

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of
Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

Reader #1: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 50 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 20 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 4 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 80 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

| | | |
|------------------|----|---|
| Sub Total | 10 | 4 |
|------------------|----|---|

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 84 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

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:

Jefferson County has proposed a PBCS structure that converts the district salary guide of 5 levels and 28 steps to a three level three step guide. The increased compensation takes all teachers on the BA to step 6 for tier 1 step 1. Tier 1 step 2 equates to approximately level 1 step 21. For teachers with MA equivalent the start of tier would be equivalent to level 3 step 9+. Tier 3 step 1 starts at the top of the guide. The major differences between these guides are that there is no guarantee that increased education will result in increased compensation. Also the tier guide teachers can go up or down in salary. Although the top and bottom of the scale have been raised significantly, a teacher through growth measures and evaluations must demonstrate significant effect on students, teams, and schools in order to move to the upper end of the scale. The fact that teachers can drop back down the salary schedule decreases the likelihood of undifferentiated compensation inflation over time. Based on the criteria described, only 15-20% of teachers (page 25) in the JSC schools will achieve Tier 3. Table 3 (page 26) of the narrative indicates how teachers move up or down the guide based on effectiveness and student growth.

Each year, at least three different evaluators will formally observe each teacher a total of four to six times. Of those observations, two will be announced with the remaining two to four being unannounced. The principal (or assistant principal) will conduct two observations per year. Master teachers and mentor teachers serving as peer evaluators will conduct the remaining observations. Five days of training including scoring of videotaped sessions will be provided to observers. This will be repeated each summer to recalibrate the raters.

Table 4 (page 33) outlines the fact that student achievement based on the CGM accounts for 50% of the PBCS. Payouts amounting from \$4000 to \$8000 are identified as a combination of distinguished ratings on observation and average median growth of students greater than cut off percentiles starting at the 45th percentile. Half of a payout can be obtained through achieving one side of the table or the other. This half payment would mean that a payout could be made based solely on the observation and not the student growth portion. This is a loophole that would not meet the priority of significant weight on student growth (sub priority a)

Mentor and master teachers will be trained by outside experts and curriculum and data experts from within the district. "Each year, at least three different evaluators will formally observe each teacher a total of four to six times. Of those observations, two will be announced with the remaining two to four being unannounced. The principal (or assistant principal) will conduct two observations per year. Master teachers and mentor teachers serving as peer evaluators will conduct the remaining observations. To ensure inter-rater reliability, all evaluators will go through five days of intensive training on the rubric and will be asked to score videotaped lessons. Training will be conducted each summer to re-calibrate scoring." (Page 22) There is no mention of the second part of sub-priority b which requires the observation rubric to be aligned to professional teaching standards.

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:

Projected costs in the budget narrative total \$22,615,775 with Jeffco and other funding sources at \$3,505,524. These funds are inclusive of the overhaul of the salary schedule in year three of the proposal. No Non-federal funds have been identified in the standard budget sheets. Jeffco anticipate that current CDE funds will underwrite the bulk of the remaining compensation model design process between now and the end of the calendar year. (page 37) They have engaged Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA) through December 2010 to develop cost and models and related implementation scenarios. The intent is to recover money that would have gone to the regular salary guide and redirect the funds into the PBCS. "TIF support will allow the CMFST to continue its efforts to refine and target the model based on formative evaluations, surveys of teachers and other district or community stakeholders, or other considerations. A consultant will be retained effective January 2011 to conduct the technical aspects of this work on an ongoing basis, under the CMFST's direction." (page 37) " The CMFST will work with the

Grants Management staff at the Jeffco central office to identify and secure funding from state and local sources to supplement TIF funds during the project period, and to sustain the JSC program thereafter." (Page 41) Jeffco feels that if awards are made they will increase the likelihood of more funds being raised "from grant sources and other state and local sources." (page 41) The problem is that these sources may not materialize and then they would not only not be able to meet their responsibilities under sub priority a to provide performance based compensation but also under sub priority b to provide from non-TIF funds since there might not be any non-TIF funds to distribute. This means that Jeffco would not meet priority 2.

