

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	45
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	78

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	5
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	83
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

The proposal cites 50% of performance based compensation will be related to student growth. Trained evaluators will carry out multiple teacher/principal observations using a variety of evaluation tools and instruments including observation rubrics. Compensation incentives appear to be adequate to promote teacher participation.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

A detailed budget plan is provided. A performance based compensation system will be developed and used. The proposal includes alliance school district members progressively assuming a greater percentage of the cost as grant years progress.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The proposal outlines a plan to develop a data management system, train users of data generated to inform instruction/professional development, and develop a system for use of data that uses teacher effectiveness measures in making teacher retention decisions. A professional development evaluation/feedback system will be developed during the planning years.

**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:**

A monetary reward system is outlined that rewards teachers and principals who assume leadership roles and serve as professional development providers(p. 31-34).

**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:**

A communication and stakeholder involvement plan is outlined covering the years of the grant. Presentations in a variety of formats will communicate the plan to various stakeholders. A "feedback" loop will exist for stakeholders.

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:**

Documents of support from the state education agency, state/local principal associations, state teacher associations, participating district officials, and local government officials are included in the proposal ( p.2 and appendix).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

This proposal will use a planning year to analyze present evaluation instruments used in various schools/districts and develop evaluation instruments that are research based and validated. Training in the use of instruments will be held for principals during the first year of the grant. Evaluation procedures will include multiple teacher observations and an evidenced -based rubric. A performance based compensation system with student growth as a significant factor will be a feature of the initiative.

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:

A data management system will be created during the proposed planning period. Components of the data system that will be created are cited in the proposal which include student achievement data linked to teacher compensation. The proposal timeline for this element is very ambitious.

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:

A general professional development plan spanning a five year period is cited to ensure teacher and principal understanding at the PBCS components. Charts outlining goals/activities for each of the five years of the grant exist. Peer evaluators will be trained and master teachers modeling best practices will available via videos.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

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

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

**General:**

The proposal cites the use of individual teacher professional growth plans. A timeline listing professional development for school staff on topics of best instructional practices and use of evaluation tools exist. More detail is needed related to professional development opportunities for staff members of non-participating grant schools, an evaluation system to assess the effectiveness of the professional development offered, and articulation of the link between the professional development provided and effectiveness measures.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides extensive data documenting many of the criteria cited. Poverty and achievement data for schools identified as high need that are part of this proposal exist. Data on teacher recruitment and retention is presented. The coordination of work by several districts to create a common school improvement model built around student learning is admirable.

**Weaknesses:**

Given the multiple districts/schools participating in this proposal, it is difficult to identify comparable schools as no definition is provided..

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal adequately addresses the key criteria present in the grant application. The proposal envisions using much of the first two years of the grant to develop key elements of the plan - data management systems that link student achievement to payroll and HR, evaluation instruments with student growth as a significant factor, a teacher monetary compensation system, and relevant professional development opportunities to enhance educator effectiveness and understanding. The coordination of applications in several districts to create a common school improvement model built around enhancing student

achievement is admirable. Involvements of the members of this multiple group of school districts is documented in letters of commitment and support included in the document (teacher associations, administrators, school board members).

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal faces the challenge of coordinating the work of multiple schools in multiple districts. Implementation of key features of the proposal would not occur until late in the grant cycle. During the proposed planning years, the applicant needs to more fully address the measurements of teacher effectiveness that will be used.

**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 proposal includes documentation, including letters of support, detailed budget plans, resumes outlining qualifications of key personnel, and a plan for member districts to progressively assume costs of the initiatives after the TIF funds end.

**Weaknesses:**

Funding sources present in the proposal may not prove to be adequate given a marginal economic climate that impacts local school districts, who are listed as proposal members.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

staff in its schools), and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel;

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal cites the use of an outside evaluator to assess the grants goal attainment. A detailed timeline outlining the development of specific qualitative and quantitative evaluation components is presented. In the planning year process, identification of strong and measurable performance goals will occur. A feedback and continuous improvement plan will also be developed in the planning years of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

Formative evaluations are needed as part of the grant applications.

