

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources, Human Resources (S385A100074)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Absolute Priority 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Absolute Priority 2 | | |
| 1. Absolute Priority 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluaton Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 3 | | |
| 1. Absolute Priority 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Requirement | | |
| Requirement | | |
| 1. Requirement | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Core Element 1 | | |
| 1. Core Element 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 2 | | |
| 1. Core Element 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 3 | | |
| 1. Core Element 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 4 | | |
| 1. Core Element 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 5 | | |
| 1. Core Element 5 | 0 | 0 |
| High Quality Professional Development | | |
| 1. Professional Development | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Need for the Project | | |
| 1. Need for Project | 10 | 7 |
| Project Design | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 55 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 23 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 4 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 89 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 95 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources, Human Resources (S385A100074)

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:

MPS has illustrated that the proposed PBCS will offer differentiated awards for teachers and principals tied to their impact on increasing student achievement.

(a) Teacher and principal effectiveness will be evaluated using multiple measures: both value-added and classroom observations. Value added data at both the classroom and school level will be considered as appropriate (Methodology, p.12). The PBCS model weighs performance observations for teachers and administrators at 50%; for teachers in tested areas, the remaining 50% of the performance measure is divided between 30% on classroom level value added, and 20% for schoolwide value added. For teachers in nontested subjects, the remaining 50% of the performance rating is based on schoolwide value added (p.23). For principal performance, the remaining 50% is based on school-wide value added.

(b) The MPS TAP model includes multiple observations (p.24) that are aligned to professional development in the form of postevaluation conferences (p.25, 26), and ongoing cluster meetings and other opportunities to work with the school based

master/mentor teachers. Teachers are observed three or more times per year (p. 25). Teachers also participate in the MPS evaluation system annually for the first five years of employment, then once every 3 years (p.31).

Principals are evaluated using a redesigned MPS tool on four areas: leadership behavior, implementation of the school improvement plan, student outcomes, and compliance (p.27). A scorecard looks at these four areas: for student outcomes, the evaluation considers student reading and math achievement, high school completion rate, ACT composite test scores, and Total Quality Credits (as applicable for high schools)(p.28). Principals receive a full evaluation every 2 years, and interim evaluations in the compliance and school improvement plan every year (p.29). The TAP requirements state that the principal must be proficient in four leadership standards: developing an exemplary school plan, effectively communicate student progress, knowledge of quality instruction practices, and knowledge of curriculum (p.20).

c) No other indicators of leadership roles were discussed.

The applicant provides sufficient justification for the award amounts. The bonus pools are proposed to be allocated at \$3000/teacher, \$5000/AP, and \$10000/principal (p.16). MPS will establish a graduated set of bonuses within each category that will be determined during the planning period (p.16). The proposed bonus amounts are over 5% of average teacher pay, and between 8-10% of the average principal salary.

The bonus award amounts are based on recommendations from the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching and the application cites relevant research (p.17).

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:

MPS has adequately discussed the fiscal sustainability of the PBCS with the district paying an increased portion of costs and statements that reallocated Title funds will be distributed to fund the program.

The applicant stated that the local evaluation will "use document analysis and project costs and funding sources to examine the likely fiscal sustainability of the PBCS" (p.57).

a) The applicant submitted a budget for years 1-5 of the grant period for all major costs including performance awards for teachers and administrators, salary augmentations for master and mentor teachers, and other costs associated with planning and implementing the PBCS (p.51 and Budget Narrative)

b) In years 3-5 of the grant period, MPS will pay an increasing share of the PBCS costs

using non-TIF funds, "namely reallocation of Federal Title funds" (p.51). A table on page 52 of the application illustrates PBCS paid by MPS increasing from \$62000 in year 3 (8 schools participating) to \$624000 in year 5 (16 schools participating). The budget narrative provide detail of the proposed matching funds over the life of the project.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed PBCS is an integrated strategy for strengthening the workforce. MPS has chosen the TAP System to implement a PBCS in 16 high need schools. The elements of TAP include multiple career paths, ongoing applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance based compensation (Abstract). There are strong connections between professional development and assessing student performance to change practice.