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:

Targeting 12 schools within a district of 155 schools based on high poverty numbers, while simultaneously re-structuring compensation and supports at the targeted school, should dramatically impact recruitment and retention of effective teachers. (page 56) Beginning teachers get a large incentive to go to Jeffco schools; however, it does not seem that the proposal has considered the negative impact of movement down a tier or from higher to lower tiers. This is possible and while the 502 phone surveyed JCEA members (page 14) had a 67% rating for proceeding in the right direction, the 93% that needed additional collaboration time seemed to say that the monetary part was not the primary consideration. At this point Jeffco has met the priority. For the future, they may have difficulties once the example mentioned above actually happens.

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:

Educators will have the incentive of an \$80000 (page 29) step 1 Tier 3 for the additional responsibilities they take on. These teachers must earn 70% distinguished ratings on their evaluations, and demonstrate significant student growth such as median growth on CSAP of greater than the 60th percentile. Teachers who meet these criteria must submit a portfolio of work that demonstrates their ability to work with students, colleagues, and data. A panel of peer evaluators and administrators will review the portfolios. These teachers will continue to teach but will be released 20% of their time to work with other teachers. Mentor teachers will be responsible for approximately 10 other teachers. Jeffco has met this requirement.

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:

Jefferson County has had two years to prepare for this TIF project. (Page 14) As a part of their communications plan, they conducted a survey in May 2010 polling 502 JCEA members with a 67% positive feeling toward the strategic compensation plan JCS. The communications team will coordinate outreach to local stakeholders to other school personnel and the community at large. (page 40) Levels of support will be determined by feedback from these outreach programs. A survey will be developed in year 1 and administered in year 2-5. Jeffco has assembled the pieces necessary to meet this core element. This is a high quality portion of this plan.

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 educator survey mentioned in the communications plan above showed 67% of the educators polled (502) thought the district was headed in the right direction with the JSC. JCEA has been a part of the planning for the JSC. They are a part of the Governor's Council for Educator Effectiveness (page 12). It is apparent that support is there for a new compensation initiative.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

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

General:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 3:

JSC will take two years to implement. The first year of the TIF grant is a planning year. The second year there will be a pilot and full implementation will commence in year three. Baseline data will be established and there will be two years in order to correctly place a teacher on the proper step and tier of the totally new compensation system. The Governor's council was established to ensure that every educator is evaluated using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid methods with at least 50% devoted to academic growth.(page 12) Appendix E contains the current evaluation form which will be reviewed and updated to be more robust and better aligned to the JSC components. Teachers will be evaluated on 20 different indicators. Each year, at least three different evaluators will formally observe each teacher a total of four to six times. Of those observations, two will be announced with the remaining two to four being unannounced. The principal (or assistant principal) will conduct two observations per year. Master teachers and mentor teachers serving as peer evaluators will conduct the remaining observations. To ensure inter-rater reliability, all evaluators will go through five days of intensive training on the rubric and will be asked to score videotaped lessons. Training will be conducted each summer to re-calibrate scoring. If disparities exist in evaluation scores, the teacher and evaluators will meet to reconcile differences in evaluations. (page 22) Additional forms of evidence will be a portfolio for teachers moving to the third tier and the Colorado Growth Model which will be used as the value added portion of the proposal. Various assessments, SAT10 and CSAP as the major ones will be used to supply the student achievement data. All parts of this core element appear to have been met.

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 management plan is presented in Appendix F. It contains a three column display of the activities, timing and key personnel responsible for implementing it. Data collection starts August 2011 where the Assistant PM for HR and the data analysts transmit the data required by the evaluation plan for the first time. (Appendix F pg 47) The plan is sufficiently detailed to adhere to the linkage of payroll and data. Missing from the plan is the IT involvement to create the apps necessary to make the linkage.

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:

Master and mentor teachers are to be supported with training on how to observe peers and use data (data experts within the district) (page 30) Mentor and master teachers, in concert with Jeffco professional development office staff, will create most professional development materials not already available. Jeffco has addressed this portion of the plan in a high quality manner.