**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 proposal outlines a plan to use value-added data as part of a student achievement assessment system. Planning years will be used to develop evaluation instruments and protocols that address value added measures and compensation. Additionally, planning years will be used to develop and use communication plans around the initiative.

**Weaknesses:**

Implementing value-added components will occur relatively late in the grant cycle with development of value-added systems during the planning year. The proposal has heavy reliance on using the planning years with multiple district member participants working on the development of common instruments and procedures which poses a major challenge.

**Reader's Score: 2**

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 outlines differentiated compensation for effective teachers in hard to staff positions and schools. An initial screening of applicants seeking to identify effective teacher candidates will occur.

**Weaknesses:**

Due to the multiple districts involved in this proposal, uniform application of proposal parameters may be difficult to monitor or implement. Hard to fill positions are defined very generally and hard to staff positions need to be more clearly communicated to staff in schools.

Reader's Score: 3

---

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	37
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	68

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	74
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

### 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 adequately addressed the development and subsequent implementation of a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, with multiple rating scales, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement as part of a coherent and integrated approach of the MCEA to strengthening the educator workforce of several Arizona school districts.

The Applicant gave significant weight (50% of scoring scale) to student growth based on objective data on student performance and addressed teacher observations. The Applicant demonstrated its response to Priority 1 throughout the application, more specifically as noted in Table 19 (pp. 37-38).

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 very successfully documented and detailed the projected costs with non-TIF funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial resource for during and after the grant period. Tables 23 -27 demonstrate a planful and intentional use of local, state and federal funds to sustain the project. The Applicant demonstrated planning for sustainability through its Projection model on page 51).

The areas where the Applicant specifically demonstrated it's response to Priority 2 is noted in Table 19 (pp. 37-38).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The Applicant provided a very comprehensive approach to its PBCS. 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 LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

Of particular positive note is the Applicant's Theory of Change (Figure 1, p. 3) model to increase educator effectiveness. The model includes educator evaluation, PBCS, educator career pathways and targeted professional learning. This comprehensive approach facilitates a greater likelihood of success as it deals with building capacity through professional development and career pathways-as opposed to a project that deals only with performance based incentives.

The areas where the Applicant specifically demonstrated it's response to Priority 3 are noted in Table 19 (pp. 37-38).

Reader's Score: 0

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

Applicant ably describes how its proposed PBCS will provide teachers and principals with opportunities and incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles via career pathways (pp. 31-35).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

**1. Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

The Applicant demonstrated the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel as evidenced by letters of support from, district superintendents, public policy makers, the education association, and professional associations (page 2 and Appendix).

The use of cross district teams (pp. 39-47) as a strategy to further enhance communication is 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:**

The Applicant demonstrated the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel as evidenced by letters of support from, district superintendents, public policy makers, the education association, and professional associations (Page 2 and Appendix).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

This system is in alignment with new state legislation regarding teacher and principal evaluation, as well as with requirements for superintendent performance pay (pp. 12-13).

Table 7 (p. 10) depicts REIL's performance based management system and provides a big picture view of the 5 components of the system.

Applicant provided information on the use of student growth data, an evidence-based rubric, the required number of observations, inter-rater reliability and the collection and evaluation of additional forms of data (p. 29).

**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:**

Applicant provided the data management system specifications (Table 15, p. 30) for the system that will be developed in year one and in place by July 2011.

When developed, the proposed data-management system will be able to link student achievement data for teacher and principal instructional use, though Applicant did not address if the data management system will link to payroll and human resources systems (p. 30).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1. Core Element 5:**

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

**General:**

The Applicant addresses a plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness is included in the PBCS. It can be found in the five-year professional development plan (Table 16, p. 32).