The applicant describes that the PBCS will use both classroom observations and student data to inform meetings between classroom teachers and the mentor/master teachers. There are also grade/subject level meetings "several times a week to review data and collaborate" (p34).

The issue of retention and recruitment is addressed as part of the local evaluation criteria. In the evaluation, a comparison of the project and matched comparison schools will look at year-to-year changes in the "percentage of effective teachers remaining at the school" and "the percentage of effective new teachers returning for a second year" (p. 56).

The MPS Human Capital Management Functional plan is an effort to retain staff that is aligned to the district's 5-year strategic plan (p.3). In the Plan, a number of components would be addressed with the PBCS implementation including providing incentives, schools based mentors, and development of an evaluation system (p. 4).

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 clearly describes roles and responsibilities for master and mentor teachers who are awarded bonuses for assuming additional responsibilities (p.40). The bonuses are an annual salary augmentation for \$5000 (mentors) and \$10000 (masters) with additional pay for extra days of work (at an hourly rate). Thorough descriptions are provided in the budget narrative and page 41.

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:

Some discussion is provided on the plan to communicate the components of the PBCS but no evidence of an existing plan is provided.

Master and mentor teachers will communicate the value-added model to career teachers (p. 14).

"MPS will continue to build and maintain support from a broad groups of stakeholders. . . Teachers, principals, district, and union representatives will engage in an in-depth dialogue with TAP state leadership to understand the TAP model. . . (p.22-23). Other details are discussed about activities during the planning year to build staff buy-in, build community support, and "establish multiple means of relaying information" (p.22).

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:

Some discussion is provided on the involvement and support of key stakeholders in the PBCS. Letters of support are provided by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the MPS Director of the Department of Administrative Accountability, and the President of the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (Appendix D).

The applicant is proposing a planning year, during which the staff of each eligible high need school will vote to implement the PBCS, and only those schools with 70% of teachers in support will be considered for the pilot (p.1).

The applicant describes that meetings about the PBCS began in August 2009 and in June 2010 MPS discussed the proposed model with the Department of Public Instruction, the Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association (META) and others. "The districts and MTEA officials held several meetings during the month of June. . . where the goal was to develop an outline" for the PBCS (p. 21).

The applicant has a number of opportunities to collect input from program participants including district wide meetings, internal and external websites, and annual teacher surveys.

The applicant has a number of opportunities to collect input from program participants including district wide meetings, internal and external websites, and annual teacher surveys.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant provides a clear discussion of plans to implement the TAP system of evaluation. There is also an MPS evaluation system in place.

The TAP/MPS evaluation addresses all criteria for a fair, rigorous, and transparent system. The Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities Performance Standards (SKR) incorporates multiple rating categories, multiple observations, and efforts to ensure inter-rater reliability (p.23).

The applicant says that "a joint labor management committee will be formed with MPS and Milwaukee Teacher Education Association representatives, the WI DPI advisors, and independent experts to develop a teacher performance evaluation system" (p.24).

- 1) The sample rubric and supporting information describes an evidence based rubric aligning classroom performance to standards (p.25).
- 2) Teacher evaluations are conducted at least three times per year. Principals receive a full evaluation every 2 years, and interim evaluations in the compliance and school improvement plan every year (p.29).
- 3) Objective student performance is also included in the teacher and principal evaluation system using value added measures of classroom and schoolwide student achievement gains (p.24)
- 4) The TAP leadership team receives annual training on SKR standards and rubrics (p.25). The leadership team also monitors inter-rater reliability through the use of the CODE system (p.26).

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:

MPS has a data management system in place and is expanding the system to link student achievement to teachers and other key data elements. "MPS has a robust data warehouse. . . provides unprecedented access to reports on student data like attendance, discipline, test scores, and GPA" (p.14). Individual teachers, school learning teams, and leadership teams are all trained in EdStat and ClasStat, a "variation of EdStat focused on classroom and grade level data" (p.15-16).

Value added is used in MPS. The model measures year to year growth for each school or teachers. Scores are generated for MPS by school and by grade within each school (p.18).

TAP's CODE system helps schools manage teacher observation and performance-based compensation calculations (p.33).

