

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations,
Office of the President (S385A100123)

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	6
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	75

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	3
------------------	----	---

Total	110	78
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations, Office of the President (S385A100123)

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 National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) proposes "Schools of Excellence", a program that the NBPTS asserts will fulfill the requirements of the TIF initiative (p 3). The applicant addresses Absolute Priority 1 at various points throughout the grant. Both targeted districts - Richmond, Virginia School District (p 11) and 12 schools in 5 districts in the State of Maine (p 8) - have considered implementing some type of incentive to improve teacher recruitment and retention and to strengthen the educational workforce, but budget constraints have negated their efforts. It is stated they will join NBPTS in developing and implementing a PBCS that can be modified to fit the several LEAS involved in the project (p 14) and that student growth will be used as a primary evaluation tool (p 31). There is no description of how student growth will be used in the PBCS determination. Observation-based assessment of teachers and principals is not addressed.

Tables that show how teacher improvement will be noted and how the differentiated rewards will be calculated are provided. Although there is little discussion on consideration if the proposed incentives are large enough to make a real impact, the incentive amounts

proposed should be sufficient to entice teachers (up to \$7,500 a year.) (p 15)
There is no rationale given for the NBC attainment being at the top of the scale of incentive awards -there is no indication that student growth is part of the requirements to attain that certification.

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:

Although it is not fully addressed as a problem, the large expenditure for differentiated stipend rewards proposed in this program will be difficult to sustain past the five-year funding period. The projected amount is approximately \$5 million each year of implementation. There is no commitment on the part of NBPTS or the school districts assuming the responsibility of 25%, 50%, 75% of the PBCS in years 3, 4, and 5. There is much discussion of possible sources of funds for sustainability, but no funding entity has stepped forward. The two partnering entities - RSD and Maine - have not committed to providing continuing funds, nor has NBPTS.

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 two local LEA's partnering with NBPTS are working on the required data collection and data management programs and policies. The applicant proposes a planning year to design and implement the data management system as well as several other core requirements. The LEA partners will use the data management system to make professional development, retention and tenure decisions as TIF guidelines require.

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 primary additional responsibility that is emphasized in the proposal is that of mentoring new teachers during the induction period (p 18). A stipend will be provided for experienced teachers that accept that task. Extensive mentoring training will be provided. Comprehensive induction that is based on one-on-one mentoring is shown by research to be associated with positive gains in student achievement.

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:

NOT MET: WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.

NBPTS has proposed a planning year that will be used to design a communication plan for the PBCS. It will include the involvement of key teachers, principals, district administrators unions and other key community leaders. Maine and Virginia entities will adapt the plans to best fit their needs.

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:

NOT MET: WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.

The LEAs that will partner with NBPTS will use the planning year to develop a strategy to involve the key stake holders, including unions, in the implementation of the PBCS. There is no outline of this plan provided. (p 50)

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:

NOT MET: WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.

The application provides discussion of the evaluation plan that will be developed in several sections. A rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation will be developed that will use multiple rating categories. The evaluation section defines the thrust of the evaluation plan that will be developed, and provides the primary questions that will be answered in the process. Evaluation will consider student growth, comparisons of that growth in the participating schools with that in other schools and districts, incentives at various levels, recruitment and retention success, and other issues TIF requires in evaluation (p 31). It does not fully discuss teacher observation at least twice a year or interrater reliability, as required by the TIF guidelines. The rubric to be used is based on Austin Independent School Districts and Denver Public Schools Student Learning Objectives (SL0). The plan will be in place at the end of the planning year.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

NOT MET: WILL BE DEVELOPED IN THE PLANNING YEAR.

The data management system that is required by the TIF program will be developed during the planning year. It will link student achievement data to teacher and principal data systems. . It will align student data, teacher and principal evaluation data, and teacher and principal professional development. The districts will work with the Technology Departments so that all the data systems will mesh. Although a complete data management system is not currently available, the plan described indicates it will be in place at the end of the planning year.

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:

NOT MET

The applicant states the districts will identify gaps in their current professional development systems and create a PD plan that incorporates the missing needed information, including data that bears on evaluation procedures and how to incorporate that information to improve student achievement and growth. This long-term PD plan will include mentoring training and NBPTS programs and certification. However, the application states the measures to be presented to the teachers are the basics of the NBPTS' foundation: the Architecture of Accomplished Teaching, the Five Core Propositions, and the content - specific NBPTS Standards. These documents do not fulfill the requirements of the TIF PBCS guidelines.

