master teachers at the site level and as selected through a performance-based process.

**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:**

With the assistance of its partner from University of Indiana - CELL, the applicant conducted informational workshops on NIET's TAP program for approximately 175 teachers and administrators from throughout the state. It solicited and received letters of support from state teacher unions, individual site principals and teachers (Appendix B), thereby demonstrating initial good-faith and proactive attempts to secure buy-in from local stakeholders. If awarded a TIF grant, IDOE proposes extensive site workshops at which teacher votes (a minimum of 75%) will need to be secured in order to implement the TAP at that specific site. Specific plans and/or details of at-large community meetings were cited as the responsibility for participating LEAs.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1. Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

The applicant conducted informational workshops on NIET's (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching)'s TAP (Teacher Advancement Program) for approximately 175 educators from throughout the state. It also solicited and received letters of support from state teacher unions, individual site principals and individual teachers (Appendix B) as a means of securing buy-in from local stakeholders. More widespread local support and input have yet to be secured, but efforts demonstrate promise of success for input from teachers & school leaders, as well as buy-in and site-specific individualization of TAP components.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The Applicant's contracted partnerships with University of Indiana's CELL and NIET's TAP strongly suggest a quality implementation given each organization's track record with professional development and educator evaluation.

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:

IDOE's extant data-management system of matched/longitudinal scores for measuring student growth at the individual level is a strong example of the systems needed for assessing the extent of value-added growth for teachers and schools. Additionally, its recently launched Learning Connection (a.k.a., electronic backpack/portfolio of each student's assessment results, courses, grades and work products) promises to be a phenomenal resource for educators, student and parents by providing detailed progress reports for individual students throughout their K-12 careers

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

**General:**

The applicant addresses this core element (especially as it pertains to professional development) throughout its narrative as evidenced in its adoption of NIET's TAP and the delivery model it seeks to employ through its partnership with CELL. This approach is an appropriate leveraging of local and national resources (CELL and NIET, respectively) as partners in developing local (site-based) capacity, Engaging master and mentor teachers as peer coaches and curriculum experts along with principals in the leadership team following their selection through a competitive, practice-based process promises extensive and in-depth understanding of expectations for effective practice.

**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:**

As cited multiple times in preceding commentary, the TAP model for professional growth as driven by student performance data, informed by effective pedagogical strategies customized to maximize effectiveness for the local site and delivered/modeled locally by resident experts/coaches is a powerful and effective professional development model.

**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:

STRENGTHS: (1) As evidenced in its averaged teacher turn-over rate of 20.5% over a two-year period (p. 4 - Project Narrative and delineated on p. 3 of Appendix C), the applicant makes a strong case for the need to implement a retention strategy for teachers and principals in multiple hard-to-staff areas. Likewise and as supported by the detailed list of 228 emergency and transition-to-teach credentials issued for 2009-2010 in Appendix C, professional development and ongoing induction programs as proposed would help to curb the attrition rate currently plaguing the applicant's high-needs schools. (2) Overall, student achievement as measured on state standardized tests vary from approximately 50% of students in high-poverty schools meeting proficiency in ELA and/or Math to more than 80%, suggesting varied levels of need for innovation and intervention through a TIF award. (3) The applicant provides an adequate definition of comparable schools (grade level span, poverty levels and enrollment size on page 6.

#### Weaknesses:

(1) Although the applicant establishes the need to improve recruitment of career teachers for its listed hard-to-staff areas, its partnership with "well-regarded talent organizations" that are limited to 2-year commitments from its participants is inconsistent with retention efforts (p. 16) and well-established and researched best practices of developing on-going, personalized relationships with students - especially high school students, to ensure achievement as defined by high school graduation and college enrollment rates. Of the 228 emergency and transition to teach credentials issued for hard-to-staff areas, the applicant fails to report how many of those were issued to candidates with such limited commitment requirements. Additionally, the applicant failed to provide any information on the skills and seniority of the approximately 80% staff that remained in their schools.

(2) Student Achievement, as provided in Appendix C - list of comparable schools, is not lower in the project participating schools than in the sites not-participating in the program

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) Strategy for process to award incentive funds

(i) The applicant's methodology to determine effectiveness using valid/reliable student growth measures is one it has adopted from the NIET-TAP model and promises to be an adequate approach at the elementary and middle school levels. Teachers, principals, master and mentor teachers will have longitudinal access to student test scores and will be able to compare pre- and post-academic year student performance for each educator.

(ii) Awards are sufficient in size (3-5% of teachers' and administrators' base salaries at

a possible maximum of \$5,000 for teachers and \$10,000 for principals) to affect educator behaviors.

(iii) The applicant provides a very clear description of how teacher and principal effectiveness will be determined (e.g., 50-30-20% of which 50% comes from at least 4 mostly unannounced- classroom evaluations to assess teacher knowledge of skills, learning environment/community, teacher reflection and application of effective pedagogy as evaluated on an articulated & shared rubric; 30% is based on student value-added growth at the individual classroom level; and 20% comes from school-wide student academic growth).

(2) State teachers' unions and individual teachers who attended the CELL training (p. 30) are aware of the IDOE's intent to implement the NIET-TAP program and their vote is required (75% of teachers at each site) before the innovation commences, but only 150 of the 1,364 teachers of the 44 participating schools attended the May 2010 informational session held by CELL. More teachers need information and multiple opportunities to discuss the proposed reform before voting on it.