MPS's student information system, eSIS, links students to teachers via courses (p.33). In 2009-10, MPS began an expansion project, IRIS, that creates "new data marts on staff, financials, data quality, programs/interventions, and surveys" (p.34). IRIS will have the capacity to link teacher information to student outcomes via the "student-course-teacher-school link" (p.34).

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 develops a good connection between evaluation measures and improving teacher performance through professional development and a continuous feedback loop. The applicant describes "individualized, classroom based, ongoing coaching and feedback provided by mentor and master teachers," and that "groups of teachers meet in grade or subject clusters several times a week to review data and collaborate" (p.34).

Teachers develop Individual Growth Plans to develop goals that lead to improved student achievement (p.36).

The evaluation rubric used for observations looks at 19 indicators of effective instruction. "By indentifying specific areas of improvement with detailed evidence from a teacher's instruction and concrete examples to address these areas, the rubric leads to growth on the part of the teachers to improve. . . and leads to higher quality instruction" (p.37).

Principals receive professional development and training on the TAP model and "leadership, team-building skills, test analysis, establishing standards-based classrooms and instructional supervision" (p.38). They are also trained to be evaluators.

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:

1) The applicant has demonstrated that a clear plan for implementing a professional development system is in place. The schools selected for consideration in the pilot are the highest need schools in the district based on a complex needs assessment of enrollment, grade levels, percent free and reduced lunch, and percent of students scoring proficient on state standardized tests (p.5). Support and frequent interactions with master and mentor teachers support adjustments to the teachers' classroom performance. Grade and subject teams meet frequently to discuss instructional practices.

2) In TAP schools, there is a strong correlation between classroom observation scores and value-added assessment scores for their students, so TAP focuses on changing the teacher's classroom practice through PD to impact student performance (p.13). PD is embedded in the TAP system with continuous feedback to teachers using frequent student assessment and evaluating the teacher's classroom performance (p.5).

3a&b) The applicant provides little discussion of specific actions taken for teachers who perform poorly on the teacher effectiveness measures (evaluation or student achievement). "Teachers will be provided with the support needed to systematically address the needs identified through assessment" (p.14). Regardless of performance, all teachers participate in the PBCS and receive the same professional development interventions. The narrative does not discuss specific PD for educators who earn awards.

4) Master and mentor teachers will support the career teacher in understanding and analyzing student growth measures and how teaching relates to this growth. Teachers will be provided with the support needed to systematically address the needs identified through assessment. "Teachers will use the value-added data from their own students to look at trends in their own instruction" (p.19).

5) The following language supports a process assessing professional development, "One of the key areas of observation [of the annual school review process] is professional development. The reviews conclude with a set of recommendations regarding the areas in which schools are particularly strong or need additional assistance. State-level TAPTM staff regularly conduct site visits in which they may assess the effectiveness of the professional development. These highly-trained individuals may tackle issues on-site as they arise. In addition, NIET monitors trends in teacher effectiveness and student achievement to identify any broader areas of improvement in professional development" (p. 40).

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The schools selected for consideration in the pilot are the highest need schools in the district based on a complex needs assessment of enrollment, grade levels, percent free and reduced lunch, and percent of students scoring proficient on state standardized tests (p. 5). MPS has a 41% turnover rate for new teachers leaving by their fifth year (p.2).

MPS works with alternative certification programs to fill teacher vacancies in shortage areas.

The applicant provided a thorough explanation of how comparable schools were identified (p .11).

Weaknesses:

While MPS discussed working with institutions of higher education on recruiting highly qualified teachers, there is no information provided on how they currently recruit teachers who are highly effective to high need schools, subjects and grades.

The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to show that the proposed high need schools have trouble recruiting or retaining qualified, effective teachers.

Reader's Score: 7

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 has given thorough consideration to the key areas around planning and implementing the PBCS through adopting the TAP system. The planning year will allow MPS to finalize any outstanding issues in the PBCS implementation, but a sound foundation exists.

The plan rewards teacher and principals for improving student achievement and evaluations consider both student achievement data and classroom observations.

The district has demonstrated they have a data management system with the capability to link students and educators and other systems.

The PBCS uses educator evaluation information, including value added measures of student growth and observations rubrics, to inform professional development decisions that will improve practice and contribute to greater student achievement.