Said professional development plan is intended to enable educators to use the data generated by the effectiveness measures to improve practice.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development**

**1. High Quality Professional Development:**

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

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

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

**General:**

Applicant provided a five-year professional development plan (Table 16, p. 32) that integrates the 5 phases of professional learning. Said professional development will be regularly assessed using Guskey's 5 levels of data (p. 33).

The Applicant's five-year professional development plan addresses the tools to increase effectiveness in high need schools, and supports the training of principals, Master Teachers and Peer Evaluators; focuses on the instructional needs of high needs students; and supports teacher and principal understanding and use of data from the measures of effectiveness to improve practice (pp. 31-33).

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 provided data to demonstrate the difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff. For example, in Table 2 Unqualified and Under-Qualified Teachers (p. 5) provides years of teacher experience and number of teachers with emergency certificates.

Pages 6-8, the Applicant adequately defined and demonstrated that student achievement in each of the school districts whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the state. As well, Applicant specified comparability of other districts in terms of key factors such as size, grade level configurations, and poverty rates, and location (p. 6).

Applicant defined student growth with the state level AIMS and with MAPS -a value added growth calculation model. (p.7) and demonstrated that the comparison districts outperformed the REIL districts.

#### Weaknesses:

On page 4, Table 1 -it is unclear how the number of school leaders was determined. It is unclear if these are all the leaders in each district or just a subset and if they will all participate in the grant.

While the Applicant provided data to demonstrate difficulty in recruiting staff, it did not provide specific information for hard to staff subjects or specialty areas (p. 5). There was minimal to no specific information or data to demonstrate difficulty retaining hard to staff subjects and specialty areas.

Applicant defined comparable schools as the "state." As such, Applicant has not adequately addressed this criteria (p. 13).

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:**

The Applicant provided a very comprehensive approach to its PBCS. 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 LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

The REIL goals start with a student centered goal -ensuring that students graduate college and career ready pathways (p. 9). Applicant provided measurable performance objectives that are clearly related to the goals of the project and intended to raise student achievement via an increase in teacher and principal effectiveness.

Table 7 (p. 10) depicts REIL's performance based management system and provides a big picture view of the 5 components of the system. This system is in alignment with new state legislation regarding teacher and principal evaluation, as well as requirements for

superintendent performance pay (pp. 12-13).

Applicant proposes to use AIMS (state assessment) and MAPS, both already proven to be valid and reliable measures of student growth. Applicant will use Year One to determine validity and reliability of local assessments (p15).

Applicant has justified the sizes of the performance awards with the research. In addition, amounts were determined with sustainability considerations (pp. 16-18). The awards are differentiated and provide a continuum of opportunities to earn an award for teachers, principals and other staff.

The Applicant demonstrated the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel as evidenced by letters of support from, district superintendents, public policy makers, the education association, and professional associations (Page 2 and Appendix).

Applicant proposes to use trained Peer Evaluators to assist principals in the multiple observations. This will be of great benefit to principals and increases capacity in the district re: calibration of observations and evaluations.

Applicant proposes to increase the number of teacher evaluations to 5 a year (p. 28). Additionally, Applicant proposes to collect additional forms of evaluation evidence.

The Applicant proposes to use Year One to develop a Stakeholder Engagement and Communication Plan guided by the framework in Table 13 (p. 25). Said framework appears to support ongoing communication.

Applicant provided the data management system specifications (Table 15, p. 30) for the system that will developed in year one and in place by July 2011.

Applicant provided a five-year professional development plan (Table 16, p. 32) that integrates the 5 phases of professional learning. Said professional development will be evaluated using Guskey's 5 levels of data (p. 33).

#### **Weaknesses:**

As noted in the evaluation section, the objectives are big picture in nature. They are not measurable until the 3rd and 4th years of the project. Objectives for PBCS and teacher evaluation systems (the purpose of this grant) aren't accountable until years 4 and 5 of the project.

Applicant plans to purchase formative (benchmark) assessment system for those districts that do not meet the established requirements. There is no mention as to which assessment system will be chosen or how that decision will be made.