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 professional development emphasis is placed on two strategies: that of the Take One! NBPTS program and the National Board Certification Program that is promulgated by the NBPTS. Both are highly successful according to the applicant and are nationally

implemented. Take One!, to be utilized by teachers and principals, links student learning to effective instruction. A prepared video and a written commentary are submitted to the NPPTS to be viewed within the context of the NBPTS standards (p 20). Schools using it report a stronger link between teaching practice and student learning, particularly in high-need schools. Why that can be expected is not explained. No on-going process to assess and/or modify Take One! is indicated.

Take One! can be seen as a first step in achieving National Board certification. The applicant never fully explains the process by which a teacher gains the NBC - whether it is based on service and evaluation, along with various professional development activities, or if there is a curriculum connected to it, or some other procedures necessary. There is no effort to introduce measures other than that of the NBPTS to teachers and principals.

It is noted NBPTS will be compensated approximately \$3 million through the grant for providing the programs. Teachers who accomplish the National Board Certification status are awarded substantial annual stipends. Principal certification and teacher leader certification will be developed during the grant period and utilized as a major method of gaining incentive stipends.

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:

Research is cited to support the need for highly effective teachers and strong school leadership to increase student learning and achievement. Further research citations indicate high-need, low performing schools do not support the recruitment, retention, or the provision of quality professional development of effective teachers and leaders. The choice of the two targeted areas was driven by the statistics showing low student achievement in comparison to state statistics. All schools are high-need in terms of free and reduced lunch data.

The need of the targeted schools is compared to the state statistics and that of comparable schools defined by GreatSchools.

Weaknesses:

Data is not established for evaluating the difficulty in recruiting teachers in high-need areas - the applicant states the sites will determine the hard-to-staff areas during the planning year (p 16). The methods and/or data to be used are not discussed.

Several of the targeted schools have Math and reading performance percentages higher than the state average (p 10).

GreatSchools, whose definition of comparable schools is used, is not defined.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed PBCS will have several different differentiated levels. such as market incentives for those who teach hard-to-staff subjects, probably including math, science and special education (p 16). The targeted subjects will be determined by site. A second category of market incentives will be aimed at National Board Certified Teachers. Induction and mentoring will be supported.

National Board Certification for Principals and National Board Certification for Teacher Leaders will be developed during the grant funding period. The first will recognize the essential role of principals in instructional leadership, change, and school management. The second will provide leaders to improve teacher practice and student achievement and growth in high-need schools.

A performance-based evaluation model is described that will establish a teacher's effectiveness. Student growth will be defined by state administered standardized tests or, for teachers in non-tested subject areas, pre- and post-assessments and student learning objectives. A table is provided relating student growth and performance based-standards that is used to establish differentiated awards.

The TAKE ONE!, a personalized professional development activity provided by NBPTS (p 20), and NBC are the primary professional development activities discussed.

Weaknesses:

A primary source of qualification for teachers to be rewarded with stipends is gaining National Board Certification. An overview of the process to gain NBC is provided - four portfolio entries that feature teaching practice and six constructed response exercises that assess content knowledge is required. There is no further description of what these exercises are or what is the knowledge gained. It is noted these are not easy - teachers might take up to three years to complete certification. There is no connection shown specifically between the incentive reward for gaining NBC and the student growth evaluation model described. Whether a NBCT could get further incentive rewards through the performance based standards is not addressed. It would strengthen the proposal if the NBC process were further clarified. In particular, an evaluation process including student growth, measured as required in the TIF guidelines, and multiple classroom observations as required, should be an integral part of the NBC process if the rewards come from the TIF funding.

Few, if any, alternatives to PD offered through NBPTS is proposed. Such narrowness in activities and strategies that are part of the proposed NBPTS project suggests a conflict of interest.

The project design does not observably incorporate the data-management system that links student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

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 project management is comprehensive. It clearly shows the responsibilities of each of the three partners -NBPTS, the State of Maine and the Richmond School District. A detailed timeline is presented. The description of the management plan reiterates the planning year activities, emphasizing the development of the five core elements. The membership of the proposed School for Excellence Steering Committees (one on each site) is described and their duties delineated. The primary goal of each year of the project is listed. A summary time line is also given.

