

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 11:35 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs,  
Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration  
(S385A100146)

**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	8
---------------------	----	---

<b>Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	60	52
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1. Adequacy of Support	25	15
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1. Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	79

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	4
------------------	----	---

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (S385A100146)

### 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:

Miami-Dade has established a CORE initiative (page 1) for 8 high need elementary schools serving K-5. The PBCS will offer three methods of earning compensation, two of which are based on student growth. The first two involve growth of one or two levels, the third takes the percentage of students proficient. IPEGS the district teacher evaluation system only calls for one observation per year. This will be increased to two for participating teachers. Additional training on classroom observation will be initiated in year one to ensure better inter-rater reliability. The budget pages identify \$200 per day for PD for Saturdays and Summer (budget pages e0). Assistant principals will receive \$225 per day for project specific PD during the summer. For teachers and principals no incentives will be paid in Year 1 as that is a planning year. During Year 2 (budget page e1), only core area teachers (Reading and Math (Grade K-5) and Science (Grade 5) will be eligible for performance-based compensation incentives. In Year 3 Art, Music and Physical Education Teachers will be eligible for incentives based on student proficiency. In Years 4 & 5, all teachers who opt to participate in the program will be eligible for performance-based compensation incentives. The size of the

proposed performance-based awards for teachers will be capped (page 22) at \$10,000. Assistant principals and principals will receive a fixed percentage of the total amount of performance received by their instructional staff. The annual payout to an assistant principal cannot be greater than the largest payout to one of the instructional staff at their respective school. PD activity is paid at \$1000 per action research 10 per school. One PD liaison (page 50) per school at \$1000 is allocated. Leadership incentives are grade level leadership positions and awarded less than \$1000 since there are 48 positions and only \$36000 allocated. Non-federal funds are budgeted at \$1,960,116. The amounts identified for teachers and principals as a per diem stipend does not amount to what some districts and state departments of education pay now as regular stipends. Therefore one cannot count these stipends as being significant.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

Projected costs were included in the review comments for Priority 1. M-DCPS has requested \$10,000,000 and will provide a match of \$1,960,116 for the same five year period. Awards are only mentioned for principals, assistant principals, and teachers who opt into the CORE program initiative. However, the statement in the narrative for Absolute priority 2 (page 2) references principals and other personnel who earn it under the system during this time. Money does not appear to have been budgeted for these other personnel. Also, the narrative suggests other funding sources, but it does not seem that these other sources have been secured at this time.

As detailed in the budget narrative, M-DCPS has projected (page 56) the costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS during the project period and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals and other personnel who earn it under the system during this time.

M-DCPS has indicated in the non-federal funding pages (page e12) that they will allocate non-federal funds to the PBCS. This is addressed in the stipend lines on pages e9 and e10.

**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:**

Since the teachersâ union had already signed an MOU (page 25) with the LEA for the RTTT award, M-DCPS has continued from there to base incentives on state standardized achievement exams for tested grades and subjects, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) for Grades 3-5, Stanford Achievement Test for Grades 1 and 2, the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading for Kindergarten; and rigorous district-wide end-of-course exams for difficult-to-measure subjects such as art, music and physical education. The stage method of implementation seems appropriate for assessing non-traditional teaching areas.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

The Professional Development Liaison will receive (Budget narrative page e3) a grant-funded supplement of \$1,000 per year, in addition to the yearly District-funded supplement of \$500, making the total for the position \$1,500 per year. This individual will support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness of the proposed PBCS.

The TIF grade level leaders (page 53) will serve as the chief communicator of the project design, planning and implementation with teachers at their respective grade level and will represent the interests of their grade level during TIF leadership team meetings. The TIF Grade Level Leader will also be responsible for collaborating with the PD Liaison and to offer professional development activities that address the professional growth needs of the teachers on their grade level. This position is intended to be a new leadership role in the school in addition to the grade level chairperson, and the responsibilities of the TIF Grade Level Leader should complement those of the grade chairperson. Providing additional teachers with leadership opportunities. M-D has proposed a \$750 stipend per year (page 53) teachers with leadership opportunities to shape, guide and evaluate performance-based compensation, will help develop a more collaborative school culture, and will ensure buy-in and anchor reform in classrooms. The amounts provided educators as incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles are insufficient for the amount of effort that would be entailed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1.Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

One of the responsibilities of the project manager is the implementation of the district communications plan. This plan was completed last August, but it only included administrators of eligible schools, region superintendents, and region directors. (unnumbered page approximately page 119 of 142). One of the five objectives identified as communication objectives is to communicate to the community. This has not been addressed.