The REIL score will be used to determine both teacher and principal placement on the performance award continuum. Per page 15, the REIL score is not yet determined. Year One will be used to normalize the local assessment system process across the districts and develop the data management system. This entails a great deal of time and effort given the number of districts. It is uncertain that the planning year (actually 10 months) will be sufficient to complete these tasks. (p. 15).

While the Applicant demonstrated the involvement of teachers, principals and other personnel as evidenced by letters of support from, district superintendents, public policy makers, the education association, and professional associations (Pages 2, 23-24, and Appendix) it is uncertain as to the extent to which there was, and will be teacher involvement, or two way communication. The support letters, management plan and timeline tasks note administrative, professional association and ESA involvement and appears to be somewhat "top heavy" and "top down" communication.

On page 19 and throughout this section, Applicant writes, "student growth will be at least 50% of the total award for performance -based compensation." In Table 9 on page 18 Individual value added is only 40% of the score. The evaluation instrument is noted as being 50% of the score. This will need to be clarified.

There was no evidence or information as to teacher involvement in the decision to use trained Peer Evaluators to assist principals in the multiple observations. It is unclear as to the extent of teacher buy-in and involvement in this decision.

It is unclear what the Applicant will do for the ineffective principals in need of support if the Applicant does not receive the federal grant for ESLS (Engineering School Leaders Success). As well, it is unclear how long ineffective teachers and principals will be placed on an improvement plan before they are recommended for non-renewal of contract (p.22).

The Applicant proposes to develop a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers, principals, Peer Evaluators and Master Educators that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth as a significant factor. The challenge is that this system is not yet defined and will not actually be in place until Year 3 (the evaluation rubric being developed in Year 2 - p. 27).

Applicant does not provide information as to how the additional forms of evaluation evidence (survey data, student work, observation of teacher in PLCs) will be measured (p. 28). Additionally, it is unclear when or how student achievement data will be linked to the human resource and payroll systems.

The five-year professional development plan (Table 16, p. 32) does not provide for repeat sessions for staff who miss opportunities in that year. As well, it would be clearer if the plan noted if the trainings were sequential and when they occur - by month or quarter.

**Reader's Score: 37**

#### **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 provided a specific and detailed management plan and timeline that is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

In addition to a detailed timelines (by month) and specific milestones for the entire five years of the project (pp. 39-48), the Applicant provided a five-year PLAN-DO -STUDY-ACT Cycle aligned to specific project periods (p. 39) as well as by categories of work. This will further ensure accomplishing the stated tasks.

A strength of this application is that the Management Plan indicates tasks, early on in the grant period that address, communication to educators and stakeholders and sustainability efforts.

Applicant provided job descriptions for Project Director and key personnel that clearly outline roles and responsibilities (see Appendix). The Project Director and key staff appear to have the capacity and necessary skills and qualifications to carry out their responsibilities.

The staff time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively for a project of this size and scope. Applicant has allocated 1.0 FTE to Project Director and key staff (p. 50 and Budget narrative in Appendix).

The applicant has very successfully documented and detailed the proposed project with funds provided under other federal or state programs and local financial resource for during and after the grant period. Tables 23 -27 demonstrate a planful an intentional use of local, state and federal funds to sustain the project. The Applicant demonstrated planning for sustainability through its Projection model on page 51).

**Weaknesses:**

As much as the Applicant has provided a detailed timeline, the milestones are not specific and measurable.

All of the tasks and activities on the Management Plan list the persons responsible for the tasks, usually project and MCESA staff. It still remains unclear as to the extent of teacher, principal, educator involvement/input on committees and planning meetings etc.

It is unclear why performance incentives for student growth will not start until 2014-2015 (p.47). Incentives based on classroom observations do start earlier in 2013. Applicant will need to clarify why incentives start 3 years into the grant period.

While the Applicant provided a detailed picture of fund sources for sustainability - there is some concern as to the districts' ability to carry over half of their Proposition 301 funds (page 51 - Projection Model). As well, Applicant needs to speak to Title I funding limitations and requirements as they relate to the use of funds for this project.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

(3) Includes adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous

improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement and increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel.