The NBPTS staff members that will be involved in the project, their positions, and their duties are given. The senior personnel positions job descriptions in the Maine and RSD schools are described. Relevant Curricular Vita indicate the outstanding credentials and experience of the NBPTS staff.

The project has been relatively successful in developing support for the proposed project, particularly the NBCT effort. It is hoped that will continue after grant funding. The applicant describes various strategies that might obtain the funds necessary to sustain such a large project.

Weaknesses:

There are no job descriptions or required credentials noted for the Maine and Richmond site program administrators.

There is no indication that non-Federal funds will be used for the required 25%, 50%, and 75% of the PBCS in years 3, 4, and 5 as is required by the TIF guidelines.

Although many strategies to raise funds to continue the Schools for Excellence project after grant funding is gone, there is no entity that has committed to funding any portion of it for example one of the sites in question. NBPTS has not proposed any its funds to continue the project.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

other personnel;

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

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

Strengths:

The evaluation section defines the thrust of the evaluation plan that will be developed, and provides the primary questions that will be answered in the process. Evaluation will consider student growth, comparisons of that growth in the participating schools with that in other schools and districts, incentives at various levels, recruitment and retention success, and other issues TIF requires in evaluation. Evaluation of the project does incorporate the data management system that will be developed in the planning year which will be the source of quantitative data. Observation and interviews will provide qualitative data. Formative and summative methods will be used so that findings can be used to guide program improvement. An outside evaluator will be employed in the evaluation process. The evaluation plan, though far from complete, displays an outline for the program evaluation procedure.

Weaknesses:

Although the percent of expected increase is given for some of the elements, there are no bench marks or comparison data noted for the evaluation questions of listed. It does not fully discuss teacher observation at least twice a year or interrater reliability, as required by the TIF guidelines.

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 state both the State of Maine and the Richmond School District have value added measures of student achievement in place. The Maine Department of Education and the New England Comprehensive Center is developing the rubrics for the Maine measures. RSD, through the Commonwealth of Virginia, employs the Standards of Learning .

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not demonstrate that the project, Schools for Excellence, is involved in these value-added activities. They may be used as part of the evaluation process for the PBCS, but their incorporation is not described here.

Reader's Score: 1

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 induction and mentoring components of the project will aid in attracting and retaining new teachers.

Weaknesses:

There is no explanation of a process to determine if a teacher filling a position in a hard-to-staff vacancy is effective. The determination of what is defined by hard-to-staff vacancies is to be left up to the individual sites. The applicant primarily addresses NBCTS and new teachers in this priority discussion, rather teachers needed in the hard-to-staff subject areas.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations,
Office of the President (S385A100123)

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	5
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	17
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
Sub Total	100	69

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1.Competitive Priority 1	5	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1.Competitive Priority 2	5	1
Sub Total	10	3
Total	110	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations, Office of the President (S385A100123)

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 application does not fully meet Absolute Priority 1. The stipend options create a system through which teachers and principals can receive increased compensation without evidence of student growth. Stipends for National Board Certification will be offered without consideration of and at higher levels than incentives for actual student achievement growth (p. 15).

The application does not adequately justify the incentive amounts for each option. The project will not meaningfully differentiate incentive payments based on student growth, and growth incentives are not substantial (\$1,000 - \$3,000 per year). The large discriminating factor for awards is whether a teacher or principal attains National Board Certification (p. 15).

The evaluation system for teachers and principals will include multiple measures of educator effectiveness, based on the National Board standards, which will include classroom observations and student growth measures, resulting in four levels of performance (p. 28).

During the planning year, the project will develop a PBCS system that aligns with Maine's

statewide strategy and the strategy under development in Richmond Public Schools for performance pay systems (p. 34).

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 application does not meet Absolute Priority 2. The application includes a detailed budget narrative that projects costs associated with the development and implementation of the project during the five-year grant period (budget narrative). The applicant does not provide an increasing share of the incentives in years 3-5 of the project. (Year one is a planning year.) In fact, the budget narrative provides for an increasing amount of grant funds for incentives each year - \$3,112,554 in year two as compared to \$4,886,022 in year five (budget narrative, pp.-15-16). The applicant's response to this priority does not project costs beyond the grant period, and future sources of funding are largely limited to grants and donations, which are speculative (pp. 36-39). The application states that the State of Maine and Richmond Public Schools have agreed to provide an increasing share of the PBC from non-TIF funds, but this provision is not included in the letters of agreement or reflected in the budget narrative (p. 55).