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:**

Appendix C item 1.2 calls for the involvement and support of teachers, principals and other personnel and the teachers' union, in a PBCS. The stakeholder buy-in is the percent of teachers and principals that opt in to the PBCS. On page 26, the narrative states that the teachers and principals union was in communication with one another prior to the release of the TIF proposal release. If RTTT funds were awarded to FL then the growth measure would be determined by the state, if not, then the LEA would determine it. The LEA would also have to purchase the SAT10 for non-FCAT grades. Since May 26, 2010 the teachers' union has been participating in multiple meetings and presentations to teachers. In analyzing the statements above M-D is committed to the PBCS which shows the quality of the application. They have taken into consideration contingency plans.

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:**

Principals have a three component plan identified on page 29 and will select 3-6 indicators based on the previous year's school wide student performance and identified areas needing improvement for the school. They then identify areas still in need of improvement and establish their priorities. Once established the dashboard cannot be changed and 51% of the principal's evaluation will be this dashboard. The two other components are not as well defined. Administrative competencies are defined leadership and technical skills required to demonstrate proficiency in the performance of job responsibilities. Essentially this says whether or not the principal is doing his job. The second component says the professional growth targets are experiences and activities that contribute to growth and enhancement of administrative competencies needed to meet performance tasks. Doing the job gives you more experiences doing the job. These are weak definitions because they are essentially cyclical in nature.

Teachers have a performance evaluation in place since it was piloted in 2005. It was piloted for three years and implemented district wide this year. "The District's teacher evaluation system (Instructional Performance Evaluation and Growth System or IPEGS) currently requires one observation per year using an objective evidence-based rubric, aligned with professional teaching standards." (page 2) Teachers are evaluated on eight performance standards. These eight are enumerated on page 31. There is a rubric within each of these standards that has four performance levels. These are similar to a four level student performance level design. The IPEG rubric is detailed on page 32. It defines what to look for and defines effectiveness. Multiple forms of evidence can be utilized to evaluate performance and to complement the observation components of IPEGS.

An interesting feature of the IPEGS system is that each instructional professional selects the measure, defines it using data that they analyze, and is then accountable for the outcome.

Since this is the first full year of IPEGS, data and feedback from this year will be used to establish inter-rater reliabilities. The training process will be refined for the 2010-11 school year.

**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 existing data warehouse has the capability to link student data to individual teachers and schools for analysis and reporting, even though many of the applications are over 20 years old. M-DCPS is in the midst of migrating to a SAP-based ERP. This will handle E-Recruitment and finance and streamline most of the business processes. (Page 36)

**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 professional development plan for teachers includes five days of PD each year two of which are devoted to assist teachers in completing their IPEGS in order to achieve their student achievement goals. (page 40-41)

Teachers participating in the PBCS will receive an additional three days of PD designed to support their efforts to improve student achievement and earn performance incentives. They will receive additional compensation for this targeted PD. This is a good idea when there is a change implemented.

**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:**

Page 41 identifies a menu of PD options to enable targeting teacher needs to specific activities identified in the IPEGS goal setting process. The PD will address the needs of novice through expert teachers. All of the PD will be aligned to the eight performance standards of the IPEGS teacher evaluation system. The content will center on curricular and instructional strategies selected because they have a high probability of increasing student achievement. Action research will also be available for professional growth as leadership opportunities. Here teachers will turn researcher and share the results to increase the knowledge of effective practices.

The PBCS growth and proficiency measures above (page 20) will drive targeted professional

development and performance based compensation. In determining the proposed performance-based awards, the historical assessment data of M-DCPS students and teachers of the eight participating schools were analyzed to understand current levels of performance and set prospective, challenging yet achievable benchmarks. This historical data and use thereof addresses number 4 of the priority referring to "use the measure of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement. Although not explicitly stated, the action research identified in the proposal would be a perfect opportunity to assign the research question addressed in number 5. Determine the effectiveness of the professional development provided by M-D through the PBCS in improving teacher and leadership practice to improve student achievement.