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:

Observation data will be used to drive ongoing professional development for teachers, guided by these mentor and master teachers. Coaching and professional development work will complement but not supplant regular district-provided JSC Evaluation Competition professional development opportunities. Other professional development needed for teachers to qualify for more advanced tiers, such as license endorsements or National Board certification, will continue to be obtained by teachers independently. Mentor and master teachers, in concert with Jeffco professional development office staff, will create most professional development materials not already available.(page 39)

Because no teachers will have been identified for Tiers 2 or 3 during the initial year of pilot implementation, Jeffco and the JCEA will jointly nominate members of a Jeffco Peer Evaluation Program (JPEP) Committee before the start of the 2011-12 school year. The committee will review applications from accomplished, effective teachers in the district

to select peer evaluators during this transition year. Subsequently, the JPEP will continue to offer support to mentor teachers in terms of training them to evaluate reliably and carefully, and to develop relevant professional development plans for the teachers whom they evaluate. (page 32) Since these peer leaders are developing plans for teachers they evaluate, they are directly linking the measure of effectiveness to the needs assessed in each of their evaluatees. Through the evaluation process these needs will arise and a plan to address these needs will be created by these peer evaluators. This applies to both teachers and principals.

The table on page 8 anticipates that 5% of the teachers in the first wave of awards will receive no award. While PD plans are spoken of for those people who will be receiving performance stipends to keep them moving on an upward bound trend, there is an implicit expectation that everyone will improve. Also it is stated that the decision concerning tier movement will be made along with the tenure decision. (Page 25) Again the implicit assumption is that if a teacher does not get a stipend and is up for tenure, they will be released although this is never stated. The aspect of continued effective practices and additional responsibilities are covered in table 3 on page 26 along with the PD plan that will be established between the teacher and peer observer. There is no mention of evaluating the effectiveness of the professional development plan. Therefore Jeffco would not meet this portion of the criteria.

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:

Jeffco has identified 41 high need schools, selected 20 from this group with the highest percentage of need (average FARM rate of 83% page 2, significantly higher Hispanic population and increased ELL population). Academic need was identified in figure 2-5 page 5-7)

High teacher retention rates even in high need schools are given on page 7.

Because of this total overhaul of the payment system, Jeffco expects teachers will consider moving to high need schools. Documentation of high need schools is contained in Appendix A.

For the purpose of the evaluation comparative schools have been chosen; 12 high need schools 6 of which to match with a control group of 6 in order to evaluate the JSC which is a total revamp of the standard salary schedule.

Weaknesses:

Recruiting of staff for these high need schools is expected to follow the complete overhaul of the salary schedule converting it to the JSC. The JSC represents a 25% increase in the range of salaries (page 56) with larger salaries available in all tiers. Outside of counting on the restructured payment schedule, no other recruiting or retention initiatives are addressed.

There does not really appear that there is a need based on the statistics given for recruiting if there are over 20 applicants for every position even in high need schools. Jeffco has not addressed the definition of comparable schools for the identified need schools.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the

capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

Strengths:

Jeffco proposed design is based on key findings from other successful TIF sites. The JSC plan will use multiple measures in order to determine the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel. The newly adopted Colorado Growth Model (CGM) will be used as one measure of student learning growth, and thus effectiveness for teachers in grades four through ten in reading, writing and math. JSC will not be a bonus award it is a whole salary system so 1.ii does not apply. Participation from teachers, principals, and the JCEA along with letters of support have been included in the proposal. The Governor's council was established to ensure that every educator is evaluated using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid methods with at least 50% devoted to academic growth.(page 12) The fairness and transparency is starting at the top. Jeffco has a strong data team that will work to align individual, team, and school data with school-wide goals and payroll systems.

Weaknesses:

The rubric that was exhibited in the appendices is not the rubric that will be executed. This is yet to be determined. Full support for participation is assumed through the survey and letters. Teachers liked the idea of redoing the salary guide, however, they were really interested in more collaboration time. Most of the Professional development is to be home grown. The assumption is that if a teacher is effective with students they will also be effective with adults; this is not always the case.

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The management plan, Appendix F, is well organized and follows a logical timeline and milestones. It appears that it will be able to accomplish the project effectively. The project director and key staff biographies indicate that they are qualified to carry out their responsibilities. They have up to 40 years of experience in education and have had many and varied responsibilities in the past. The fiscal sustainability table indicates that Jeffco will take over 100% of the fiscal support of the project by the end of the grant. The requested grant amount will not support the salary guide until partially in year 2 and fully by year 3. The 22.6 million requested seems adequate to support what they are planning.

Weaknesses:

There are no definitive plans for fiscal support identified in the plan. There are grants mentioned from CDE through ARRA which expires December 2010 (page 45). They anticipate recovering funds from the replacement of the salary guide they are replacing and mention cost modeling, however this seems to be optimistic.