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 application meets Absolute Priority 3. Data will be available from the National Board Certification process, principal and teacher evaluations, and student achievement. Evaluation data will be used to guide professional development and will be available for employment decisions (pp. 27; 29; 39-42).

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 project will provide teachers with 2 opportunities for incentives based on additional responsibilities and leadership roles. They can serve as mentors, and/or they can complete the National Board Teacher Leader model which is slated for implementation in year 5 of the project. The mentoring program in Richmond will be based on the New Teacher Center's model, and program for the participating schools in Maine will be the New Teacher Mentoring and Induction initiative piloted by the Maine Department of Education (pp. 18-19).

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 application does not meet Core Element 1. The applicant does not currently have a plan for communicating the components of the project to school personnel or the community at large. The project intends to develop a plan during the planning year (pp. 34; 44-45).

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 application does not meet Core Element 2. The applicant did not demonstrate involvement and support of school personnel or unions. The project intends to develop involvement and support during the planning year (pp. 34; 44-45).

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 application does not meet Core Element 3. The evaluation system for teachers and principals will include multiple measures of educator effectiveness which will include classroom observations and student growth measures, resulting in four levels of performance (p. 28). Four performance levels are identified: basic, emergent, effective, and accomplished. Inter-rater reliability will be address through training for peer reviewers. The applicant intends to develop this component during the planning year (pp. 28-29; 34; 44-45).

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 application does not meet Core Element 4. A data-management system linking student achievement to teacher and principal payroll and human resources is not currently being implemented; however, the development of site-based systems is included as an activity for the planning year of the project. Compliance with FERPA will be incorporated as part of this process (pp. 34; 38; 44-45). A data-management system linking student achievement to teacher and principal payroll and human resources is not currently being implemented; however, the development of site-based systems is including as an activity for the planning year of the project. Compliance with FERPA is included as part of this process (pp. 34; 38; 44-45).

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 application does not meet Core Element 5. A data-management system linking student achievement to teacher and principal payroll and human resources is not currently being implemented; however, the development of site-based systems is included as an activity for the planning year of the project. Compliance with FERPA will be incorporated as part of this process (pp. 34; 38; 44-45). A data-management system linking student achievement to teacher and principal payroll and human resources is not currently being implemented; however, the development of site-based systems is including as an activity for the planning year of the project. Compliance with FERPA is included as part of this process (pp. 34; 38; 44-45). The application does not meet Core Element 5. It did not include a plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of effectiveness that will be used in the PBCS or a professional development plan specifically linked to data generated by these measures. The project intends to develop the plan for this component during the planning year (pp. 34; 44-45).

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:

Professional development will include mentoring, Take One! lesson units, completion of National Board Certification, and the evaluation system's intervention process (pp. 17-29). Data resulting from the National Board Certification process, principal and teacher evaluations, and student achievement will available to guide professional development and

to make employment decisions (pp. 29; 39-42). The applicant did not include (1) a professional development plan specifically linked to data generated by student achievement measures or (2) regular evaluation of the effectiveness of professional development. During the planning year, districts will be required to develop strategies to ensure that teachers and principals understand the effectiveness measures and provide them with professional development to use data to improve instruction. Districts' identifying gaps in the current professional development system and creating a new system will also be required in year 1. The application does not provide for ongoing, regular assessment of the resulting professional development program for possible modification to improve its effectiveness (pp. 34; 44-45).

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 application identifies 23 high need schools that will participate in the project, with free and reduced priced lunch percentages ranging from 50 to 89.92 (pp. 8-13).

The application describes teacher recruitment to be problematic in the Maine schools due to low pay, poor local housing, and a lack of employment options for families (p. 11). Six of the 8 Virginia schools have been identified by the state as "hard to staff" (p. 12).

For 13 of the Maine schools, data is provided concerning student performance on state assessments as compared to statewide results (p. 10).

Three of the 8 Virginia schools scored 5-29 percent lower than comparable schools in third grade tests (p. 12)

The applicant applies the definition of "comparable" school that is used by GreatSchools - located in the same area and with similar student makeup in terms of diversity and poverty (p. 12).