**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:**

Appendix A contains a list of high need comparable schools as defined by SES, ethnicity, and ELL status. Comparable school groups have been indicated. Considerable effort has been taken to scrupulously match schools to the TIF group by matching 9 south FL schools to each TIF from other LEAs and showing that matching within the M-D system showed statistical significance.

#### **Weaknesses:**

There is no definition of how these schools are comparable, just statistics that the reader is left to intuit. Tables in appendices should be complete entities unto themselves with explanations or some means of interpretation included nearby. The explanation in the first 10 pages is extremely technical but incomplete since the table on page 7 only shows letter grades and the explanation is for the table in the appendix. M-D has done some analysis (page 4) to identify schools and subject areas that have difficulty retaining instructional staff. By providing incentives up to \$10000 M-D expects to retain highly qualified teachers. The only problem with this thinking is the fact (page 4) that 50% of all voluntary attrition occurs in teachers with three or less years of experience. The technical name for this situation is "teacher burnout" and no incentive is high enough to reverse this.

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 compensation method for principals is similar to that for teachers. All students taught by all teachers in the program have an effect on the principal's score.

Teachers may opt out of the PBCS on or before Sept 1 each year.

Page 25-6 illustrates the fact that the teachers' union and district have been communicating about TIF prior to the release of the RFP.

Each instructional professional (page 34) sets an annual performance goal for him/herself (defined in terms) for improving learner achievement. The instructional professional

analyzes relevant data sources to determine and define an appropriate goal, which is then reviewed for completeness and adequacy according to criteria by the assessor. Because these goals are databased performance targets, there are rigorous external measures of learner performance that are incorporated into the annual evaluation. Fairness is ensured because the measure is selected and defined by the instructional professional who is accountable for the outcome. While most of this can be claimed as a strength of the design, collaboration, self selection, goal setting, etc. the rigor is not really assured without an alignment of these goals to a set of generally considered rigorous standards.

**Weaknesses:**

The allocation of dollars depends on a share of the available money divided by the number of people who qualify. This is similar to the stock market where profits are allocated to share holders and then divided by per share ownership. (page 21) There are also other ways to qualify. Two out of three ways are based on growth. This is a weakness because the amount of award will go down as teachers improve and more colleagues also qualify for bonuses.

M-D has stated in the narrative that should a teacher get an individual award of \$10,000, based on a \$48672 average annual teacher's salary, this would be a 20% increase (page 22) and be an incentive to stay. The problem with this is not everyone will earn \$10,000, and in a narrative fraught with statistical references, M-D must realize that the statistical probability that a teacher will attain the cap amount is extremely low. Therefore it will be necessary to consider other initiatives for retaining effective teachers.

M-D considers that the compensation for teachers to remain in the high needs school will be an effective means of recruitment rather than signing a bonus.

The support letters section contains signoffs from the teachers' union and principals' union but very few teachers at each of the schools. The maximum number of teachers counting the principal of the school at each school was 7 with most signoff sheets having less than that. This does not indicate overwhelming support.

**Reader's Score: 52**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Even though through the proposal much of the necessary pieces are in place, year one is to be the planning period to insure that all five elements are in place.

Both the administrative director and TIF project advisor oversee the current TIF grant,

therefore they are experiences in their positions.  
The narrative assures that requested funding is sufficient and goes into detail as to why the amount is sufficient.(page 55)

**Weaknesses:**

A sustainability plan has not yet been established. Budgeting, fundraising, and advocacy for continued funds beyond the life of the TIF award will be included in the planning period activities. Possible sources for funding have been suggested, but there are no solid sponsors to turn to yet for funding. (Page 54)

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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:**

WestEd has been hired to perform an evaluation of the CORE initiative, conducting both qualitative and quantitative analysis of data, focus groups, and interviews. This is an evaluation of the plan as it is proposed to answer three research questions as to feasibility and adequacy. They will also investigate the extent of increased teacher and administrator effectiveness due to participation in this TIF grant.

The proposal states that there are two lower levels of rating (page 31 -32) are used to provide feedback to teachers who do not meet expectations. This would address sub part 3 of this criterion demonstrating adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project. The "developing" category in particular addresses the fact that the teacher requires support in meeting the standards and professional improvement being jointly identified and planned between the professional and the assessor.