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:

Strong measurable objectives were presented in the appendices in the sample that was given.

Both quantitative and qualitative data will be produced. The quantitative data will be produced from the student assessment data and the rubric will produce category data possibly distinguished, effective, emerging, and ineffective for the labels.(Page 21)

Weaknesses:

The sample that was given was not the final version, which will be established later. (Evaluation tool Appendix E page 1)

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 Colorado Growth Model will serve as the primary measure of teacher, team, and school impact in grades four through ten in reading, writing, and math.

Weaknesses:

The Colorado growth model is not really a value added system, but is being used as one. While not a traditional value-added model, the trajectory created by multiple years of student data compared to performance of a similar group across the state, will provide what Jeffco feels is an acceptable measure of teacher impact. (Page 55)

While Jeffco states they are using the Colorado growth model as a value added measure as a significant portion (50%) of the PBCS, they have not provided for the second portion of this priority. They do not address the portion of the priority that clearly explains the CGM to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practice. Jeffco has not met this portion of the priority.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The JSC is a total revamp of the standard salary schedule.

Weaknesses:

Because of this total overhaul of the payment system, Jeffco expects teachers will consider moving to high need schools. Because of this recruitment has not been mentioned as an addressed area.

Hard to staff subjects are not defined. Hard to staff subjects and specialty areas are expected to not be a problem due to the new compensation system.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of
Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

| | | |
|---------------------|----|---|
| 1. Need for Project | 10 | 3 |
|---------------------|----|---|

Project Design

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 50 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 20 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 3 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 76 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

| | | |
|------------------|----|---|
| Sub Total | 10 | 6 |
|------------------|----|---|

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 82 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

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:

Strengths

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for a tier based incentive program based on student performance and teaching practices. (page 18-19) The awards being offered for teachers and principals are of sufficient size and are awarded at 3 different tier levels. (page 23-24) Teachers will be observed by mentors, master teachers or principals and their evaluation will be guided by the Jeffco Peer Evaluation Program (JPEP). (page e37) The proposal provides details of how principals will be evaluated and compensated. This evaluation will be based on effectiveness and student performance. (page 56)

Weaknesses

A rubric for evaluation is not clearly provided. Their rubric will be developed later. The proposal does not provide evidence of how evaluators are trained under the Jeffco Peer Evaluation Program.

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:

Strengths

This proposal includes sufficient evidence that the applicant has projected costs associated with the implementation of their tiered plan. The proposal includes extensive tables with the average cost for each teacher for the 6 schools at each tier level. (page 9-10)

Weaknesses

There is not an effective response to how they will sustain this project. Non-federal funds are not identified to provide fiscal support of this project.

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:

Strengths

A professional development model is proposed that features a more job-embedded model. (page 28) This plan will be tied to student data and teacher evaluation. (page 57) Based on the availability of full time master teachers and mentors to work with teachers, a sound plan is proposed. (page 29) A table provides evidence that student achievement will be linked to retention of the most effective teachers and principals, especially within high-needs and low performing schools. (page e53)

Weaknesses

None noted

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:

Strengths

The plan clearly explains how teachers who excel will be moved to tier 3 where they will assume leadership roles as mentors and master teachers. (page 29) In year 3, they will receive an additional salary incentive based on performance. -The proposal states that two years of evaluation data will be required for this movement within tiers. (page e22) The following criteria will be used for movement to tier 3- 70% distinguished ratings on evaluation when all raters are averaged and individual student growth on CSAP (district test) or other subject measure is above the 60th percentile. (page e26)

Weaknesses

None noted

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:

Strengths

There is a strong plan for communication that involves the district Communication Services staff and a Communications Consultant. This team will conduct ongoing surveys and interviews of all stakeholders. (page e39) These feedback mechanisms will allow the IC and district to determine levels of support for the JSC plan, learn areas in which certain groups need additional information about how the plan works, or have input that may be valuable to improving buy-in among district teachers and principals or other stakeholders. (page e39)

Weaknesses

None noted

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:

Strengths

The proposal is convincing that the applicant has the support of the local union. A two-year process of study and discussion among district and union leaders has been instrumental in the planning process. (page 42)

Weaknesses

There is no evidence that teachers and principals have been involved in the plan.