Weaknesses:

Direct teacher input is not planned until after the planning year is underway. More information about direct teacher involvement in planning would be helpful. No discussion of what may happen if 70% acceptance isn't achieved in the targeted 16 schools.

Unclear if additional interventions/targeted professional development are put in place for teachers who score poorly on the teacher effectiveness indicators.

Reader's Score: 55

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided goals, objectives and performance measures with supporting activities for key activities required to establish and launch the PBCS (p.44). The identified project director seems well qualified to direct and support the implementation of the PBCS. The applicant has written roles and responsibilities for the project coordinator who will oversee the day-to-day operations (p.41-42). The executive master teacher will be responsible for training and consulting support for master teachers. There are clear roles and responsibilities identified for each level of PBCS leadership and management team (p.50).

MPS will take on an increasing share of the PBCS costs in years 3-5.

The requested amount seems sufficient and reasonable to attain project goals.

Weaknesses:

More information should be included for how MPS will reallocate Federal Funds to cover the increasing share (p. 51).

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:

An existing relationship with WCER exists to support a quality local evaluation. The plan is based on strong, measurable performance objectives. Evaluators will be present throughout the planning process and are basing the project design on a general theory of action for the PBCS. The evaluation plan will look at how the PBCS is aligned with district goals, developed with stakeholder input, communicated to stakeholders, measures teacher and principal performance and student achievement, provides aligned PD to support improved practice, provides sufficiently large incentives to influence behavior, and is implemented with fidelity (p.54-55). The impact evaluation addresses and produce quantitative and qualitative data on student achievement, effectiveness of teachers, and improving the recruitment and retention of effective teachers.

Weaknesses:

While the evaluator will provide annual reports to MPS, more frequent feedback is necessary for the district to make program adjustments (p.57).

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The PBCS is designed to improve classroom and administrative practice and reward teachers with high quality professional development and performance incentives.

Weaknesses:

Specific strategies are not discussed to resolve recruitment challenges for attracting highly effective teachers to the targeted schools or to high need subject areas.

No discussion is offered on filling vacancies with highly effective teachers or how MPS would communicate which schools/subjects are high need.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The PBCS is designed to improve classroom and administrative practice and reward teachers with high quality professional development and performance incentives.

Weaknesses:

Specific strategies are not discussed to resolve recruitment challenges for attracting highly effective teachers to the targeted schools or to high need subject areas.

No discussion is offered on filling vacancies with highly effective teachers or how MPS

would communicate which schools/subjects are high need.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/9/10 5:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources,Human Resources (S385A100074)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 1 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Absolute Priority 2 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluaton Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 3 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Requirement | | |
| Requirement | | |
| 1.Requirement | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Core Element 1 | | |
| 1.Core Element 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 2 | | |
| 1.Core Element 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 3 | | |
| 1.Core Element 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 4 | | |
| 1.Core Element 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 5 | | |
| 1.Core Element 5 | 0 | 0 |
| High Quality Professional Development | | |
| 1.Professional Development | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Need for the Project | | |
| 1.Need for Project | 10 | 7 |
| Project Design | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 50 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 23 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 4 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 84 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 89 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources, Human Resources (S385A100074)

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:

Value-added, which encompasses student growth data, will account for up to 50% of the decisions about the amount of incentive awards, with 30% of that being at the classroom level and 20% at the school level for teachers and the entire 50% at the school level for principals (p. 23).

Teacher observation data will be collected three times a year. To ensure reliability and validity, observers are trained annually on using the observation protocol and must provide additional evidence to support their scores assigned. The results are used primarily for providing feedback for improvement as well as in determining incentive amounts. Teachers also are trained on the rubric to increase the relevancy and transparency of the evaluation system (p. 23).

In January 2010, the district redesigned the evaluation system for principals to use a scorecard approach focusing on four areas. Principals receive annual interim evaluations on compliance and school improvement plan implementation and full evaluations every 2 years in all four areas. Assistant principals are evaluated on "appropriate leadership

behavior domains and on school improvement plan implementation" (p. 29).