**Weaknesses:**

A further investigation of the logic diagram (appendix C) and the incentive formula for validity and fairness by a contractor similar to the above strength might improve this proposal.

**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:

It was recognized that a value added model was needed as a requirement of the grant.

#### Weaknesses:

Value added measures are mentioned twice, once on page 27 where it was a consideration brought to the table as to whether or not existing V-A models would serve the district's needs, and in Appendix C the Logic Model as a requirement for this TIF grant. It has not been addressed with any sort of plan.

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:

There is recognition of the fact that retention and recruitment is a priority of the TIF grant.

**Weaknesses:**

M-D stated in the project design on page 24 that "the proposed performance-based compensation awards are more likely than recruitment incentives to influence a teacher's decision to transfer to and remain in a high-need school". No other plan for recruitment or retention has been offered.

Hard to staff subjects are never addressed.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted**Last Updated:** 7/30/10 11:35 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 12:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs,  
Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration  
(S385A100146)

**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	8
---------------------	----	---

<b>Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	60	55
<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	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>

**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>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
------------------	-----------	----------

<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>92</b>
--------------	------------	-----------

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (S385A100146)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

##### Strengths

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for incentive awards based on student performance and teaching practices. The student performance will be evaluated based on state assessments. The evaluation of effective teaching will be based on a minimum of two separate observations per teacher per year guaranteeing (page e26) a high degree of inter-rater reliability, using a thorough evidence-based rubric. (page e1) The awards being offered for teachers and principals are of sufficient size and the planning committee has done a thorough job of projecting the amounts needed. (page e20)

##### Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

Strengths

There is evidence in the proposal that cost to implement this incentive program have been projected for the next five years beginning in year three of this project. (page e9) The timeline for implementation in the appendix documents that the system will assume increasing amounts of funding using other resources each year ranging from 10% to 30%. These resources will be from state funds and the repurposing of other federal funds.

Weaknesses

The range of 10 -30% in years three through five does represent a steady increase that would lead the reader to believe that the system can fully sustain this model in year 6. The proposal references some funding sources that are pending the approval of other grants and they are not guaranteed. (page e2)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

Strengths

The proposal provides sufficient evidence that professional development plans for teachers will be comprehensive to address the needs of each individual. This plan will be based on needs identified through classroom walkthroughs, observations, analysis of student achievement data, and professional growth targets identified by the teachers during the IPEGS goal-setting process. (page e41)

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

Strengths

A positive leadership role provided in this program will be the opportunity to serve as a grade level leader. (page 53) This recognition will be based on performance and results. The performance and results will be based on teacher observations.

Weaknesses

Evidence that teachers will be awarded for activities beyond student growth and performance is weak in the proposal. The leadership opportunity offered to teachers is the opportunity to do action research within their classroom. There is little detail of how this opportunity will be implemented or evaluated. (page e43)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1:

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

General:

Strengths

The proposal contains strong evidence to show that the teacher's union and principals and teachers were involved in the planning process. (page e27) The teachers union has signed a collaborative agreement for this program. (page e6) A timeline with targeted audiences, communication activities and persons responsible is included to support the successful implementation of this project. (page e26-e36)

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (including input from teachers, principals, and other personnel in the

schools and LEAs to be served by the grant) and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs (where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining) that is needed to carry out the grant.

**General:**

Strengths

A strong planning committee was evident in the proposal involving all levels of administration and teachers in the planning process. The local teachers union has also demonstrated support by their involvement in the planning process. (page e46)

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

Strengths

The proposal documents the use of an objective based rubric that will be used to evaluate teacher performance. This rubric is aligned with professional teaching standards and the LEA's coherent approach to strengthening the educator workforce. (page e8) The evaluation of effective teaching will be based on a minimum of two separate observations per teacher per year. (page e26) Administrators will receive adequate training in this evaluation method guaranteeing inter-rater reliability. (page e2) Continuing to foster the success of this program, during a pilot year of the instrument factors that adversely impact inter-rater reliability will be identified and addressed in order to promote participant buy-in and to ensure that all stakeholders view the system as equitable and fair. (page e35)

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1.Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

Strengths

A positive element of the proposed system is that the system will allow student data to be linked to individual students and schools for analysis and reporting. (page e36)