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:

Strengths

There is a strong plan in place for the evaluation of teachers based on student growth and there is evidence that teacher observations will result in individual plans of support as needed. To ensure inter-rater reliability at least three different reviewers will observe teachers each year. (page e21) The principal will conduct two observations per year. Master teachers and mentor teachers serving as peer evaluators will conduct the remaining observations. To ensure inter-rater reliability, all evaluators will go through five days of intensive training on the rubric and will be asked to score videotaped lessons. (page e21)

Weaknesses

The rubric presented in the appendices is not the actual rubric that will be used. The rubric for this project will be developed later.

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:

Strengths

A quality plan is provided demonstrating that the team has the knowledge and expertise needed to implement a successful data management plan. (page 35) These systems will provide multi-year reports, as well as, student growth reports.

Weaknesses

None noted

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 5:

Strengths

A strong component of this proposal is a two-year prior planning period involving all stakeholders. The proposal executes a plan in which the state department and local personnel will present the plan to teachers. (page 56)

Weaknesses

It appears that they are relying heavily on the state department for much of this communication.

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:

Reviewer Comment High Quality Professional Development:
Strengths

A strong professional development model is proposed that features a more job-embedded model. (page 28) This plan will be tied to student data and teacher evaluation. (page 57) Based on the availability of full time master teachers and mentors to work with teachers, a sound plan is proposed. (page 29) Teachers observations will be followed by a conference that includes the observer and the teacher. Areas of strength for each teacher will be identified, in addition to areas of refinement that will be addressed through professional development. (page e32) This individualized conferencing will address the needs of all teachers including teachers who do not address in the 3 tiers. The proposal states that master and mentor teachers will lead the analysis of student work to look for areas of misconceptions and develop strategies to remediate students resulting in improved student performance. (page e33)

Weaknesses

A regular assessment of the effectiveness of the professional development plan is not presented in the proposal.

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 schools that participate in this project give convincing data that their students are much higher need than the rest of their district. This is supported with many tables of student data. (page 2, and 5-7) The average free and reduced rate in these schools is 83%. Of the targeted population of students only 30% attain proficiency on the reading assessment and 3% on the Math. (page e4) One of the objectives of this plan is to retain highly qualified teachers and principals. (page e53) Currently, only 73% of the principals are retained each year. (page e7)

Weaknesses:

There is insufficient evidence that these schools have problems recruiting and retaining teachers. The proposal actually states that in 2009, teachers that were highly qualified filled 100% of their positions. (page 7) They do not adequately address a definition of comparable schools.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for a tier based incentive program based on student performance and teaching practices. (page 18-19) The awards being offered for teachers and principals are of sufficient size and are awarded at 3 different tier levels. (page 23-24) Teachers will be observed by mentors, master teachers or principals and their evaluation will be guided by the Jeffco Peer Evaluation Program (JPEP). (page e37) The proposal provides details of how principals will be evaluated and compensated. This evaluation will be based on effectiveness and student performance.

(page 56) A Steering Committee for the Jeffco Strategic Compensation plan, comprised of district leaders, worked to determine how best to compensate and support teachers. (page e12) Evidence of a continued communication plan is the existence of a web portal on the district site, quarterly meetings with teachers and administrators, and regular email updates. (page e57) The plan proposes a data management system that will integrate all of the required components. (page 35) Professional development plans will be determined for individual teachers based on evaluation results. Observation data will be used to drive ongoing professional development for teachers and will be based on performance within the classroom. (page 38)

Weaknesses:

An evaluation rubric was not included. Their rubric will be developed later. There is no evidence that the professional development plan proposed is based on student performance data. The proposal offers no evidence that the involved school have shown support for this plan.

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

(3) The applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other

Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources; and

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

Strengths:

An adequate description of the qualities of the management team is provided demonstrating that they have proven success with the implementation of other projects. (page 42-44) A table in the appendices demonstrates the projected cost and details of sufficient resources to implement this project. (page 9 of appendix) This cost modeling work offers an insight into the short and long term cost projections. A detailed timeline guarantees that this plan will be implemented on schedule. (page e43)

Weaknesses:

The role and responsibilities of the management team are not clear. It would be helpful to include a table of activities and responsible parties. Non-federal funds are not identified to provide fiscal support of this project and it does not demonstrate sustainability.

