

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management,  
(S385A100091)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	40
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	77

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	87
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management, (S385A100091)

### 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 makes the case for high need in nine targeted schools, where about 86% of students are low income, with no fewer than 74% qualifying in any one school (Page 3).

The applicant also utilized the Maryland State ranking of schools to identify as high need. This provided an objective comparison of targeted schools versus comparable schools in their region. Five of the schools targeted under this grant rate as being five of the lowest performing schools on the list with respect to academic achievement and student performance. The remaining four were not far behind (Page 4).

The applicant states that there is high student, teacher and principal turnover in the school, and that grant funds will partially be utilized for providing incentives for recruiting and retaining high quality educators, particularly subject-area teachers. They report that 24% of their teachers leave their schools annually, so only 45% of teachers have been at the school for less than a year. Moreover, in key areas, such as math and science, one of the targeted schools has had six school leaders within three years and another, has had two school leaders in the past year (Pages 3-6).

Weakness: The fact that there has been so much turnover of students and staff in the schools, indicates a more serious problem than being able to recruit highly qualified teachers for high needs schools. It indicates that there is a serious internal management or operations problem that may not be resolved through providing performance pay.

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 does have projected costs related to the project. Specifically, they will need funds for incentives, personnel, and costs related to implementing the two new components of their project. These include principal evaluation and support, and support for measuring and monitoring student achievement. The LEA also wants to expand the number of teachers and other school personnel who they will serve through their PBCS. (Pages 1-6). The applicant will match TIF funds with non-TIF funds (i.e. school membership fees, financial backer) over the course of the five-year project period at 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 (Page 53).

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 is committed to providing teachers with leadership opportunities and incentives, through mentor or master teacher roles (Page 21).

There is a focus on bolstering school leader and teacher support systems to effect strong gains for enrolled students. This involves a strong performance management system which evaluates professional performance, holds employees accountable for increasing student achievement, and which provides incentives and professional development training to help meet growth targets (Pages 21-22).

Teacher and principal evaluation is differentiated, uses multiple measures and is centered around the MAPS data management system, an in-house system developed collectively by school leaders and a consultant from a local data systems developer. The applicant's goal is to provide an open and fair system, which weighs heavily on student achievement, and which involves a combination of objective student and school data and use of observations for assessment. The data management system connects each component of the PBCS and aligns student performance and employee performance data in ways that allow it to be utilized promotions, tenure, and other human resource functions (Pages 26 - 29).

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Requirement - Requirement**

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

##### **General:**

Applicant is committed to providing teachers with leadership opportunities and incentives, through mentor or master teacher roles. Teachers must first demonstrate that they meet performance criteria in their role as teachers, before making application to become instructional leaders (Page 21).

**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 LEA presented a couple of brief paragraphs (Pages 26 and 39) which explained that it has planned orientations and training sessions for school personnel, as well as a process where project developers worked with school leaders through the model development process, and in which teachers were informed through their school principals. The applicant also stated the following: teachers understand their opportunities and commitment for student achievement as well as to the learning community. The applicant also reports that school personnel will be asked to work individually and in teacher teams to make recommended refinements, and to better understand and to take advantage of supports provided through the PBCS ( Page 39). Plans could have been more developed, as this section is a priority or core piece of the plan.

**Reader's Score: 0**

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

### 1. Core Element 2:

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

#### General:

The applicant reports that the project has the full support of the school community, however, teachers were not invited to have direct input into the planning process. Instead, they were informed of what would happen and their role in the process, as were the principals, according to the proposal. Management company staff seems to drive school operations. The applicant also states that all schools are non-unionized, all employees are at-will and union support is a non-issue. It is recommended that the applicant develop strategies for meaningfully engaging teachers in the reform process, and provide expanded leadership opportunities and incentives for them, as data on teachers in charter schools reveals that they work in these schools because of opportunity to provide input on their jobs that charters provide, as well as leadership opportunities. The applicant listed high teacher and principal turnover as a critical problem in the school. Perhaps it has been due to the highly hierarchical structure which consigns school professionals to very limited roles (Page 26).

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 is on their way to developing a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates evaluations, using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth, and that includes rubrics, charts, and descriptions of all levels of procedures and guidelines. The system tracks various measures of student growth and achievement, and examines it, along with classroom and school observations twice per year (Page 26). It appears, however, that applicant will need to take more time to develop a stronger framework for the PBCS, complete with its component parts (i.e. rubrics, professional standards, clearly defined).