Weaknesses:

Data are not provided to demonstrate the degree to which the participating schools have difficulty with teacher and principal recruitment and retention. Information is needed concerning the number of vacancies, teacher credentials, and attrition rates in the schools (pp. 11- 12).

Without explanation, no student achievement data is provided for 2 of the Maine schools (p. 10).

Only 7 of the 15 Maine schools had a progress rate below the state median (p. 10).

Only 5 of the 15 Maine schools had a 3-year average math and reading percentage that was lower than the state average (p. 10).

The applicant does not provide data concerning student achievement in comparable Maine schools. It is unclear the degree to which the participating schools have lower student achievement than comparable schools in terms of size, grade levels, and poverty levels (p. 10).

In 2 participating Maine districts, Regional School Unit 12 and Regional School Unit 24, schools with the lowest student achievement levels are not participating in the project (pp. 10-11).

Student achievement data are not provided for 5 of the 8 Virginia schools, and the data provided for 3 schools are reported as broad percentage spans (p.12).

No definition of "comparable" school is provided for or applied to the schools participating in Maine (pp. 10-11).

Reader's Score: 5

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:

Both Maine and Virginia have historically supported and rewarded National Board Certification (p. 23).

The application describes valid and reliable measures of student growth. In tested subjects, the project will use state standardized tests as the primary source of student growth measurement. In non-tested subjects, the primary source will include learning objectives aligned with district or state curriculum and pre-and post-assessments (p. 31). The application includes the Five Core Propositions as the basis for a definition of highly effective teachers (p. 6).

The applicant will assist schools in developing a process to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher candidates that do not hold National Board certification. A component of this process will include addressing past student performance in the interview (pp. 16-17). The letter of agreement with the Maine Department of Education acknowledges that the Department has received commitment from the 5 districts and that it has shown each district the service agreement (Attachment 1).

The evaluation system for teachers and principals will include multiple measures of educator effectiveness which will include classroom observations and student growth measures, resulting in four levels of performance (p. 28).

Professional development will include mentoring, Take One! lesson units, completion of National Board Certification, and the evaluation system's intervention process (pp. 17-29).

Funding is included for the participating schools/districts to develop a data system linking student growth and payroll in year 1 (budget narrative).

Weaknesses:

The application does not discuss how the proposed incentives for student growth are part of an LEA or statewide strategy (28-30).

The stipend options create a system through which teachers and principals can receive increased compensation without evidence of student growth. Stipends for National Board Certification will be offered without consideration of and at higher levels than incentives for actual student achievement growth (p. 15).

The application does not provide a clear definition for effective principals or a plan for developing one (pp. 16-17).

No evidence is provided that the proposed project has involved the participating districts, schools, principals, or teachers in its development or that the teachers and principals support the project's implementation.

The letter of agreement with Richmond Public Schools does not include an acknowledgement of commitment from the schools (Attachment 1).

The application does not describe how the data management system will link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

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 application includes an overview of the major tasks to be completed each project year (pp. 43-49).

The timeline includes a list of activities for the planning year and for each incentive area (p. 50).

Key personnel are well qualified and their time commitments seem adequate to successfully implement the project (pp. 52-53; budget narrative, resumes).

In-kind contributions of time are included for the participating schools (budget narrative pp. 13-14).

The costs of the project seem reasonable to implement the project as proposed.

Weaknesses:

The timeline does not indicate who is responsible for the completion of each specific task (p. 50).

The timeline for the planning year does not address core element 3: a rigorous evaluation plan for principals and teachers (p. 50).

Roles and responsibilities of key personnel are described in general terms. More information is needed concerning how the staff will be organized to work with the schools and districts (pp. 52-53).

The application does not clearly demonstrate that the applicant will support the proposed project with secure funds from other sources (pp. 54-55).

More information is needed concerning the degree of autonomy the participating schools will have over the development of the PBCS. The description suggests that the applicant will have limited involvement in the development process at the local level and seems to delegate responsibilities such as project sustainability (pp. 58-59).

The qualifications and/or job description for the site-based program administrators are not provided (p. 56).

Reader's Score: 17

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 includes 8 measurable outcomes (pp. 62-63).

Evaluation questions are included for overall implementation and for each of the incentive options (pp. 65-66).