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:

An adequate evaluation plan is proposed that includes the hiring of an external evaluator to conduct a summative evaluation as well as formative assessments. (page 49) Specific performance objectives are presented on page 50. Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected to support the implementation of this project. (page 39) Qualitative data collection will include a survey on school climate. (page 40) This team will conduct ongoing surveys and interviews of all stakeholders providing additional data. (page e39)

Weaknesses:

The performance objectives are not all written as measurable objectives.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for a tier based incentive program based on student performance and teaching practices guaranteeing a sufficient value-added model. (page 18-19) State test scores will be used to provide student achievement data. Teachers will be observed by mentors, master teachers or principals and their evaluation will be guided by the Jeffco Peer Evaluation Program (JPEP). (page e37) The proposal provides details of how principals will be evaluated and compensated. This evaluation will be based on effectiveness and student performance. (page 56) The proposal executes a plan in which the state department and local personnel will present the plan to teachers. (page 56) A data management system will provide multi-year reports, as well as, student growth reports.

Weaknesses:

It appears that they are relying on the state department of education to provide communication to stake holders.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal supports the recruitment of hard to staff areas within their proposal. (page 57) Teachers who are effective will receive substantially larger salaries over time, thus broadening the incentive to work in high-needs schools. The compensation structure will result in the opportunity to make 25% more than any other teacher in the district if a teacher can demonstrate effectiveness. (page e56) A table provides evidence that student achievement will be linked to retention of the most effective teachers and principals, especially within high-needs and low performing schools. (page e53)

Weaknesses:

There is no evidence that this plan will fill vacancies with teachers who are effective or likely to be effective.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of
Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

Reader #3: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

| | | |
|---------------------|----|---|
| 1. Need for Project | 10 | 3 |
|---------------------|----|---|

Project Design

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 45 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 20 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 3 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 71 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 76 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Jefferson County Public School District R-1 -- Human Resources, Division of Chief Financial Officer (S385A100084)

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 offers a differentiated compensation plan targeting teachers and principals in 20 high need schools, which includes 16 elementary, 2 middle schools, and one high school, with a sizable Latino or Hispanic student population. The proposed levels of compensation are based largely on the results of student performance as determined by objective data that includes student performance data and teacher evaluations, which would be conducted four to six times per year. In the evaluation of high school principals, additional measures include ACT scores, attendance, and graduation rates (p. 34).

The applicant states that their "salary structure has remained the same over the past 90 years" (p. 2). The proposed levels of compensation for effective teachers appear substantial as compared to the current pay scale although little discussion is offered on the method/s used to arrive at the multi-levels of compensation listed (pp. 23-24), or on whether these incentives are likely to change educators' behaviors.

According to the applicant, the "tiers and steps are understandable to teachers" (p. 25). A table outlines the salary structure proposed (Table 3, p. 26). The applicant plans on providing training and support to teachers through "outside experts" and "curriculum and data experts within the district" (p. 39) although it is unclear whether this training includes information or activities on the new teacher evaluation system.

Although the applicant provides a plan calling for differentiated levels of compensation to be determined by objective measures of students' academic growth, little explanation or discussion is provided on the justifications of compensations at the levels listed. The applicant has partially met the requirements of this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has not provided an effective response to explaining how its plan will be sustained outside of grant funds during and after the grant period. The plan includes working with a "cost modeling consultant and the district's budget officer" (p. 41) to satisfy this requirement and to identify and secure additional funding to support the project. The attached budget on the use of non-federal funds provides no information to support the sustainability of the proposed project (p. e6). The applicant has not adequately addressed the requirements of this priority.

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:

Although the proposed plan includes multiple measures on determining the effectiveness of teachers and principals in the targeted schools, it is unclear how the evaluation data collected will address any identified weaknesses in the district's professional development plan. The applicant outlines some of the requirements needed by teachers and

principals to receive incentive rewards based on student achievement. It also states that its proposed data management system will provide information that will be used in making "consequential decisions such as tenure and offering a continuing contract: (p. 22).

The plan includes elements of a comprehensive approach to performance-based compensation for effective or highly effective teachers and principals in the targeted schools.