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 has proposed a comprehensive data management system that it is developing in consultation with data system developers. This system is designed to link student achievement, school personnel data, incentives and human resources functions (Page 27). The data management system which the applicant is using has been field tested in four Michigan schools of comparable characteristics. It is the first step in school-wide reform, and a movement in a positive direction, as it appears that the school needs a new climate and culture. If utilized properly, the applicant can build a powerful learning community.

**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 provides clear goals and objectives, as well as concrete plans for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher effectiveness included in the PBCS, and that they are held accountable for doing their jobs. For example, school leaders will receive special training to support newly developed teacher teams through the PBCS. Leaders will be bolstered in their own roles to set and to support rigorous goals through training with management staff (Page 39).

**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 has selected the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) approach as a primary component of its professional development program. This model organizes teams of educators who meet regularly, review student performance, define instructional improvement goals, and critically analyze professional practices for purposes of student achievement. Also, called shared-practice, PLCs are known for implementing wide-spread cultural change in schools, leading to the development of a high-powered learning community. Research demonstrates that PLCs are effective at promoting instructional practices that lead to greater student. this method aligns quite well with PBCS' because PLCs emphasize accountability of all in the community for helping students to learn (Page 34 - 35).

The applicant also proposes professional development training in key areas with are linked with school improvement, and which target individual, small group, and larger employee-group needs for development (Page 38).

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 provides its designation of comparable schools based upon the federal definition, and provides data on its LEA and comparable districts to establish high-need status. Data provided shows a gap in achievement with students in targeted schools trailing behind others. The applicant reports an average of 86% of students qualify for free or reduced lunch in nine targeted schools, with no less than 74% of students qualifying (Pages 3-10).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant reports an extremely high turnover of teachers, students and administrators at targeted schools. For example, 30% of teachers in targeted schools leave each year. Six school leaders left another one of the schools that will be featured in the project during a three year period, and another school had two school leaders to walk out in the past four years. (Page 3) This indicates that there may be deeper management issues that will need to be resolved, before their performance management system can have the impact desired, yet no clear indication was given as to why teachers were leaving.

**Reader's Score: 9**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the school year;

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant is proposing to implement a new PBCS and is asking for funds to establish the system within its LEA, while building upon its initial design (Pages 2 -10)  
The applicant has developed a performance pay system that they feel will be significant enough to influence employee behaviors positively due to their investigation of other systems, and report that they will utilize a formula for incentives that has been used in area districts and found to be effective (Page 16).

**Weaknesses:**

The plan needed to be more developed to include benchmarks, indicators, sample rubrics or standards that will be utilized as part of the initiative (Pages 2-10)

**Reader's Score: 40**

**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 has identified a significant local funding sources, and have plans to identify additional sources (Pages 24 and 25)  
The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals in relation to design of project (40 and 41)  
The applicant is employing the Performance Management Process Model. This will be helpful in eliminating internal management and operations problems (Page 30 through 32)  
The applicant has a qualified management team who have sufficient expertise to complete the project. (Page 40 and 41)

**Weaknesses:**

Project Director and other key personnel not yet identified. (Pages 22 and 23)

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlines a detailed data collection plan which includes clear goals, objectives and questions, and which employs mixed methods research leading to quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluation will be conducted by the Education Policy Research Center at Michigan State University who will provide the district and other interested parties with on-going feedback. A final report will be produced in the final year that will be distributed throughout the region, and to others by request. (Pages 56 and 57).

**Weaknesses:**

None listed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant is utilizing Scantron as their data management tool in order to align their performance - based pay system with the value-added growth model. This allows for vertical alignment and consistency in content questions from year to year, and across grade levels. Scantron assessments are standards-based adaptive measures that provide real-time results of student diagnostic information, including objectives students are meeting well and those that require additional work. Scantron's Performance Series is fully aligned with Michigan's MEAP assessment, and has been demonstrated as a valid and reliable value-added growth model. (Page 13).

**Weaknesses:**

None Listed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides its designation of comparable schools based upon the federal definition, and provides data on its LEA and comparable districts to establish high-need status. Data provided shows a gap in achievement with students in targeted schools trailing behind others. (Pages 3-10)

The applicant reports that district personnel records show that 24% of their teachers leave their schools annually, and that 45% of teachers have been at the school for less than a year. Moreover, in key areas, such as math and science, the exit rates are greater. One of the targeted schools has had six school leaders within three years and another, has had two school leaders in the past year. (Pages 3-6).