The amounts determined for the various incentive levels was determined based on input from TAP and available research suggesting the effectiveness of different amounts (p. 16).

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:

Applicant projected the costs for various aspects of the project based on using the TAP system, which is an established model that has been widely used in other locations with known costs (p. 2).

Applicant included information that shows that they will assume an increasing share of the responsibility for funding teacher incentives by leveraging non-TIF funds to cover half of the costs associated with the PBCS (p.52).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The proposed system relies on the use of TAP, an established research-based model that meets all of the relevant criteria (p. 2). Although the use of data for making improvements in practice is discussed, no information was provided about using the data and evaluations for retention and tenure decisions.

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:

Additional responsibilities and leadership roles are one of the major domains of effectiveness that increase the incentive amounts possible. The TAP Career Ladder compensates educators for advancing to mentor or master teacher levels (p. 41).

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 communication plan includes various methods for sharing the information with key stakeholders. It includes holding meetings and posting information for the public and district personnel and conducting trainings for school personnel (p. 20).

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 included plans to work closely with Milwaukee Teacher Education Association and the state department of education to develop the teacher performance evaluation system. The application states that they will also include stakeholder (e.g., teachers, principals) input, surveys, and document reviews to determine whether this actually occurs (p. 53).

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 district will use TAP, an established standards-based evaluation system of educators for differentiated compensation that is aligned with district improvement efforts (p. 53). In addition to twice-yearly observations, the system includes various forms of additional evidence for evaluating effectiveness (p.2).

Extensive training to ensure a high degree of reliability will be provided for reviewers to conduct twice-yearly objective, evidence-based observations and using the data as a professional growth tool (p. 24).

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:

Since 2007-08, applicant has had a data warehouse that provides access to student data like attendance, discipline, test scores, and grade point averages. The expansion of an existing robust data system is currently underway to link student data with teacher and principal payroll and HR systems (p. 33).

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:

Extensive training is to be provided for all schools and personnel on the system for measuring effectiveness (p. 17). Regular observations with feedback conferences and cluster meetings will also be utilized for using the data from these measures to improve

practice (p. 35).

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 does not discuss whether professional development will be based on the needs of the schools. However, school needs are used for determining, in part, qualification for project participation (p. 1).

The TAP system that will be used includes a process for basing professional development on the needs of the teachers and principals (p. 14).

Insufficient information was included in the application as to whether educators who do not participate in the PBCS in project schools will be provided with any professional development. Only schools with at least 70% commitment to the project from the staff will be included in the project (p. 11).

Insufficient information is provided in the application about what will happen with teachers who reach the effective level. However, teachers will be offered opportunities to advance into mentor or master teacher positions (p. 40).

Teachers will receive professional development in using effectiveness to improve their practice (p. 14). However, insufficient evidence is provided to indicate that similar

professional development will be provided for principals.

TAP will conduct regular site visits that will include assessing the effectiveness of professional development and making suggestions for improvements (p. 40).

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 included a detailed discussion of the need criteria and data to support the student achievement needs of the students in high needs schools (p. 5, Appendix B) and the definition of comparable schools (p. 11).

The applicant described a systematic process for prioritizing and selecting participating schools that would ensure that those with the greatest needs would be served (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

Weak data was provided related to high attrition and a shortage of effective teachers specific to the schools to be included in the program (p. 2).

Reader's Score: 7

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:

Although details are not provided, the applicant states that high quality professional development will be provided through job-embedded coaching (p. 17). The professional development will be based on teachers' Individual Growth Plans and implemented by mentor and master teachers and grade-level subject-specific teacher meetings clusters several times each week (p. 35).

The system will use an established protocol developed as part of an existing program for observations, which will be conducted at least 3 times a year, with the data being used for making improvements (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

Insufficient data is provided on how the data management system will link to the human resources system for making decisions about hiring, promotion, or tenure (p. 32).

Applicant notes that they believe the proposed system need to be fair, but there is no evidence provided to support this assertion (p. 54).

Value-added methods will carry a weight of up to 50% for determining teacher/principal growth (p. 23).

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

Key personnel are well-qualified and job descriptions for new hires are strong. The time commitments for key personnel are appropriate and adequate for effectively implementing the project on time and within budget (p. 50 and budget narrative).