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 plan proposed includes a three-tier structure for teachers, and in Tier 3, which includes highly effective mentor or master teachers as determined by multiple measures, are called instructional leaders. Their responsibilities include providing "job-embedded professional development, lesson modeling, data and student work analysis, and weekly strategy review for collaborative teams" (p. 28). Teachers meeting the criteria for being a mentor or master teacher will receive both additional compensation and release time. The applicant meets all the elements of this requirement.

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:

One of the weaknesses in the proposed plan is the lack of detail in communicating its performance based compensation plan to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at large. To address this core element, the applicant proposes the hiring of a communication consultant whose duties include coordinating outreach to local stakeholders regarding its TIF project for a total five-year cost of \$560,000 (p. 27).

Although this is an area of the application that could be strengthened, the applicant provided evidence that meets the requirements of this core element.

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:

Even though the applicant refers to a theory of change where "Wide stakeholder involvement is essential" (p. 15), it does not appear from the narrative that school level staff were significantly involved in outlining any of the components in the current application.

However, the applicant did attempt to obtain support for its plan and was able to secure signed commitments from the superintendent, the Jefferson County Education Association (educators' union), the Rose Community Foundation, school officials, one middle school teacher, and others (see p. e78).

The applicant provides some evidence that the requirements of this core element were addressed.

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 provides evidence of a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system, which is aligned to professional standards. Under its plan, teachers would be observed four to six times a year by multiple evaluators who have received five days of specialized training. A plan to update the current evaluation rubric was discussed and includes four possible levels of performance including "ineffective" and 20 different indicators (Appendix E). In the plan, master and mentor teachers will perform some of these evaluations.

The applicant meets the requirements of this core element.

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 proposed plan to implement data management is supported by the Colorado Growth Model, which was recently adopted and designed to measure student growth and teacher effectiveness (p. 18). The Model is capable to providing multi-year reports on student growth for every student, teacher, school and district in the state. Various departments, including HR, Information Technology, Accounting, and Instructional Data Services, can link educators with student performance data and teacher payroll (p. 35).

The applicant meets the requirements of this core element.

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 topic of professional development is brought at several points in the narrative (p. 14, for example). However, no fully detailed plan for teachers and principals to receive professional development that would enable them to use the data that would be generated by the proposed project to improve their practice is provided.

To address this core element, the applicant states that by 2012, the state will hire "coaches to train Colorado educators to use and incorporate the information available through SchoolView in differentiated instructional practices" (p. 19). The applicant has failed to adequately address the requirements of this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive

differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to

(1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

This section of the proposed plan can be described as incomplete even though the applicant refers to many essential components on linking professional development to measures of teacher and principal effectiveness.

For example, a section of the application is called "Professional development and evaluation for teachers and other staff" (p. 38), but the section discusses mentor and master teachers' additional responsibilities. Another reference to professional development is found in Appendix H, Conceptual Framework's Guidance Principle, which is described as "A differentiated approach to professional development offers a viable strategy to address a balance of both individual and school needs (p. 11).

No well-developed, detailed plan linking professional development to the essential elements of the proposed differentiated compensation system and to improved practice is provided. The applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence in meeting all the requirements of high quality professional development.

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's descriptions of schools (16 elementary, 3 middle, and one high school) that are part of its project meet the defined requirements of high-needs schools. These schools have a high minority population, significant and growing numbers of EL learners, 50% are on free or reduced lunch, student outcomes are lower than in other schools. The applicant states that only 30% of tenth grade students attain proficiency in the reading assessment; this is 47 points below the remaining schools in the district (p. 4), which indicates that these students will not be college ready.

It is unclear whether there is a true "comparable" school in the district as a description of one is not provided. The applicant reports that it has a problem with the retention of principals in targeted schools (pp. 7-8).

Weaknesses:

In spite of the data presented by the applicant on the under-performance of students in schools targeted in its plan, the district does not appear to have much of a problem retaining teachers in these schools.

For example, there is an 83% retention rate of teachers in the high-need schools while teachers in other schools have an 85% teacher retention rate. In fact, the applicant states that in 2009, "teachers (in targeted schools) met the requirements of Highly Qualified (HQT) filled 100% of the positions," a percentage point higher than for teachers in non-targeted schools (p. 7). Further, the applicant reports that for every available position in targeted schools, there are 21.3 applicants although non-targeted schools have 23.6 applicants per each position (p. 8).