The applicant reports that they communicate to educators regarding the availability of positions in high needs schools through their involvement on regional school improvement teams, town hall meetings, professional meetings, and through advocacy groups/NGOs. (Page 32)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses listed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management,  
(S385A100091)

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

Points Possible    Points Scored

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	60
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	24
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	109
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management, (S385A100091)

### 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 Michigan Association of Public School Academies (MAPSA) has presented an extremely thorough and well presented plan to offer incentive pay structures for meeting student academic growth targets. These measures are determined by a formula that is clearly outlined in the proposal and comprise whole school, classroom cohorts, and legacy targets. There are also opportunities for additional leadership roles.

The determination of effectiveness of a school's teachers and principals relies on objective measures of student and schoolwide performance. The Scantron Performance Series will be used as an assessment in grades 2 - 8. They provide real time results of student diagnostic information and identify what students do well and what skills require additional work. For grades 9 - 12 the ACT suite for value added growth will be used as the model. These assessments use a common score scale and measure student's progressive academic achievement. There is also an observation component which will be used by Michigan State University evaluators and conducted two to three times a year (p.22).

Teachers have the opportunity to earn up to 15% of their salary for meeting growth

targets. There is a formula identified for growth targets and what percentage of the possible bonus each part makes up. There are various opportunities for leadership roles and these too will be compensated differentially. Pre-identified hard to staff subjects will earn a \$5000 in additional salary. School leaders also have the opportunity to earn up to 15% additional pay with different criteria defined for K-8 and 9 - 12 sites.

The applicant presents a comprehensive program.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The MAPSA proposal indicates that an increasing amount of funding over succeeding years will be contributed from non-TIF funds to this program. The non-TIF contributions begin in year one with \$874,540 being contributed in year one and \$1,005,870 being contributed in year 5. They state that MAPSA will receive "significant outside funding in continued support of the refinement of the performance management system" (p.53), although the source is not listed.

**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 MAPSA proposal is integrated with a professional learning community model and thus aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce. IT is also part of a statewide effort in Michigan to incentivize teaching through legislation passed in 2009. Michigan has a statewide growth model and is adopting common core standards.

The applicants present evidence that all nine schools have full staff commitments to the

project and the developers have worked with school leaders through the model development process. Teachers fully understand their commitment and the opportunities for students.

A data management system is being developed and will provide schools and stakeholders three types of data - state level and standardized data, local system data (e.g. gradebook, financial systems, human resources systems), and locally collected data (e.g. survey data that is locally created). Interface is possible from multiple facets of school operations and analyses may be run to provide information for continuous improvement. Not only will this data allow schools and teachers to set manageable goals, and be able to track them, but they can customize professional development efforts to fit their specific needs. The data management system also ensures that goals that are set are reached and this would contribute to determining retention and tenure decision.

**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 performance based compensation plan presented by Teacher Excellence & Academic Milestones for Students (TEAMS) is logical and includes incentives to lure effective teachers to work in their schools with sign on bonuses and financial incentives (\$5000) for hard to staff subjects that will continue annually for the 5 years of the project. They also offer financial incentives for leadership roles which will be documented through time logs, surveys, achievements, and evaluations by school leaders. Bonuses of \$4000, \$3000, and \$2000 can be earned for leadership roles granted they meet performance criteria. These roles include mentor or master teachers, induction of novice teachers, or high needs students, tutoring students, and leadership positions in learning communities.

**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 TEAMS model is built upon the professional learning community structure. In that structure there is constant dialogue between the members with weekly times set aside for meetings. All teachers and school leaders will be thoroughly educated about the TEAMS system and its components during these meetings. Additionally the data management system has the capability to serve as a communication tool and this will be utilized as well. Training sessions with a trainer will be scheduled 6 times a year so everyone knows the capabilities of the system. The program management system provides for online access and will produce documents with will be distributed to users, as well as afford access to stakeholder, including community and parent involvement organizations (p.32).

Teachers at all sites will be trained in the rubrics for the evaluation system. Master teachers will also be trained so they may support and monitor throughout the year during informal observations.