(3) Differentiated bonus/incentive awards were clearly evident and described in detail in Project Narrative (pp. 17-20 for teachers and pp. 20-23 for leadership teams, including administrators and mentor/master teachers). The ranges for all educators are consistent with the research on private sector incentive awards for affecting employee behavior.

(4) The applicant's data management system on student achievement has the potential to be linked to the payroll and Human Resource dept. given its extant status and the two-year pilot that has resulted in its currently high levels of functionality. The implementation of the CODE system should prove beneficial as proposed.

(5) Professional development, as described throughout the project narrative, is consistent with effective practices for sustaining desired reforms (e.g., ongoing, specific to individual teacher and student needs). The TAP model's success in other districts/states is well documented (pp. 27-29) and promises to be effective for this applicant if implemented as intended and proposed (to be customized based on local needs and strengths).

#### **Weaknesses:**

(1) Strategy for process to award incentive funds

(i) While the applicant's methodology to determine effectiveness using valid and reliable student growth measures should be easily implemented and effective at the elementary and middle school levels using state standardized tests that can be matched for individual students from one year to the next, there is currently not a comparable such procedure/program in place for high school students. Year-end course scores/exams in Algebra I and 10th grade English are clearly insufficient measures and subsequently, they are ineffective for the purposes of determining secondary teacher incentive awards. Although the applicant is aware of its need to develop such a system (p. 34 and p. 44), a comprehensive assessment system that can be developed, piloted and refined for secondary students at the same levels of reliability and validity as what exists at the elementary and middle school level is not clearly described. There is insufficient detail to fully assess how this proposed assessment will be inclusive of all students (especially since AP focuses on a select segment of the school population). This is a significant weakness since high schools comprise approximately 20% of participating sites and reflect almost 9,400 students who would be affected if current enrollment remains constant.

(ii) No weaknesses re: sufficient size of awards.

(iii) No weaknesses re: how educator effectiveness is determined

(2) Significantly more community-engagement meetings need to be conducted to elicit teachers' involvement and input before this is implemented, as the applicant acknowledges. It appears that most of this activity occurred during the spring, 2010 timeframe in an accelerated pace. There is no evidence that extensive collaboration took place in program development. All stakeholders need to be engaged in the co-constructing of the reform so that they may own it, not simply buy into it.

(3) No weaknesses in the segment on differentiation of bonus awards.

(4) No weaknesses re: data management systems

(5) No weaknesses in the professional development segment.

Reader's Score: 48

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

- (1) The management plan reasonably includes a planning year to develop the missing core components.
- (2) Key personnel are qualified to carry out fiscal management and implementation responsibilities. CELL and NIET professional development managers and trainers are well qualified to meet the needs that IDOE has identified as their responsibilities.
- (3) The applicant will provide some non-TIF funds under other Federal or State programs to support program goals as evidenced in year-by-year budgets (Appendix C) and the budget narrative.

**Weaknesses:**

Per the applicant's project narrative, the management plan outsources the bulk of non-fiscal oversight and implementation to non-IDOE entities, thereby limiting the applicant's ability and opportunities to build capacity for replicating the innovation on its own. IDOE administrators identified to support the project are limited to committing 10% of their time to program management and implementation (with the exception of the current Title II Coordinator who splits his time equally between Title II and TIF fiscal management). There are no clear job descriptions or responsibilities delineated for the

Primary Investigator or other IDOE staff mentioned in the Project Narrative (pp. 50-51). While partners (CELL and NIET) are capable of and likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project, the one-page timeline is sketchy and does not give details on milestones. Finally, and per the applicant's own admission, 4 of the 5 key elements are not yet developed and require substantial planning time. The applicant did not adequately describe planning activities, responsible personnel during the planning period, their responsibilities and/or activities.

NIET's partnership was evident in the Memoranda Of Understanding (MOUs) they provided to substantiate their relationships w/ project school principals. No such evidence supporting CELL's commitment was evident.

**Reader's Score: 17**

#### **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:**

Performance objectives are clearly articulated and described fairly well throughout this section of the narrative. Some methods of data collecting are mentioned (e.g., co-constructing a survey with a yet-to-be-identified evaluator to ascertain effectiveness of professional development - p. 61; Objective #2). Both quantitative and qualitative data are referenced for developing an understanding of the innovation's effectiveness across participating sites in comparison to comparable schools that are not participating in the TIF.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses in Evaluation Plan

**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 addresses this priority at the elementary and middle school levels through use of state tests and its data management system.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant does not have a value-added assessment system in place for its high school students.

Applicant's sole measures are standardized test scores for elementary and middle school students. Existing assessment program is insufficient and did not include other measures (such as district benchmarks, attendance, discipline incidents, graduation rates, college enrollment, capstone performances/projects).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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:**

**STRENGTHS:**

Recruiting bonuses of \$1,500.00 are an effective means of employing for hard-to-staff areas.

**Weaknesses:**

High needs schools are not very different than the TIF Comparable Schools as evidenced in appendix C. Per the table- TIF Comparable Schools-in Appendix C, the applicant lists both participating schools as well as non-participating schools they deem to be comparable. Some of the program schools (previously listed in the narrative but not identified as such in the comprehensive table) did not meet federal guidelines for high needs because they did not meet the 50% threshold of free- and reduced-lunches. At the same time, some of the non-participating schools had higher rates of poverty and lower test scores than proposed participants. The term "comparable" was not adequately defined or illustrated.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:07 PM