Applicant will assume an increasing share of the financial responsibility for the project by using non-TIF funds for salary augmentations for master/mentor teachers; performance rewards; hiring master teacher replacements, specialists to fill in for teachers to attend professional development cluster group; any additional testing; teacher pay for extra training days; and fees related to with training, technical assistance, and evaluation (p. 51).

The management plan was well designed and for each project objective included activities, timelines, person responsible, and milestones (p. 44).

Weaknesses:

Nothing was included in the proposal or budget about including a position for organizing, managing, and and maintaining the various documents, files, and data involved in the program.

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 evaluation plan included an external evaluator to implement a phased-in, random assignment design (p. 11).

Applicant provides measureable objectives and methods of measuring that include both quantitative and qualitative data (p. 53).

Evaluation methods will provide information useful for making program improvements (p. 53).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's plan for one evaluation report per year is inadequate for continuous improvement and planning (p 57).

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:

Applicant will use the TAP classroom-based value-added approach to measuring teacher effectiveness that will account for up to 50% of incentives, as evidence of effectiveness. The district has an established data management system that calculates the value-added scores (p. 23).

Weaknesses:

While there was some discussion about the training that would be provided for teachers on using individual student value-added data to plan and revise teaching strategies, the application also states that value-added is "measured at the classroom (when data is available) and school levels" (p. 12 and 17).

It is not clear how state testing data that is not available at the student and classroom levels will be used to improve classroom practices nor how classroom-level value-added measures (that are not always available) can count 30% toward determining teacher incentives.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need Schools. (Up to 5 points):**

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

Strengths:

The district will develop stronger relationships with IHEs and alternative certification programs to "communicate its needs regarding certification and teacher preparation." This will expose the district to new recruitment and retention strategies for attracting non-traditional applicants for filling teacher shortage areas (p. 3).

Strategies will be developed for retaining effective teachers such as reducing the number of new teachers assigned to the most challenging classrooms, and providing incentives for skilled veteran teachers to take the assignments, and increasing the focus on an established mentor/induction program on developing school-based mentors (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

No information was provided about how they will recruit high quality and effective teachers to fill hard-to-staff subject areas or how teachers will be informed about vacancies that are hard-to-staff (p. 2).

With the exception of high school science, for which 78% of the teachers are highly qualified, the evidence provided for supporting the existence of high needs subject areas is unconvincing (p. 2).

Weak evidence was provided indicating the need for more highly qualified teachers. The proposal notes that over 50% of district teachers have a master's degree, which is above the minimum requirement of a bachelor's degree (p. 2).

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/9/10 5:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 10:49 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources,Human Resources (S385A100074)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 1 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Absolute Priority 2 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluaton Criteria | | |
| Absolute Priority 3 | | |
| 1.Absolute Priority 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Requirement | | |
| Requirement | | |
| 1.Requirement | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluation Criteria | | |
| Core Element 1 | | |
| 1.Core Element 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 2 | | |
| 1.Core Element 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 3 | | |
| 1.Core Element 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 4 | | |
| 1.Core Element 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Element 5 | | |
| 1.Core Element 5 | 0 | 0 |
| High Quality Professional Development | | |
| 1.Professional Development | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Need for the Project | | |
| 1.Need for Project | 10 | 7 |
| Project Design | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design | 60 | 45 |
| Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project | | |
| 1.Adequacy of Support | 25 | 23 |
| Quality of Local Evaluation | | |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval. | 5 | 4 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 79 |

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

| | | |
|------------------|----|---|
| Sub Total | 10 | 8 |
|------------------|----|---|

| | | |
|--------------|-----|----|
| Total | 110 | 87 |
|--------------|-----|----|

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Milwaukee Public Schools -- Human Resources, Human Resources (S385A100074)