Applicant demonstrated a detailed evaluation process that will collect and produce evaluation data that are both quantitative and qualitative in Tables 29 and 30 (pp. 56-59).

Applicant will collect student outcome data from a variety of sources (AIMS, MAPS, DIBELS, local formative assessments, graduation data).

The proposed evaluation provides adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

The objectives are generic and not measurable until 3-4 years into the project. Even the communication system goal must not be met until the end of the first year. Objectives for PBCS and teacher evaluation systems (purpose of this grant) aren't accountable until years 4 and 5 of the project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Applicant demonstrated that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals and other personnel will use a value-added measure of the impact on student growth as a significant factor (50% of score) in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel.

In addition, the Applicant also demonstrated that it has a plan to develop a data system that will collect the necessary data and ensure data quality that will increase capacity to implement the proposed value-added model.

The Applicant specifically demonstrated its response to Competitive Priority 4 in Table

**Weaknesses:**

The growth model was not adequately addressed and could be explained in more detail. The value-added model will not be implemented until later in the grant period.

**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:**

With the intent to serve high need students, the Applicant addressed this priority with a differentiated compensation for hard to staff positions, a hard to staff position list, a new screening process, and opportunities for Turnaround teachers and principal positions (pp. 35-36).

The Applicant very clearly and specifically demonstrated its response to Competitive Priority 5 in Table 19 (pp. 37-38).

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not define additional leadership roles and responsibilities for Turnaround Teachers and principals. There was no indication of a process in place for communicating to teachers the hard to staff subject areas and high needs schools.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	16
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
------------------	-----------	----------

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** Maricopa County Education Service Agency -- Maricopa County Education Service Agency, Teaching and Learning (S385A100076)

### 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:

REIL will develop an evaluation system that includes multiple rating categories, frequent observations, and student growth as measures of effectiveness (p. 11, 19). The PBCS will be based on differential compensation based on these multiple measures, to include a value-added calculation, as well as school, team, and individual awards, and salary augmentation based on career pathways and hard-to-staff designations (p. 12). This information will contribute to an individual's REIL Score, in designated percentages (p. 18, 21), that will then determine the level of compensation.

The student growth component will use state achievement data as well as local formative and summative assessments, and the Arizona Growth Model, to produce value-added data that will allow for rankings of teachers and schools (p. 14).

Teachers will be observed by principals and peer evaluators in order to demonstrate observed and documented practices that are aligned with Arizona's teaching standards (p. 19).

Master Educators and REIL Peer Evaluators will be evaluated according to instruments that are yet to be developed, but will be based on student growth and will include at least 3 observations per year (p. 19-20). Principals will be evaluated with at least 3 observations done according to the Ontario Leadership Framework, as well as individual and district value-added data (p. 21, 27-8).

There is a contradiction in the compensation amounts that are mentioned in the proposal; performance awards in the amount of 4-10% of base salary are listed (p. 16), and then maximum amounts of \$10,000 and \$15,000 are listed for teachers and principals, respectively (p. 17). Further confusion is introduced on p. 18, where the table presents even different amounts. It is difficult to determine if the awards are sufficient, based on this discrepancy.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

#### **General:**

The proposal describes how project funding will be directed in order to achieve the goals of the systemic reform effort that is being planned (p. 54).

The contractual budget seems to be out of proportion with the overall scope of the project; there is a concern about the number of major tasks that need to be outsourced (budget narrative).

The proposal offers a clear representation of how TIF and non-TIF funds will be used to transition fiscal support for the PBCS (p. 18, 53) throughout the grant period. State and federal funding sources are described that will support project implementation through and beyond the grant period (p. 51-2).