The timeline includes yearly assessment of student achievement data in order to set expected student outcomes and yearly comparison of the student achievement to the outcomes that were established (p. 50).

Weaknesses:

More information is needed to demonstrate the strength of each of the outcomes. For example, the first outcome indicates that 150 National Board Certified and effective teachers will be recruited in hard-to-staff schools by the end of the grant period. The application has not documented conclusively how many of the schools are hard to staff and has not provided the context of what percentage of the vacancies the 150 represents (p. 62).

The seventh outcome anticipates that all schools will be performing at 20 percent above their current performance levels or 10 percent above the state average on state assessments. The outcome does not indicate at what point in the grant period this is expected to be met. In addition, the outcome is not strong for those schools that are already performing 10 percent above the state average on state assessments, which seems to be the case for at least 5 of the participating schools (pp. 10; 63).

The outcomes do not address teacher retention (pp. 62-63).

Information is not provided relative to the data to be collected, to what degree quantitative and qualitative data will be available, and how it will be used to evaluate each performance outcome (pp. 62-63).

The evaluation plan does not offer specific information concerning what data will be available at what intervals and how the data will be shared and used to facilitate successful implementation of the project (pp. 66-67).

Reader's Score: 2

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 application states that both Maine and Richmond Public Schools have value-added measures of student achievement in place (pp.32; 41). Individual stipends will be based on student learning objectives established at the beginning of each year after reviewing students' baseline skills (pp. 32-33).

Weaknesses:

More information is needed concerning the value system to be used, including how the applicant will calculate different levels of compensation and how it will explain the model to teachers in order for them to use the data a guide instruction (pp. 41-44).

Reader's Score: 2

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

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

Strengths:

Mentors will support induction teachers with the goal of retention of effective teachers. Vacancies will be posted on the National Board's daily electronic newsletter.

Weaknesses:

The application does not identify hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. The school sites will determine these areas during the planning year (p. 16). No data is provided concerning the degree to which the participating schools have difficulty in filling vacancies or the level of attrition they experience.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations,
Office of the President (S385A100123)

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	5
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	80

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	86
--------------	------------	-----------

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards -- Government Relations, Office of the President (S385A100123)

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:

- (a) The Schools for Excellence plan gives significant weight to student achievement. The plan identifies two levels to measure student growth: 1) tested and non-tested, (2) other measures. In tested area student growth measurements include state standardized test and value-added measures. Non-tested areas include student learning objectives aligned with district or state curriculum, pre-and-post assessments. Level two is not required unless there is a discrepancy between student growth and performance-based standards. (b) Observations will be conducted at least twice a year by trained peer reviewers. A specific plan has not been developed for observations; this will be developed during the planning year (pg. 44). (c) Mentors, peer reviewers and candidate support providers are additional teacher leadership roles. National Board Certified Teachers may apply to be mentors to 1 - 3 year teachers. The maximum incentive for this additional responsibility would be \$3,000 per year (pg. 15). Peer reviewers will conduct classroom observations. Candidate support providers support Take One! and National Board candidates through the process. The applicant addresses incentives for the program. Incentives range from \$1,000 - \$3,000 for teachers and up to \$5000 for principals (pg.

14). These incentives may be too low to attract "highly effective" and "accomplished" teachers and principals.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant provides a thorough budget and narrative outline for costs associated with implementation and sustainability. It appears in reviewing the budget that the schools will receive money from National Board through the TIF funds to cover some of the cost, such as compensation. The applicant provides multiple possibilities for non-TIF funds; however, there is no commitment at this time or identification of the sources. Maine will utilize other grants the state has received recently to support Schools for Excellence (pg. 37); however, these sources are not identified. Richmond will explore the possibility of tapping into some the Richmond Public Schools Education Found, Inc. funds; however, there has not been a commitment at this time.

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 provided quality research about National Board Certification and its positive effect on student achievement. The applicant identifies a strong evaluation system. A strong component of the evaluation system is the peer assistance and review (PAR) program for teacher and principal evaluation that utilizes multiple measures to identify effective performance. These measures are based on performance standards and include formative and summative assessments, PAR panel, and peer reviewers (pg. 27). Based on PAR evaluation results teachers are placed in one of four categories for teacher effectiveness (basic, emergent, effective and accomplished.) In the lower two realms teachers work with a PAR team to help them improve their instruction. Teachers who fail

to improve instructional practices may be released. (pg. 30) The application addresses recruitment and retention issues, but does not specifically address them for Maine or Richmond. No system to evaluate the effectiveness professional development is identified.