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 espoused the implementation of differentiated performance incentives for teachers, assistant principals, and principals that are based on added value measures of student growth along with performance observation evaluations. While the applicant provides a rationale, based on existing literature, of the positive effects of differentiated performance incentives, there is no hard data presented to suggest that the amounts proposed will leverage behavioral changes among educators. The observations for teachers are scheduled to occur at least more than once within an annual period (p. 23), yet the exact number to observations are unclear due to conflicting information. For principals and assistant principals, there is clear indication that observations will occur twice a year as required by the absolute priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has expressed a robust plan to financially support program implementation during the life of the grant. However, fiscal consideration for continued sustainability beyond the life of the program is not expressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The PBCS itself, along with professional development for teachers, are identified as means for fostering teacher retention. In addition, the applicant recognized the importance of data driven professional development to support teacher retention. An example can be found in the program's utilization of individual growth plan (p. 37), in which teachers are required reflect on performance data to revise their growth plans annually. However, decisions for how data will be used for tenure are not provided.

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:

Additional compensation will be offered to mentor and master teachers. In fact, mentor and master teachers are slated to receive stipends based on their performance in these new roles (p. 42). However, an incentive-based plan for educators to take on additional leadership roles is not articulated. Particularly one that includes performance based evaluations for these leadership roles.

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 planned for routine information sessions at the district and school levels and to post relevant program information on the district website (p. 23). In addition, the program evaluation is slated to include the use of surveys and interview to determine whether the program has been communicated effectively to stakeholders (P. 55); thereby closing the implementation-feedback loop needed for continual improvement toward program effectiveness.

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 laid out a clear plan for identifying the role responsibilities of key individuals for program implementation and has planned information sessions to inform personnel of program components. In fact, ground work for garnering support began prior to the life of the grant in 2009, when the district began meeting with state research associations and teacher education unions (p. 22). While the applicant has not presented written support from teacher unions, it has recognized the need for continued dialogue and information sharing with key stakeholders.

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 PBSC evaluation system is clearly defined and aims to utilize multiple data sources, including value added models at the classroom and school levels. Most data, however are quantitative, the extent to which qualitative data will be use is less developed. Inter-rater reliability on the teacher observation protocol has been addressed; however, the methods for ensuring such reliability have not been explained. For example, the applicant does not discuss how multiple evaluators may simultaneously conduct an observation of a single teacher to ensure inter-relater reliability.

The applicant explains that teacher observations will occur two to three times annually, and will be conducted by certified evaluators (p. 25).

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's data management system will be populated with student achievement and personnel performance data. Educators will be able to access the system for data-based decision making at the school level (p. 34).

It is not clear if, or the extent to which, the student learning or employee evaluation data will be tied to the payroll and or human resources system to inform tenure and promotion decisions.

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 observation evaluation protocol to be utilized has been used within the district and is familiar to teachers. Master and mentor teachers, leadership teams, and classroom teachers will be provided training of understanding and analyzing student growth and how teaching relates to student growth. In addition, employees at various levels will be provided access to and training on the MPS data dashboards, allowing them to access data relevant to their job role. It is assumed that with such training as well as the required 70% buy-in of teachers, educators will develop an understanding of the measures for teacher and principal effectiveness in the PBCS.

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 purports to provide a mentor teacher to all first year teachers and to teachers with less than 5 years of service who obtained alternative certification in special education (p e5), thereby targeting a particular at risk teacher population for additional support services.

The proposed professional development programming will be based on added value and observation data for individualized as well a school-wide professional development.

The program proposes to provide professional develop to job-embedded clusters of teachers (p. 18) and is to support the development of individual teachers by way of the individual

growth plan (IGP, p. 37).

The applicant states that teachers and principals will receive individualized professional development based one evaluation data to consist of observations and student achievement (p. 55). However, no details are provided on a systemic approach for the individualized professional development for principals in tandem with the IGP for teachers.

Besides receiving technical training for conducting teacher observations, the extent to which master and mentor teachers are to receive specialized professional development for the continuous improvement within their roles is not fully developed.

The applicant states that it will utilize established National Institute for Excellence in Teaching procedures toward a systematic approach for assessing to the efficacy of the professional development.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

According to Appendix B, the potential 16 schools to be included in the PBCS will meet need requirement in the area of 50% of the student body receiving free or reduced meals.

The applicant has identified comparable schools in appendix C which demonstrates that the targeted schools for the program do meet the need for low student achievement.