Weaknesses

The proposal does not provide sufficient evidence that the data management system will be in place by the end of year 1. It only states that ARDA staff (district consultant) will develop the data interface(s) necessary to link student achievement data to teachers. There are no credentials of this team listed or a timeline for the process. (page e37)

**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:**

Strengths

A thorough communication plan includes providing professional development that will be targeted to communicate the methods of assessment to teachers and principals is in place. (page e36) A timeline is provided that supports these elements. (page e26-e35)

Weaknesses

None noted

**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:

##### Strengths

The applicant presented a strong professional development plan that will be implemented for each school based on individual teacher needs identified through observations and performance. (page e40-e42) These professional development opportunities are designed to support the improvement of student achievement. Teachers will earn additional compensation for their participation in this targeted professional development. The menu of professional development options will address needs identified through classroom walkthroughs, observations, analysis of student achievement data, and professional growth targets identified by the teachers during the IPEGS goal-setting process. (page e42) Targeted professional development will be based on student data to improve effectiveness. (page e24) Teachers participating will receive an additional three days of professional development designed in accordance with TIF requirements and to support their efforts to improve student achievement and earn performance incentives. (page E41)

##### Weaknesses

There is no evidence that teachers will be encouraged and compensated for assuming leadership responsibilities within the school.

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 presents evidence of need based on free and reduced lunch data and student achievement data for the schools involved. (page e7) (page e10) Eighty-nine percent or more of students are eligible for free and reduced price lunch. (page e0)

The proposal includes documentation that appropriate comparable schools can be identified and that participating schools are currently performing lower than comparable schools. (page e9) The planning committee has done a thorough job of investigating areas where teacher recruitment and retention are difficult and have provided evidence that the incentive program will impact this area. (page e5)

**Weaknesses:**

The table referencing need based on free and reduced lunch data contains only letters and there is no correlation between the letter and actual percentages. (page e7) Inadequate information is provided that this project will impact the recruitment of teachers in hard-to-staff areas.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for incentive awards based on student performance and teaching practices. The student performance will be evaluated based on state assessments. The evaluation of effective teaching will be based on a minimum of two separate observations per teacher per year guaranteeing (page e26) a high degree of inter-rater reliability, using a thorough evidence-based rubric. (page e1)

The proposal contains evidence to show that the teacher's union and principals and teachers were involved in the planning process. (page e27) A timeline with targeted audiences, communication activities and persons responsible is included to support the successful implementation of this project. (page e26-e36)

It is convincing that a professional development plan will be implemented for each school based on individual teacher needs identified through observations and performance. (page e40-e42) These professional development opportunities are designed to support the improvement of student achievement. Teachers will earn additional compensation for their participation in this targeted professional development. The menu of professional development options will address needs identified through classroom walkthroughs, observations, analysis of student achievement data, and professional growth targets identified by the teachers during the IPEGS goal-setting process. (page e42) Targeted professional development will be based on student data to improve effectiveness. (page e24) Teachers participating will receive an additional three days of professional development designed in accordance with TIF requirements and to support their efforts to improve student achievement and earn performance incentives. (page E41)

#### **Weaknesses:**

Sustainability of the project is unclear. The proposal references many funding sources that are pending the approval of other grants and they are not guaranteed. (page e2) The proposal does not provide sufficient evidence that the data management system will be in place by the end of year 1. It only states that ARDA staff (district consultant) will develop the data interface(s) necessary to link student achievement data to teachers. There are no credentials of this team listed or a timeline for the process. (page e37)

**Reader's Score: 55**

**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:**

Adequacy of support for the project is demonstrated. Key project personnel are identified with roles and responsibilities detailed in the proposal. (page e48-e52) A timeline with targeted audiences, communication activities and persons responsible is included to support the successful implementation of this project. (page e26-e36)

**Weaknesses:**

Since the proposal is to implement a plan of budgeting and fund raising in year one, sustainability is not guaranteed. (page e54) No other funding sources other than non-federal funds that are in place are identified.

**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:**

Substantial evidence is provided that the evaluation plan proposes to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. There will a collection and analysis of quantitative data from student and teacher databases. They will also implement surveys of teachers

and principals and conduct interviews and focus groups to collect qualitative data which will be used to drive direction for this project. (page e56) A logic model is included in the appendix detailing objectives and specific measures.