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 provides information about other additional roles and responsibilities in the application: PAR team members, mentors, peer reviewers and candidate support providers. Those who are National Board Certified can apply to become mentors for 1 - 3 year teachers. The maximum incentive for this additional responsibility is \$3,000 per year (pg. 15).

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:

Core Element #1 has not been met.

The application addresses the requirement of communication with teachers, administrators, other school personnel and the community at large (pg. 50). However, a plan has not been developed. The plan will be developed no later than March 2011.

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:

Core Element #2 has not been met.

In year one Schools for Excellence Steering Committees will be developed and will include numerous stakeholders. The committee will include representatives from unions, teachers, principals, community, central office staff, etc (pg. 46). The Steering Committees will develop an implementation plan. The Steering Committee will convene no later than November 2010 and meet bi-weekly for three months to make decisions about incentive levels and types that will meet their specific district needs. The Steering Committee meets regularly throughout the five years.

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:

Core Element 3 has not been met.

(a) The applicant provides limited information about the performance-based compensation rubric that will be developed to evaluate and differentiate teacher and principal effectiveness. Based on evaluations teachers will be placed in one of four categories of effectiveness. Incentives will be based on rubric rating. The application states throughout that student growth will be a significant factor in identifying teacher effectiveness. However, the rubric has not been developed so specifics have not been identified in this application. Amounts of incentives will be based on rubric ratings and shall not exceed a maximum amount of \$7,500 per teacher in any year of the grant. The application addresses observations of each teacher at least twice during the school year but does not specify what will be evaluated during the observations. The applicant does not address the observation of principals and what that may look like. The applicant does not address inter-rater reliability.

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:

Core Element 4 has not been met.

At this time a data-management system to link student achievement has not been developed. However, the state of Virginia has developed one but does not have the student achievement connection in the system. NBPTS will provide the states with incentive dollars to add this connection. Maine is in the beginning stages of development. NBPTS will provide Maine and Richmond \$100,000 the first year and \$15,000 each additional year to develop the data management system connecting student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

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:

Core Element 5 has been met.

The applicant addresses a vague plan to ensure that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness in the PBCS. As the teachers are working through the process they will be rated on differentiated levels of effectiveness: basic, emergent, effective and accomplished. An evaluation rubric will be used to differentiate the levels. Compensation will be based on the level of teacher effectiveness. The program will address communication in year 1 to provide information about the Schools for Excellence PBCS. Communication is to be released no later than March 2011 (pg. 45). Year 2 communication will address specific components of National Board Certification and Take One! In year 3, additional teachers will be identified to enter the program.

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:

(1) The program includes an evaluations process that rates teachers and principals based on their effectiveness. (2) Through this evaluation system professional development is identified for individual needs. The Schools for Excellence will provide mentoring for new teachers and job-embedded professional development through Take One! The applicant identifies professional development and training for peer reviewers, focused on National Board Standards, to improve evaluations of new teachers, experienced teachers, and principals. This will help to guide future professional development for teachers and principals. (3) Teachers and effective teachers can participate in the National Board process and receive their National Board Certification. After receiving their certification they have the option to mentor 1 -3 year teachers. They can participate on PAR teams or become candidate support provides. (2 & 3) The PAR (Peer Assistance Review) team will collaborate with "effective" or "accomplished" teachers to determine professional growth goals. Those at the "basic" and "emergent" levels will receive support from mentors or coaches (pg. 29). (4) A plan will be developed the first year to communicate to teachers and principals the PBCS plan by April of 2011. Training will begin on effective teaching measures addressed in the plan the fall of 2011. (5) It is not clearly stated how the professional development will be assessed for effectiveness.

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:

(2 & 3) The schools are compared to other schools as reported by GreatSchools in terms of location, diversity, free and reduced lunch count, and economic status (pg. 9 -12).

Weaknesses:

(1) Recruitment and retainment issues are addressed in the application but not specific to the TIF schools. Limited information is provided about the comparable schools. (3) No real definition of a "comparable school."