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the

educator workforce, including in the use of data and evaluations for professional development and retention and tenure decisions in the LEA or LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

**General:**

"The REIL Alliance Membership is composed of: Professional Practitioners, Public Policy Makers, and Professional Associations," all aimed at strategic efforts to reform school-level operations that will create highly effective and accountable schools (p. 2). The strategic plan is further represented in the model on p. 3, which depicts clear results and long-term outcomes that are expected as a result of REIL.

The overall project leadership structure (p. 23) and the chart listing responsibilities of stakeholder groups (p. 24) depict how the various teams will work collaboratively to reach project goals. A stakeholder engagement and communication plan is in place to ensure that all stakeholders are involved in the varied levels of the project (p. 25).

The pooling of resources for several small high-need districts appears to be a coherent strategy for developing a comprehensive Performance-Based Management System and strengthening the educator workforce in Arizona (p. 4, 10).

As part of this strategic effort, "districts will revise their retention and tenure policies to reflect use of data from multiple sources," (p. 12). Further, a focus on "law and policy changes, through collaborations with key Alliance Members, will lead to revised legislation related to teacher and principal recruitment and retention policies, as well as changes to current PBC legislation (p. 13).

There is evidence of community and state support for change and the potential for sustainability, as demonstrated through substantial letters of support (appendix).

**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:**

Career pathways are used for effective teachers and principals to seek leadership opportunities, including Master Educators, Peer Evaluators, In-Demand Teachers, and Turnaround Teachers (p. 34).

Hard-to-staff positions include math, science, and special education, as determined by the number of unfilled teaching positions at the end of the 2009-2010 school year (p. 5). This points to difficulty in recruiting teachers for these positions. Each district will further determine their own hard-to-staff assignments. The designated assignments will be staffed by In-Demand Teachers and Turnaround Teachers, who are eligible for salary augmentation (p. 35).

Individuals will be recruited into the various career pathways through the STEP process, which includes multiple measures of effectiveness such as videos, performance tasks, student achievement data, and interviews (p. 36).

**Reader's Score: 0**

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

### 1. Core Element 1:

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

#### General:

"The REIL Alliance Membership is composed of: Professional Practitioners, Public Policy Makers, and Professional Associations", all aimed at strategic efforts to reform school-level operations that will create highly effective and accountable schools (p. 2. 23). A stakeholder engagement and communication plan is in place to ensure that all stakeholders are involved in the varied levels of the project (p. 25).

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 REIL Alliance Membership is composed of: Professional Practitioners, Public Policy Makers, and Professional Associations", all aimed at strategic efforts to reform school-level operations that will create highly effective and accountable schools (p. 2. 23). The overall project leadership structure (p. 23) and the chart listing responsibilities of stakeholder groups (p. 24) depict how the various teams will work collaboratively to reach project goals.

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 planning year will be used to ensure that the teacher and principal evaluation tools to be used are valid and have inter-rater reliability; evaluator experience and content knowledge will also be evaluated to ensure a high-quality instrument before implementation takes place (p. 26-29).

There are multiple planned efforts to ensure that inter-rater reliability will be achieved, including the use of established instruments and various levels of training on those instruments (p. 29).

REIL will develop an evaluation system that includes multiple rating categories, frequent observations, and student growth as measures of effectiveness (p. 11, 19).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The applicant proposes to develop a data management system within the planning year, and has outlined the criteria for the system's specifications. One of the criteria is to link student achievement data to human resource and payroll systems. The immense amount and complexity of tasks is a concern, and does not seem feasible to accomplish in under a year's time (p. 30).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1. Core Element 5:**

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

**General:**

Professional Growth Plans will guide the job-embedded support teachers need to become effective and/ or to explore career pathways. Professional development opportunities will range in content, but will be site- and teacher-specific, as well as principal-specific, according to individualized and group needs (p. 11, 3-3). Data and evaluation feedback will guide professional development opportunities.

Online videos of exemplary classroom teachers will be used to provide examples of effective teaching (p. 31).

Various methods for evaluating the quality of professional development and its ability to promote effectiveness in educators are outlined (p. 33-4).