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:

All the schools work on a professional learning community model that provides for strong and active involvement as well as shared accountability for reaching goals. These "PLC families" work together and assume collective responsibility for student achievement. Teachers, principals and other personnel are focused on a common goal. PLC's at each site determine professional development activities specific to their needs. Charter schools do not have unions. Letters of support have been submitted by the Board Presidents, school leaders, and administrative personnel. They indicate a high level of support for the project. There is also evidence of a strong and highly interactive system where teachers, school leaders, other personnel will work together to determine goals, plan action plans, enact them and determine if they are working.

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 TEAMS model provides for a rigorous and fair evaluation system that is observation based and that emphasizes the PLC framework. The evaluation will examine input and outcomes and will be based on the targeted goals of student growth and consistent with professional standards. Evaluations will employ a combination of testing data, observations and determine the effectiveness of the project and activities designed to meet objectives. They will also look at school leadership, differentiated instruction and the interaction of school staff with parents and the community.

Observations will be performed by Michigan State University personnel two to three times a year and they will be trained in the rubrics and expectations for formal observations. An evaluation plan will be developed that provides formative and summative pieces and will provide feedback to the management team on progress in meeting goals. There will be a mix of quantitative and qualitative factors in the model. Evaluation experts will be provided to conduct the evaluations.

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 program has been working with a developer to provide a performance management tool and provides schools and stakeholders with three types of data - state and other standardized test data, local systems data (human resources, gradebook), and locally collected data. This tool will allow for analysis of the data by various stakeholders, goal setting, communication, and planning to meet goals in one system.

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:

Teachers at all participating sites will be trained in the rubrics and understand areas for evaluation. Master teachers who are responsible for team coordination and site specific professional development at each site will be trained in these rubrics in order to help coach teachers throughout the school year during informal observations through the PLC model.

School leaders are an integral part of the professional learning community. They were integrally involved in the model development process and will continue to be an important part of the next phase. School administrator's support is essential in the success of a PLC although leadership is shared. Each school's PLC will determine the nature of professional development activities the members do.

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 TEAM program works on a professional learning community model where professional development activities are determined by each school's team. It is a cyclical process whereby the PLC's analyze quantitative and qualitative data from previous years through the performance management system to identify challenges the members face with the instructional program. Goals are created that the members wish to accomplish. Once goals are established approaches need to be determined to meet challenges. As the PLC's modify their practice they also determine additional professional development needs that they need and implement new instructional practices. This is continuous improvement and is a true strength of the program.

All teachers and site personnel are involved in the PLC's and they all receive training and professional development opportunities. Additionally all teachers at the charter school will receive training in the rubric and understand areas for evaluation. Master teachers will also be trained and they will coach teachers throughout the year during informal observations.

**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 has provided convincing data that the schools with which they work are high-need charter schools. These schools serve predominantly low income students as evidenced by the high percentages of free and reduced lunches (p.4). Turnover rates of teachers and administrators are staggering and the schools are ranked by the Michigan State Department of Education ranks several of the schools near the bottom. The population is almost entirely African-American (98-100%) and math in particular seems to be an area of concern.

The applicant presented comparable schools data, comparing the charter schools with Detroit Public Schools whose populations are at least 80% minority, at least 70% qualify for free or reduced lunches, located in a large metropolitan area, and serves the same grade levels. The comparison showed that the performance of most students in the charter schools were worse than those of their public school comparables. (p10)

**Weaknesses:**

none found

Reader's Score: 10

**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 TEAMS proposal is a strong, well defined, appropriate and well designed plan to improve student achievement in low performing, hard to staff schools, using a professional learning community approach and differentiated performance based compensation.

Differentiated compensation has been proposed for teachers and school leaders. The different levels of incentives are based on student growth (in a defined formula of multiple rating factors), possible leadership opportunities, and performance objectives and instructional methodology. Hard to staff subject areas will be provided with stipends that extend for 5 years (\$5000) to recruit and retain teachers. The stipends seem appropriate to support the desired goals.

This is supported by the professional learning community framework that works with the philosophy that all staff is responsible for student achievement and seeks to work cohesively to identify needs, plan goals, develop action plans and implement them with multiple points of intervention. The inclusive PLC format makes working in this environment a supported effort and one that is team oriented. Additionally PLC's encourage leadership roles and this will further support the goals of the program. Professional development is focused on addressing specified issues and grows out from the needs defined by the PLC.