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation plan does not thoroughly address measurable objectives. (page e57)

**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 proposal adequately demonstrates that the teacher's union and principals and teachers were involved in the planning process. (page e27) A timeline with targeted audiences, communication activities and persons responsible is included to support the successful implementation of this project. (page e26-e36)

**Weaknesses:**

Value-added measures are noted in the logic model in Appendix C, but it is not supported in the content of the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty

areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides evidence that the planning committee has done a thorough study of problem areas in recruitment and retention and feels that this focused incentive program will assist in these areas. (page e5) By providing performance-based incentives up to \$10,000 per year, M-DCPS believes it will be able to retain highly-effective teachers and that it will impact hard-to-staff areas. (page e5)

**Weaknesses:**

No information is provided to address the hiring of teachers who are effective or likely to be effective.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/30/10 12:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 10:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs,  
Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration  
(S385A100146)

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

<b>Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	60	50
<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	82

**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	88
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (S385A100146)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

The applicant proposes a plan calling for differentiated levels of compensation for teachers, principals, and other school personnel in eight high need elementary schools, grades K through 5, that are part of its CORE Initiative (p. e0-e1. Three goals are outlined to improve student achievement, to increase teacher effectiveness, and to improve administrative and instructional deployment practices. In determining educator effectiveness, significant weight is given to student performance based on the state's Florida Comprehensive Tests (FCAT) and the results of multiple observations of teachers and principals in participating schools.

The applicant provides a justification for the levels of compensation it has outlined. The applicant states that performance awards "include the possibility of a teacher earning up to an additional \$10,000 per year" (p. e21). The plan also calls for awards for principals; however, awards are limited, as they cannot "exceed the performance-based payment to any individual teacher at their school."

The applicant provides evidence that it meets the requirement of this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The applicant provides a budget to support its plan through the life of the grant period (pp. e1-2). However, it does not provide a plan to use non-TIF funds over the course of the five years funding period in any amount. The applicant addresses this by requesting a planning year during which it the applicant states that it will develop a formal sustainability plan based on fund-raising, outreach to foundation funding, and other advocacy efforts (pp. 2-3).

Although the applicant does not offer a plan for the fiscal sustainability of its plan, it makes a commitment to develop one during a requested funding year.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The applicant's plan provides various strategies to strengthening the educator workforce that includes the use of student performance data and evaluations for professional development (pp. 3-4). Although the applicant addresses retention of effective educators, it does not fully address the issue of using these data in making tenure decisions.

Although some weaknesses were noted, the applicant meets the basic requirements of this criterion.

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:**

One idea presented in the proposed plan was to encourage teachers with the opportunity to conduct action research that could be shared with colleagues (p. 43). No statement or discussion was included on whether incentives would be provided for this activity, and it was unclear whether the leadership opportunities and additional responsibilities of conducting action research would be available to all teachers (p. e5).

The applicant also outlined a plan to identify a grade level leader at each elementary school to serve as chief communicator for the project. This leader would present the interests of the grade level in TIF leadership meetings and would also assist in addressing the professional development needs of grade level teachers at his or her school. A monetary stipend would be provided.

The applicant has met this requirement.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

The applicant presents an effective plan for communicating its plan to teachers, administrators, and other school personnel.

Letter of support from teachers, principals, the Dade Association of School administrators, the region superintendent, and others were included in the appendix. Although this support from educators is impressive, the applicant was less effective in discussing a plan to communicate its plan to the community at large including parents of students in participating schools.

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 was effective in involving and in receiving support for its plan from teachers, administrators, and other school personnel. Signed letters of support included in the application came from teachers, principals, the region superintendent, and the Dade Association of School Administrators (Appendix B, p. e84).

The applicant met with representatives of the Teachers Union for various discussions early on. These meetings resulted in the United Teachers Union of Dade President and a labor attorney representing the union signing a collaborative agreement supporting the applicant's plan, which is included in the application (p. 6).

The applicant meets the requirements of this core element for involving major stakeholders in its plan.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

The applicant's evaluation plan for teachers appears rigorous and directly links teacher evaluation with student performance while providing for continued professional growth based on a collaborative effort between the teacher and principal. According to the applicant, "the new system incorporates the assessment of both the act of teaching and the results of teaching" (p. e30).