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

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

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

**General:**

Professional Growth Plans will guide the job-embedded support teachers need to become effective and/ or to explore career pathways. Professional development opportunities will range in content, but will be site- and teacher-specific, as well as principal-specific, according to individualized and group needs (p. 11, 31). Data and evaluation feedback will guide professional development opportunities.

Teachers who are deemed to be ineffective will receive a variety of supports, including job-embedded content and pedagogy-based coaching and support from principals, master educators, and REIL peer evaluators (p. 22). Those who fail to make improvements will be recommended for non-renewal. Principals will be given the same levels of support from the Superintendent and other personnel, and will face similar consequences if satisfactory improvements are not made.

Online videos of exemplary classroom teachers will be used to provide examples of effective teaching (p. 31).

Various methods for evaluating the quality of professional development and its ability to promote effectiveness in educators are outlined (p. 33-4).

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal displays the number of unqualified and under-qualified teachers in the partner districts, demonstrating the lack of teachers with necessary qualifications and experience, which points to the notion that effectiveness is likely negatively impacted (p. 5).

Hard-to-staff positions include math, science, and special education, as determined by the number of unfilled teaching positions at the end of the 2009-2010 school year (p. 5). This points to difficulty in recruiting teachers for these positions. Each district will further determine their own hard-to-staff assignments. The designated assignments will be staffed by In-Demand Teachers and Turnaround Teachers, who are eligible for salary augmentation (p. 35).

The STEP process will use multiple measures of effectiveness such as videos, performance tasks, student achievement data, and interviews (p. 36) to "revolutionize the current applicant process as REIL school districts implement new procedures for hiring staff to fill vacancies, including vacancies in hard-to-staff areas," (p. 36).

Comparable districts were selected based on poverty rate, location, grade-level configuration, and size (p. 6). Each project district was paired with a comparable district, as displayed on Table 3 (p. 6).

Student achievement was determined by analyses of AIMS MAP scores, which is a value-added growth calculation, and the percent of grade 3-12 students not meeting state standards (AIMS assessments) in reading and math (p. 7). In the majority of cases, comparison districts outperformed the project districts in student achievement (p. 7-8).

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not discuss the issue of retention, and the implications for the project districts if they are unable to retain qualified and effective teachers and principals.

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The pooling of resources for several small high-need districts appears to be a coherent strategy for developing a comprehensive Performance-Based Management System and strengthening the educator workforce in Arizona (p. 4, 10).

Professional Growth Plans will guide the job-embedded support teachers need to become effective and/ or to explore career pathways. Professional development opportunities will range in content, but will be site- and teacher-specific, as well as principal-specific,

according to individualized and group needs (p. 11, 31). Data and evaluation feedback will guide professional development opportunities. Therefore, professional development activities are intended to be aligned with student achievement goals and teacher effectiveness measures.

REIL will develop an evaluation system that includes multiple rating categories, frequent observations, and student growth as measures of effectiveness (p. 11, 19). The PBCS will be based on differential compensation based on these multiple measures, to include a value-added calculation, as well as school, team, and individual awards, and salary augmentation based on career pathways and hard-to-staff designations (p. 12). This information will contribute to an individual's REIL Score, in designated percentages (p. 18, 21), that will then determine the level of compensation.

The student growth component will use state achievement data as well as local formative and summative assessments, and the Arizona Growth Model, to produce value-added data that will allow for rankings of teachers and schools (p. 14).

The proposal includes plans to evaluate the reliability and validity of the local assessments being used; by determining the quality and availability of these assessments, the project aims to normalize the local assessment systems and implement efficient data management across localities (p. 15).

Teachers will be observed by principals and peer evaluators in order to demonstrate observed and documented practices that are aligned with Arizona's teaching standards (p. 19).

Master Educators and REIL Peer Evaluators will be evaluated according to instruments that are yet to be developed, but will be based on student growth and will include at least 3 observations per year (p. 19-20). Principals will be evaluated with at least 3 observations done according to the Ontario Leadership Framework, as well as individual and district value-added data (p. 21, 27-8).