There is a fair, rigorous evaluation system and local evaluations will be done by a reputable university partner. The basis for evaluation is a set of performance objectives that are directly linked to student achievement and thus make it a solid and valid measure. Student test scores as well as observations performed 2 to 3 times a year will be used. Evaluations for teachers and school leaders are clearly defined, explained, supported and based on valid measures of performance objectives.

The proposed data management system would be the repository for state level test data, local system data (human resources data, gradebooks, financial systems), and locally collected data. The system would be accessible to personnel and enables smooth management and monitoring of school performance. It will help determine if goals have been met and tracks performance as well as serves as a communication tool. The management of the process will be facilitated by the use of this tool which will allow for goal setting, analyzing the data clarifying the issues, developing action plans, monitoring progress, and acting on needed changes. A comprehensive and useful program that supports the implementation and monitoring of the TEAMS approach.

Since the program is based on clear and professional performance objectives the focus continually remains on student achievement through high quality professional development and incentive compensation.

**Weaknesses:**

none found

**Reader's Score: 60**

**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 proposed management plan for the TEAMS project is well defined, and seems to support the successful implementation and roll out of the project. Proposed plans identify high quality staff to administer the project. They have attracted very competent leaders to move this project forward. The management plan is well thought out and they have clearly defined goals and timelines to keep the program on track. They intend to start in year one with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Financial commitments are reasonable and seem sufficient to support the desired goals. Additional non-TIF funds will be provided from TEAMS to supplement TIF funds.

**Weaknesses:**

p.53 Sources of non-TIF funding are not identified.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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:**

There is strong evidence of a competent local evaluation. The Education Policy Research Center at Michigan State University has been chosen as the external evaluator. The evaluation team will develop a comprehensive model that will enable the evaluation teams to examine the relationship between input activities and desired outcomes during and after TIF project activities. Teachers at all participating charter schools will be trained in the evaluation rubrics so that they will understand the areas for evaluation. Master teachers will also be trained so that they may give continuous support throughout the year.

Data gained from the evaluations will be good sources of information on teacher effectiveness and may be used to judge retention of teachers, principals and other personnel.

The evaluation will assess ongoing project activities and will provide feedback to the management team to assess progress toward meeting project goals. There will be a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data gathered and analytical models would determine if stated objectives are being met. The possibility of the impact of the PBCS on student achievement and teacher and principal performance as related to professional teaching and leadership standards is strongly presented.

**Weaknesses:**

none found

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to use the Scantron Performance Series, a value added assessment to measure student performance in the elementary grades. This will be administered 3 times over a 12 month period in grades 2-8. This value added tool is aligned with

Michigan's MEAP assessment and has been demonstrated as a valid and reliable growth model in studies that controlled for vertical alignment and consistency in content questions. They are standards based measures that provide student diagnostic information. It identifies what students are doing well and the areas of need. Student performance is tracked by individuals and student cohorts correlated to teachers over time in social studies, reading, math, language arts, and science.

In the high school they propose to use the ACT suite for value added growth model. This battery of assessments is designed to measure student preparedness toward college ready benchmarks on conservative annual assessments that connect learning, teaching and assessment with student growth. The assessments use a common score scale and measure students' progressive academic achievement. The ACT suite measures student progress over time in science, math reading, and English in relations to college readiness standards.

In addition to these measures there will be an observation component to both teacher and school leader evaluations. Opportunities to assume leadership roles and the coordination of these roles will be documented by time logs, surveys, achievements, and evaluations. The PLC structure complements this process by providing roles within each PLC for teachers to assume greater responsibilities.

There is a plan in place to explain the model to teachers and enable them to use the data. Ongoing support and training is planned for six times per year over the years of the grant (p.33).

**Weaknesses:**

none found

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The performance based compensation plan presented by TEAMS includes incentives to lure effective teachers to work in their schools with sign on bonuses and financial incentives (\$5000) for hard to staff subjects that will continue annually for the 5 years of the project, differentiated compensation based on student growth and instructional leadership. They presented evidence that their nine charter schools have a high turn over rate for teachers as well as school leaders and they are also high need schools. They have identified math, science, and special education as hard to staff and they offer extra compensation to individuals who take assignments in these areas.