Reader's Score: 5

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:

Schools for Excellence provides an adequate PBCS plan. (1) Moderate incentives are identified in the application. Incentives are applied after completion of Take One! and National Board Certification. Additional incentives are applied after the PAR process, based on effectiveness level. Incentives range from \$1000 - \$3000 for teachers and up to \$5000 for principals.

(2) The applicant has garnered the commitment and support from the district and other stakeholders. Communication and involvement of all stakeholders will take place after the awarding of the grant. A steering committee will be developed and all necessary stakeholders will be part of a steering committee. (3) The Schools for Excellence Evaluation PBCS Model proposed involves rating teachers and principals by effectiveness: basic, emergent, effective and accomplished (pg. 28). A rubric will be developed to rate teacher effectiveness. PAR Teams will be developed to guide evaluation and support teachers. Observations will be conducted twice a year by trained peer reviewer. The multiple measures of assessment, including state assessment, will be used to determine growth. (4) Virginia has a data management system in place. Maine will be developing a system. Both management states will connect student achievement to teacher and principal effectiveness during the planning year. NPBTS will pay \$100,000 to each state the first year and \$15,000 each consecutive year of the grant to develop these systems. (5) The applicant identifies high quality professional development that will be incorporated into the program: National Board Certification, Take One!, mentoring, coaching, training for peer reviewers, and other professional developed as identified to support individualized needs.

Weaknesses:

It appears support from principals and teachers has not been provided. According to the implementation plan, principal and teacher support will be garnered at the end of the first year. The applicant doesn't addresses specifics about the principal evaluation, but it is not connected to student achievement and teacher and principal effectiveness. The incentives may not be enough to attract "effective" and "accomplished" teachers to high need areas.

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:

(1) The applicant provides an adequate narrative description and timeline chart for specific components of the PBCS plan (pg. 50) Components currently not in place will be developed within the first year as specified in the grant requirements (e.g. rubric and communication plan). (2) The applicant has identified key personnel to management the Schools for Excellence PBCS program. Resumes have been provided to illustrate qualifications. (3) According to the budget outline the requested funds are sufficient to fulfill the goals of the project (E12) and (E1.)

Weaknesses:

According to the applicant, the project will be funded with some other grant funds received by the districts. However, the applicant does not identify what funds. Full support for sustainability has not been granted at this time. Support from teachers and principals will be garnered at the end of the first year.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

NBPTS has research addressing student achievement increases in classrooms instructed by NBCTs. The applicant also addresses multiple evaluation measures: PAR, Teacher Ratings, State Assessment, Observations that will help in measuring performance objectives (pg. 27 & 28).

Weaknesses:

Principal evaluation is a weakness in this application. Retention also is not clearly addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a strong plan for project evaluation and teachers performance; however, it doesn't address recruitment and retention issues for TIF schools. (1 & 2) The applicant documents multiple evaluation procedures: PAR, Teacher Ratings, State Assessment, Observations (pg. 27 & 28). Components of the evaluation system include formative and summative assessments and PAR panels. (3) An external evaluator will be identified to conduct the evaluation of the project. The evaluation plan will be development in year one and implemented in year 2 (pg. 62). The applicant has identified two purposes of the evaluations: assessing the implementation of the Schools for Excellence program at each site, and assessing each site's progress in achieving the goals of the Schools for Excellence program. The applicant provides multiple evaluation questions to guide project evaluation (pg. 65).

Weaknesses:

Retention and recruitment are not clearly addressed in the application as it relates to the schools in the TIF grant. The application addresses teacher evaluations more thoroughly than principal evaluations.

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:

Incentives will be offered to two categories of teachers: (1) those who teach hard-to-staff students and (2) NBCTs who have proven that they meet high standards (pg. 16). Induction and mentoring programs will be provided to support new teachers (pg. 42) in hard-to-staff areas and schools. The performance evaluation system will help districts identify effective teachers to place in hard to fill positions. Through the project some teachers will become National Board Certified. National Board Certification helps teachers in these areas become highly effective. The award \$1,000 - \$2000 will be awarded to effective teachers who fill these high need areas.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address how to retain and recruit effective principals. The amount of incentives for these areas may not be high enough to attract teachers. The applicant doesn't address recruitment and retention issues in the TIF schools. The application does not clearly address a recruitment and retention plan. The district will have a plan to identify effective teachers, but the application does not address a plan to attract those teachers to hard-to-fill subjects and schools.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:14 PM