"The REIL Alliance Membership is composed of: Professional Practitioners, Public Policy Makers, and Professional Associations", all aimed at strategic efforts to reform school-level operations that will create highly effective and accountable schools (p. 2. 23). The overall project leadership structure (p. 23) and the chart listing responsibilities of stakeholder groups (p. 24) depict how the various teams will work collaboratively to reach project goals. A stakeholder engagement and communication plan is in place to ensure that all stakeholders are involved in the varied levels of the project (p. 25).

#### **Weaknesses:**

There is a contradiction in the compensation amounts that are mentioned in the proposal; performance awards in the amount of 4-10% of base salary are listed (p. 16), and then maximum amounts of \$10,000 and \$15,000 are listed for teachers and principals, respectively (p. 17). Further confusion is introduced on p. 18, where the table presents even different amounts. It is difficult to determine if the awards are sufficient, based on this discrepancy.

The applicant proposes to develop a data management system within the planning year, and has outlined the criteria for the system's specifications. One of the criteria is to link student achievement data to human resource and payroll systems. The immense amount and complexity of tasks is a concern, and does not seem feasible to accomplish in under a year's time (p. 30).

**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 includes a detailed table of activities, milestones, timelines, and responsibilities for the overall project; these activities are aligned to specific project objectives (p. 39-48). Another table further represents the specific areas of responsibility for project staff (p. 49).

There is evidence of community and state support for change and the potential for sustainability, as demonstrated through substantial letters of support (appendix).

The proposal describes how project funding will be directed in order to achieve the goals of the systemic reform effort that is being planned (p. 54).

The proposal offers a clear representation of how TIF and non-TIF funds will be used to transition fiscal support for the PBCS (p. 18, 53) throughout the grant period. State and federal funding sources are described that will support project implementation through and beyond the grant period (p. 51-2).

**Weaknesses:**

The table outlining the REIL Program Management Plan (p. 39-48) appears to present too many and too complex tasks to be accomplished within the project period; there are concerns about the feasibility and the capacity to carry out this number of activities with success.

The contractual budget seems to be out of proportion with the overall scope of the project; there is a concern about the number of major tasks that need to be outsourced (budget narrative).

**Reader's Score: 16**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal defines clear and measurable goals and objectives for the project with timelines for completion (p. 9). Another table (p. 56-8) further delineates the project's objectives, research questions, data collection activities, and methods of analysis, offering a clear picture of the evaluation to take place.

Various quantitative and qualitative data sources are described for use in the evaluation (p. 59), including interviews, surveys, and student achievement data.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal indicates that a summative evaluation and final report will be prepared to summarize the grant activities once concluded, however it is not clear what methods will be used to provide feedback and inform continuous improvement efforts throughout the life of the grant (p. 60).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The student growth component will use state achievement data as well as local formative and summative assessments, and the Arizona Growth Model, to produce value-added data that will allow for rankings of teachers and schools (p. 14, 16).

Specific activities are planned to explain the value-added model to teachers so that they are better prepared to analyze data and use it for instructional purposes (p. 32).

**Weaknesses:**

The growth model and incorporation of value-added data could be explained in greater detail to provide a better understanding of the way it will inform the REIL continuum in terms of teacher effectiveness (p. 16).

**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:**

Career pathways are used for effective teachers and principals to seek leadership opportunities, including Master Educators, Peer Evaluators, In-Demand Teachers, and Turnaround Teachers (p. 34). It is intended that teachers who are on a career pathway will be more likely to be retained.

Designated hard-to-staff assignments will be staffed by In-Demand Teachers and Turnaround Teachers, who are eligible for salary augmentation (p. 35).

Individuals will be recruited through the STEP process, which includes multiple measures of effectiveness such as videos, performance tasks, student achievement data, and interviews (p. 36).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no indication that the applicant has a process in place for communicating which areas are considered high-need or hard-to-staff within the project districts.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:55 PM