The determination of effectiveness for teachers will vary and is dependent upon the subject a teacher teaches, grade level taught, if a teacher is new to the school or continuing (p.22). For example for a core instructional teacher of third grade, 40% of possible bonus pay rests on meeting growth targets for current students, 15% of possible bonus pay rests on prior year students' performance at meeting growth targets (legacy), and 25% is dependent on meeting SAW growth targets and the remaining 20% is based on observation results.

The proposal indicates that the program management system will provide a communication tool to disseminate information (p.28). The financial incentives are of a considerable amount to retain and attract teachers to hard to fill areas. They have made a solid case for the hard-to-staff subjects, especially mathematics (p.6)

**Weaknesses:**

none found

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management,  
(S385A100091)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	58
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	24
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	95

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	105
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Michigan Association of Public School Ac -- Performance Management, (S385A100091)

### 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 has outlined a comprehensive plan for performance incentives for their teachers and school leaders (17-21). The plan differentiates incentives for teachers and school leaders and provides a clear plan that is easily understandable to interpret and to implement. The plan is based on value added assessments and student growth and has been structured to be judged on observations completed internally and externally (MSU doctoral students). The amounts of the incentives will be very attractive to teachers and will be implemented in a fair manner.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The applicant has presented an appropriate budget for the implementation of the grant. The budget is structured to support the key elements of the project design (performance incentives), but also provides for other supporting elements that must be in place (management and administration). The applicant has indicated that non TIF funds will be a part of the grant, but they are vague about identifying the source of these funds.

**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 impetus for this project design has come from the school district and the Michigan Department of Education's strategic efforts to improve student achievement in the project's targeted school. Four of the five targeted schools are in the lowest five percent of the states schools. The applicant has a well balanced and comprehensive approach in their project design. They have presented a well thought out performance plan that will be attractive to teachers and school leaders. Teachers and school leaders will be able to earn performance awards up to 15% of their base salary through this project. The effectiveness of the teacher and school leader measurement for use in the project are also well designed and based on valid and reliable assessment tools, methods, and processes. For example, the applicant has structured their school leader evaluations with a third party provider (Michigan State University) to ensure valid and reliable evaluation results.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

**1. REQUIREMENT:** Comment on the quality of the applicant's description of how its proposed PBCS will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and

**leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice.**

**General:**

The applicant has created a project design for teachers and school leaders to follow. They have presented a design that meets the different needs of different teachers in fair and logical manners. They have also balanced the opportunity for leadership based on school enrollment so that schools with larger student populations will have more leadership and support available to their teachers and students.

**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 has a well designed plan for communicating with teachers, administrators, community members, and other school personnel about the components of the performance based compensation system. For example, in their charts on pages seventeen through twenty one, they have presented logical need statements, performance compensation levels, and visual representations of what the compensation system is composed of and how it will work. In addition, their plans provide descriptions of how differentiated performance incentives may be achieved by different staff and school leaders in the school district.

**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 has excellent administrative support (appendix letters of support), but evidence of teacher support is lacking (no letters of support). The applicant indicated that since they were a non-public school and not unionized that they did not need to provide evidence of teacher support. The applicant also did not provide descriptions of how teachers will be involved in leadership aspects of the grant.

**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 has presented a unique approach to creating valid and reliable evaluations. They will use MSU doctoral students (who are currently practicing administrators) which will provide external and third party evaluations. They have also created and presented teacher and school leader rubrics which indicates that they have developed their ideas and criteria for performance standards for their teachers and school leaders for use in the project design.

**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 has identified a data management system that they wish to implement (Performance Management Ecosystem). The data management tool will allow for the collation of state and local data and financial and human resource data. They will also have ongoing training and support throughout the grant cycle from the consultants familiar with the management tool.

**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 has focused on the use of a Professional Learning Community as a basis for its professional development. The model offers excellent opportunities to develop capacity in teachers, but the applicant did not provide specific details about how this

model will effectively be taught to teachers and school leaders. The effectiveness knowledge for teachers and school leaders will be gathered through education on the value added assessments that will be used and through education on the performance based models.