It appears that the district is facing challenges effectively educating its minority student population, a topic that is not fully explored especially considering the high number of highly qualified teachers in the these schools and the out-migration of principals.

Reader's Score: 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Referring elements in other successful TIF sites, the applicant built its plan around four elements. The model must be comprehensive; have wide stakeholder involvement; provide teachers and administrators with support and professional development designed to drive improvement; and select the right leadership (pp. 15-16). Research evidence to support these elements is included.

The applicant proposes that its differentiated compensation plan, which includes a strong evaluation component, professional development, career advancement, and differentiated pay, will increase teacher effectiveness and student performance and will alter the composition of the schools in the selected sites (p. 15). A union representative provided a letter of support for the proposed plan (p. e78). Incentives are provided for mentor and master teachers to provide leadership in targeted schools and to assume additional responsibilities that would be rewarded by financial incentives and release time.

The applicant's plan includes various levels of teacher effectiveness based on student growth (Table 1, p. 23), and multiple classroom observations, four to six times pre year by multiple evaluators (p. 21).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant cites several elements of a successful differentiated compensation plan and the research to support it, it provides a plan that lacks cohesiveness and detail on implementing its plan effectively. Its plan would reward currently effective teachers and provide them with leadership opportunities, but more support is needed to encourage the effectiveness of other teachers especially in the absence of a comprehensive professional development plan that clearly links student achievement to educator effectiveness. The applicant, based on support letters provided, has the support of some educators, but there is no evidence that it sought or received the support for its plan from the staff in targeted schools. The applicant's plan sometimes appeared to be a work in progress.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides an adequate budget to support its plan during the funding period, clearly defined responsibilities for key staff, and a detailed time-line (Appendix F, pp. 46-53). The project director, and key staff are highly experienced and qualified to implement the proposed plan; the school level experience of these individuals is commendable (pp. e79-e90). The plan includes working with a "cost modeling consultant and the district's budget office" (p. 41) to identify and secure additional funding to support the project with references made on using recovery and other funds to support the project.

Weaknesses:

The attached budget on the use of non-federal funds provides no information to support the sustainability of the proposed project (p. e6). Although the applicant plans on the hire of an outside consultant to assist in securing additional funding to support the proposed project, a well developed plan is not currently in place.

The applicant has not adequately addressed the element of the criterion that requires it to support the project with others, non-TIF funds.

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:

An external evaluator will be contracted to conduct formative and summative evaluations (pp. 49-55). The applicant provided a list of performance objectives and research questions (p. 50) that are also included in Table 6 (pp. 53-54). A survey of teachers and staff will be conducted on school climate and conditions (p. 39). Evaluation data includes both quantitative (student performance assessments) and qualitative data (multiple teacher observations).

Weaknesses:

A description of adequate evaluations procedures designed to ensure continuous improvement of the proposed project was somewhat unclear. The evaluation section of the narrative was sometimes incomplete and lacked detail. Performance objectives that were listed in Table 6, varied in quality and were not always strong and measurable. For example, a performance objective listed is "Development of a compensation system that adequately and meaningfully rewards teacher and principal effectiveness" (p. 43).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

A reference is made to a value added model in the abstract (p. e0) and explained further in the narrative. Data from the Colorado Growth Model, based on one developed at Vanderbilt. will serve in assessing teachers', teams' (term not explained), and schools' impact on student growth beginning in 2010 (p. 55). The applicant states that the state, "district staff and outside experts will provide professional development on how the Colorado Growth Model works and can be used for instruction" (p. 56).

Weaknesses:

It appears that the applicant is over-relying on the state to communicate value-added measures, how they will be used, and how they will inform instruction to teachers (p. 56). Few details are provided on clearly explaining the applicant's model to improve instruction. The components of the applicant's value added model are not fully described.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that "For hard to staff positions such as teachers of English language learners, special education students, math and science, these supports and strategic compensation will be especially important" (p. 57).

Weaknesses:

It sometimes seems that the applicant believes that a 25% increase in teacher salaries will raise student achievement (p. 57). From the applicant's narrative, it does not appear to have a problem in the recruitment or retention of teachers. The applicant does not fully address a need to fill hard to staff content areas. The subject of recruiting and retaining effective teachers is not fully discussed. The applicant does not provide evidence required to meet this priority.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