Components of the applicant's new evaluation system, which was implemented district wide in 2009-2010, includes the following performance standards: learner progress, knowledge of learners, instructional planning, instructional delivery, assessment, communication, professionalism, and learning environment. A four level rubric aligned with professional standards is used to assess teachers. Levels include exemplary, proficient, developing/needs improvement, and unsatisfactory (p. e31).

A sample of the rubric scale used is provided (p. e32). Evidence used in the rubric includes data supported documentation and on the job observations of performance. The process is transparent and both the assessor and the person being assessed are provided with guidance in using multiple sources of evidence. Administrators responsible for evaluating teacher performance are trained on using the evaluation model, which consists of four sessions on a range of skill building activities (p. 34-35).

During the requested planning year, the applicant will add an additional observation for teachers in participating schools, which will add a third observation to the current system. Additional training on using the system to increase inter-rater reliability is

also being considered.

The applicant has met or exceeded the requirements of this core element.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The applicant refers to the current infrastructure system, called the Miami-Dade County Public Schools Information Technology Services (ITS), that will be used to manage data to support its plan (p. e36). The system has been upgraded to link student data to individual teachers, principals, and schools. According to the applicant, specialized capabilities within ITS allow linking key components of this data to professional development and to district human resources and compensation (p. e36).

The applicant has met the requirements of this core element.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1. Core Element 5:**

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

**General:**

The applicant describes a strong communication plan that includes activities for communicating its plan on how teachers, principals, and other school personnel will be evaluated and on any additional requirements related to evaluation.

Providing access on various ways to tailor instruction to teachers and administrators through portals, a data warehouse, and Online Analytical Processing tools is included in the plan. Teachers will have direct access to achievement data allowing the teacher to monitor each student's progress (p. e36). The plan includes providing professional development on using student achievement data, which will be added to other professional development goals

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development**

**1. High Quality Professional Development:**

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

**General:**

The applicant's professional plan for teachers and administrators provides a menu of options addressing the needs identified through observations, analysis of student achievement data, and professional growth targets (p. e41). Teachers will be able to select from various professional development activities customizing their professional development plans to specific individual needs and their students' achievement goals.

To respond to the requirement for a process to assess the effectiveness of its professional plan to improve teacher effectiveness and increase student achievement, the applicant explains its plan to "incorporates educators's concern that an evaluation system that focuses on effectiveness with multiple rating categories that take into account student growth must do so in a fair, multi-metric, transparent manner" (p. e24).

Under the applicant's plan, teachers deemed effective, will be encouraged to focus on a specific classroom issue or concern and develop an action research project that when completed can be shared with other teachers (p. 43).

The applicant's plan as described meets the criteria for high quality professional development.

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates the problem of recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers and principals to the high need elementary schools that are targeted. These include the negative label that each persistently low achieving has, the sanctions that have been imposed on these schools by the state, and the challenging environment, such as longer school hours. A 50% attrition rate for teachers with less three or less years of experience was cited with the possible explanations given to low starting salaries and the cost of living in the Miami area (p. e22). The eight schools selected have student achievement levels that are lower than other schools in the LEA or other LEA in the state based on similar size, grade, and poverty levels (p. e7).

The applicant defines a comparable school in the LEA to be one that shares key factors such as " size, grade levels, and poverty levels (p. e8).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant offers an inadequate and unconvincing explanation of why it is allowing teachers in the eight high need schools in Core Initiative to opt out of the plan. The applicant's probable difficulty in recruiting effective teachers in hard to staff content areas was not fully addressed or discussed in detail, and no data was provided.

Reader's Score: 8

## Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

(1) Is part of a proposed LEA or statewide strategy, as appropriate, for improving the process by which each participating LEA rewards teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its

schools) in high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant's plan to determine the effectiveness of teachers and principals uses an effective methodology that employs both qualitative (multiple observations) and quantitative (student performance data) measures (p. e.56).

The performance awards described are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers and principals and are likely to be effective in the recruitment of effective educators to the identified high needs schools (p. e5). The applicant describes a transparent plan that clearly communicates its definition of an effective teacher or principal.

The applicant has solicited and received the support of teachers, administrators, and the teachers union in various meetings early in the process of developing its proposal. Support came from the Miami United Teachers Union, the regional superintendent, and teachers (p. 6). Copies were provided in the appendix (p. e0).