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 has outlined the use of Professional Learning Communities as a significant element in building the capacity of teachers within the schools and that this will serve as a forum for professional development for the teachers in the schools. The need for the professional development is based on the poor student achievement performance of the schools in the grant application (four schools are in the lowest five percent of performing schools in the state) and the schools have been identified as high need schools. The applicant has also described other professional development that will take place within the framework of the grant (i.e. data management system, evaluation systems, performance incentive systems). The selection of this professional learning community model is based on research that has indicated the effectiveness of this model. It also meets the needs of teachers and principals by providing a structure for teachers and leaders within which they can collaborate and plan to better meet the needs of their students. The low performance of students in the schools and the failure of previous reform models has led the school district to implement this type of professional

development model. The model provides a structured approach with designated time frames for collaboration and communication. The creation of collaboration time with structured goals and plans is a critical element in improving student achievement and teacher skills. The applicant has also identified an evaluation plan for the professional development planning. For example, the applicant has indicated that they will conduct a formal evaluation at the end of the school year when data has been collected.

**Reader's Score: 0**

### **Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

##### **STRENGTHS:**

Page # 1-11 The applicant has provided an extensive overview of the need for additional support for the students within their schools. The applicant provided statistical information on the rate of teacher turnover in each of the schools (range of 24-30%) on an annual basis. They also provided statistical information on administrative turnover.

Page # 1-11 The applicant has provided extensive statistical academic data to demonstrate the academic needs of their students. Their charts on page five and six outline the low academic performance of many of their students in their targeted schools. They have also used their statistical academic data to support their need for additional support in the academic area of mathematics.

Page # 1-11 The applicant has provided demographic data on drop-out rates and free and reduced lunch rates that are all well above national averages and indicate a need for additional support.

Page #1-11 The applicant has supported their academic need statements with comparisons from the Detroit School District. In their statistical presentation they have demonstrated that a significant number of students in their targeted schools are performing at or below the performance of comparable schools from the Detroit Public Schools. The applicant has clearly defined comparable and identified local public schools that match those comparisons.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 5-7 The applicant does not specifically define the acronym ELA in its references to student achievement statistics in their table on page five as they have presented a description of academic profiles for the schools in their grant project . Without the acronym clearly defined it is difficult to ascertain what the statistical evidence is that is being used to show evidence of a lack of student performance and it makes it difficult to draw comparisons between similiar type schools.

Reader's Score: 9

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.**

**Strengths:**

**STRENGTHS:**

Page # 11-38 The applicant has outlined a comprehensive project design to guide the implementation of the grant project. The applicant has clearly linked their grant project with state and national educational initiatives (NCLB- Race to the Top) and indicated that their efforts have been spurred by future potential changes and linkages in teacher evaluation and student performance. In addition, the applicant has indicated that their project is only made possible through data links that the state has implemented and required of schools to use (State ID System).

Page # 12 The applicant has established project goals and tied them to performance objectives that they expect their students, teachers, and school leaders to achieve. Examples of these goals include: targeted student growth targets, teacher classroom growth targets, increases in teacher retention rates, implementation of the professional learning community model, and establishment of a long term sustainability plan.

Page # 13,24 The applicant has defined effectiveness as it applies to this project design. They have referenced the use of value added assessments such as Scantron and ACT Suite as logical, valid, and reliable measures of student growth on which to base their judgements of the effectiveness of teacher and school leader performance. The applicant has provided information on the effectiveness of the Scantron system and the ACT Suite system as effective growth models for students and for teachers as they analyze data.

Page # 14 The applicant has outlined the use of Michigan State University staff to serve as evaluators of teachers and school leaders for this project. The applicant has created rubrics (appendix) for both teachers and school leaders that will be used in these third party evaluations and observations. This process will lend validity to the performances observed for this project design.

Page #17-21 The applicant has provided a comprehensive and extensive Performance Based Compensation System outline. The applicant has defined performance levels for many different instructional situations, provided descriptions of compensation levels, and provided examples of teachers that would fit into these categories. The model is well designed, visual, and a good reference for teachers as they seek to understand the expected performance standards. The compensation levels provided by the applicant offer a value added approach with performance incentive levels of sufficient size that they will create and motivate teachers.

Page #27 The applicant has outlined the use of a proven data management system (Performance Management Ecosystem) and described its functions and capabilities within the scope of this project design. The data management system provides the schools with the ability to collate state and local data and then to analyze and provide goal setting and communication features. It also provides reporting features and the applicant has indicated that ongoing training for teachers and staff will be a part of the integration of this data management system into the project design.

Page #34-39 The applicant has outlined the use of Professional Learning Communities as a significant element in building the capacity of teachers within the schools and that this will serve as a forum for professional development for the teachers in the schools. The applicant has also described other professional development that will take place within the framework of the grant (i.e. data management system, evaluation systems, performance incentive systems).