The applicant has provided clear student level achievements among the potential program schools in comparison to higher performing school among all high needs schools within the district.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not make clear whether or not teacher retention is of issue in the targeted 16 schools to participate in the program. Furthermore, while the applicant explains that the district will work to recruit highly qualified teachers, little is known whether the 16 schools will be targeted to benefit from such recruitment.

The applicant does not make clear whether or not the potentially participating schools are of the 62 identified for improvement or the 28 which missed the marks for AYP.

While the applicant explains that 19.2% of the student population within the district is identified as students with special needs, no reference is made to this area or related content areas as being hard-to-fill.

Reader's Score: 7

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 has clearly defined educator effectiveness to be gauged by value added models for both the classroom and school levels (for teachers), and at the school level for administrators. The value added value model, as related to effectiveness, is designed around a graduated point system based on level of change in student learning based on standardized reading and mathematics test data (see p. e6).

Observation protocols used to measure teacher effectiveness within the district have been used in the past for several years. As such, a fair level of familiarity with the instrument among educators is plausible. In addition, teacher observation data spanning from 2006-2008 have correlated the rating of these observations with student level outcomes, thereby ensuring the validity and reliability of the instrument (p. e13).

The applicant has laid out a robust plan for informing educators and central offices staff of the components of the program. In fact the proposal calls for 70% buy in among teachers in participating schools.

The applicant has identified clear criteria for the selection of mentor and master teachers who will take on particular leadership roles within schools (see appendix, pp e 15-17).

Professional development for teachers will likely be of high quality since activities will be informed by data from the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Professional development for teachers is to occur at the school level among clusters of teachers as well as individually through the individual growth plan for teachers.

The application has consulted research from the National of Excellence in Teaching to determine the compensation amounts sufficient to leverage change in educator behavior (p. 17).

Weaknesses:

The observations for teachers are scheduled to occur at least more than once within an annual period, yet the exact number of observations are unclear due to conflicting information. For principals and assistant principals, there is no clear indication that observations will occur twice a year as required by the absolute priority.

The levels of performance compensation for mentor and master teachers are not clearly articulated nor are the means by which they will be evaluated in these roles (p. e51).

While multiple measures will be used to assess program efficacy, there is no discussion of how the data system is or may be tied to payroll and human resources databases for the purpose of tenure and promotion decisions.

Reader's Score: 45

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The program has identified specific employee roles for program implementation. In the cases of the program coordinator and master and mentor teachers, clear selection criteria and role responsibilities have been constructed. For positions like the program director, for which particular personnel have been identified, the profession qualifications of these persons seem commensurate with the activities identified under their titles on the implementation timeline.

The applicant has planned for district based funding to support the implementation of the program on a consistent basis. For example, the district will fund salaries for mentor and master teachers, and will fund bonuses of \$3,000.00, \$ 5,000.00 for assistant principals, and \$ 10,000.00 for each master teachers (p. 52).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation at \$200,000 is substantially higher than other projected costs for the development and implementation to the program. This is of particular concern given that no cost analysis with regard to a detailed scope of work is provided.

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 has built into the implementation timeline activities to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development at various points by the National Institute for Excellence Teaching (NIET) as well as refining the Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS). Because professional development will be informed by teacher evaluations and the data-bases will be refined frequently, the likelihood for program strength is increased.

The applicant purports to develop a program evaluation with the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The applicant makes clear that the full details of the evaluation have not been fully established (p. 53), but does provide a conceptual framework for evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluator is scheduled to produce a report once a year. Though the report is slated to include both formative and summative data, the lack of frequency does not provide enough timely feedback to foster continuous improvements.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has proposed a clearly defined value added model that addresses value added at both the classroom and school levels. The application has chosen a data management system that support the added value model.

In addition, personnel are provided with adequate support for analyzing and understanding value added data to inform instruction and school-based activities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found in this area.

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 program plans to offer a mentor teacher to all first year and all alternative certified special education teachers up to three years of service; however, such assistance was not specifically identified as a recruitment/retention activity.

Weaknesses:

The program does not proposed a well defined plan for the recruitment of teachers beyond the implementation of PBCS. While it is anticipated that professional development will retain teachers, no particular activities are designed to do so for low income school placements.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 10:49 AM