Components of the applicant's evaluation system includes various performance standards and a four level rubric aligned with professional standards is used to assess teachers (p. p. 31). Levels include exemplary, proficient, developing/needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. Evidence used in the rubric includes multiple sources of evidence such as data supported documentation, where student performance is a significant factor, and on the job observations of performance (p. e31).

The applicant clearly defines the first measure of student growth as "one or more levels of improvement during the school year in a specific subject area" (p. e18) and provides a definition for a exceptional growth to be "determined by the number of students increasing two or more proficiency levels in a subject area" (p. e19).

The applicant's Public Schools Information Technology Services (ITS) will be used to manage data to support its plan. The system will link student data to individual teachers, principals, and schools, and specialized capabilities within ITS allow linking key components of this data to professional development and to district human resources and compensation (p. e36).

The applicant outlines a high quality professional development plan to increase educator effectiveness to raise student performance that is directly linked to specific measures in its plan.

**Weaknesses:**

A few weaknesses were noted in the applicants project design. For example, the plan is that it hinges on the "voluntary participation of teachers" in participating schools that are allowed to opt out of participating. No discussion or rationale was provided.

One eligibility requirement is that a teacher is required to "have at least 10 students"; such a requirement might leave out effective SPED teachers in participating schools with a few students who have high specialized needs.

One additional comment, the applicant makes numerous references to additional federal program proposals that have been awarded, were submitted in the past, or are currently begin reviewed. At various points, references were made to a possible Race To The Top award, a past Race To The Top proposal, a 2007 TIF award, and to the 2010 Talent Transfer Initiative. Such references made reading the current proposal confusing at times.

**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 applicant provides a budget (p. e5) and budget narrative (p. e127) designed to support its plan through the life of the grant period although it does not provide a plan to use non-TIF funds over the course of the five years funding period.

The applicant's project director, key staff, and outside evaluator, WestEd, are qualified to implement the major goals of the proposed plan. The specific areas of responsibilities of key staff were clearly explained (p. 50-53). A detailed time-line for the project was outlined (p. e25).

The applicant's plan is likely to achieve its objectives within budget for a five year funding period.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant does not offer a plan for the fiscal sustainability of its plan, it makes a commitment to develop one during a requested funding year through fund-raising, outreach to foundation funding, and other advocacy efforts. Although the current budget can support implementation of the proposed project, no other funding source was identified.

**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 quality of the applicant's local evaluation plan is strong. It includes the use of measurable performance objectives clearly related to the goals of the project for raising student achievement on the state's FCAT tests (pp. 11-12). The "Logic Model" was offered (p. e8) that listed several key measurable objectives.

The applicant provides for the collection and analysis of teacher and principal effectiveness using both quantitative and qualitative measures (p. e56), and it provides a logical plan for the retention and recruitment of effective teachers, principals and other school personnel (p. e27). The applicant provides for adequate evaluation procedures for feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project, both an internal evaluation system based on the Logic Model (p. e27) and external evaluation by WestEd (p. e6). For example, the applicant's model provides for a plan to encourage the leadership of effective teachers and for customized professional development based on evaluation feedback.

**Weaknesses:**

Some questions regarding the applicant's evaluation plan remain. Although measurable objectives are offered, they are not fully discussed within the narrative. In addition, it is unclear how the targeted educators would improve their practice simply on the basis of the incentive model, which is the focus of this proposal.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's plan includes the capacity to implement a value added model that distinguishes between learning gains that demonstrate student proficiency and learning gains that demonstrates two levels of growth and includes a growth measure that distinguishes between effective and a highly effective teachers (p. e27).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant needed to provide more discussion and a better definition of its value added model. It was not unclear whether the value added model was explained to teachers.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant did an outstanding job of demonstrating how its plan would assist high need schools to serve high need students and would serve to retain and reward effective teachers, principals, and others.

The applicant has provided evidence of open communication with administrators, teachers, and others in participating schools, including a surveys sent out prior to creating this proposal (p. e0). The applicant's eommuncation plan includes interviews and focus groups with administrators, teachers, and principals on the Logic Modell and on assessing the progress of their plan (p. 56).

The applicant discussed a plan for the retention and recruitment of teachers (pp. e4-5).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not fully discuss its plan to retain effective teachers in hard to place content areas or provide a plan to fill vacancies with teachers in specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/30/10 10:43 AM