**Weaknesses:**

**WEAKNESSES:**

Page #26 The applicant has provided evidence of administrative support from each of the targeted schools for the project proposal, but evidence of teacher support is lacking. The applicant indicates that there is teacher support, but no letters of support are provided from teachers or a supporting teacher organization.

Page # 34-39 The applicant has not specifically provided details on how the Professional Learning Community Model professional development will be delivered to teachers and to school leaders. The applicant describes the history and background of Professional Learning Communities and how teachers will operate within the framework of this model.

**Reader's Score: 58**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

**STRENGTHS:**

Page # 39-53 The applicant has identified appropriate leadership who will manage the implementation of the grant and described their responsibilities and roles. They provide a balance of backgrounds with which they bring to the project (i.e. education, business, technology) and have appropriate time allocated to work on the grant.

Page # 39-53 The applicant has provided a management plan that outlines the steps that will be taken to implement the grant in each of the years of the project.

Page# 53 The applicant has provided information about the non-federal contributions that will be in place to support the project beyond the initial cycle of the grant to sufficiently support the project. The applicant has indicated that total non-grant funding will be progressively added from year one for a total amount of \$3,114,519 and that the district will assume sustainability costs beyond year five of the grant cycle.

**Weaknesses:**

## WEAKNESSES:

Page # 39-53 The applicant has not provided specific milestones that can be used to gauge the success of the implementation of the grant as the applicant progresses with the implementation of the grant.

Page # 53 The applicant does not identify specific sources of funding that will be used to sustain the project beyond the initial grant cycle. The applicant only indicates that outside support will provide funds and that schools will assume the costs for sustainability in later years of the grant.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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:**

## STRENGTHS:

Page # 12 The applicant has defined performance based objectives for use throughout the implementation of the grant project. For example, they have established the following performance objectives: the percentage of students demonstrating growth will be ten percent in each year of the project, retention of eighty-five percent of the new hires in high need schools, to improve retention rates for teachers by ten percent each year, and a target of fifty percent of the teachers meeting classroom growth targets in year one of the grant with sixty percent in years 2-5 of the grant.

Page #10 The design of the project and its integrated evaluation plan will provide the applicant with qualitative and quantitative data. For example, the applicant has indicated that they will use observational data (qualitative) and testing and assessment data (quantitative).

Page #54-57 The applicant has presented an evaluation plan that will allow for collaboration between the evaluation staff and management staff during the course of the evaluation process. For example, the evaluation staff will be independent professionals from the Educational Policy Research Center at Michigan State University. This collaborative relationship will allow for the creation of a more efficient evaluation process, a continuous form of ongoing feedback, and an evaluation process that has higher validity and reliability based on the use of a third party evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 54-57 The applicant did not provide details about how evaluation information would be shared with the management staff, teachers, and communities represented within the grant project. They did not provide information on who would share the evaluation information and the processes that would be involved in sharing evaluation data in eight schools participating in the grant.

**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:**

STRENGTHS:

Page #27 The applicant has outlined the use of a proven data management system (PM system) and described its functions and capabilities within the scope of this project design. The data management system provides the schools with the ability to collate state and local data and then to analyze and provide goal setting and communication features. It also provides reporting features and the applicant has indicated that ongoing training for teachers and staff will be a part of the integration of this data management system into the project design.

Page # 13-14, 23-24 The applicant has outlined a value added model that will incorporate the use of Scantron and ACT Suite value added assessments. The applicant has described how this information will be shared and will be utilized by the staff.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were cited in this section of the grant application.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

**Strengths:**

STRENGTHS:

Page # 3-10 The applicant has demonstrated that their targeted students are high need students who are performing at or below comparable public schools in their area and that their students and schools are in need of additional support. They have also demonstrated that an average of one in four teachers changes each year at their school so that retention and recruitment of teachers are also significant issues, especially in the areas of mathematics.

Page # 3-10 The applicant has outlined how it will determine the effectiveness of teachers through the use of reliable and valid assessments and through setting appropriate performance benchmarks as a part of the project design.

Page# 3-10 The applicant has provided statistical evidence that indicates which schools are not performing and those that cannot maintain a stable teaching staff so that staff interested in striving toward performance standards are well educated on the high needs schools and high need instructional areas.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 3-10 No weaknesses were cited in this section of the grant application.

Reader's Score: 5

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

