

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

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

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

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60  | 45 |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |     |    |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25  | 25 |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |     |    |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5   | 3  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100 | 78 |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

|              |     |    |
|--------------|-----|----|
| <b>Total</b> | 110 | 85 |
|--------------|-----|----|

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

### 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:

This proposal puts forth a PBCS plan aligned to professional development opportunities and differentiated leadership roles for teachers and principals. It uses multiple methods of evaluation including formal observations using TAP protocols, as well as classroom observation and student data. At the core of the PBCS is improved student learning. Student growth is fifty percent of the teacher and principal evaluation. The incentive amount is adequate.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The applicant has provided costs adequate to support the development and implementation of the PBCS. The LEA will reallocate existing federal, state and local resources to fund the current award amount at progressively increasing levels and will consider using Title funds after the grant period ends. The superintendent and school board chair have committed resources after the grant funding ends through a MOU with NIET.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The LEA seeks to expand the success identified in student achievement in the four pilot sites currently participating in this PBCS program in the district. These thirteen schools participating in this proposed PBCS were chosen because they are of highest need as indicated on state assessments (E12). The proposal is supported by LEA priorities as outlined by the superintendent to improve the process for rewarding teachers and principals, as well as the state's Race to the Top application (E14).

**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 proposed PBCS program will provide the LEA with an evaluation system tied to differential leadership roles and additional compensation based on its goal of improved student performance. The plan provides educators with a maximum five percent salary increase which the LEA and NIET has deemed sufficient. Teachers will have the opportunity to apply for master and mentor teacher based on their ability to improve student achievement. The compensation amounts for these positions are adequate

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 thorough communication plan outlined in the proposal offers multiple channels for sharing the PBCS with internal and external stakeholders. Participating schools will receive ongoing professional development on the TAP model and the evaluation system used. The LEA will also communicate to non-participating schools as well as to community stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

**General:**

NIET will provide ongoing technical assistance to the LEA to ensure successful implementation of the program model. During the planning period requested, participating teachers and administrators will be actively involved in the planning and implementation of the project. At this point the level of involvement of unions is not known although the proposal contains a letter of support for the program in the existing TAP schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

**General:**

The applicant seeks a planning period to successfully plan and implement this program in the participating thirteen high need schools. Focus will also be on developing a principal assessment to support the teacher evaluation instrument. The teacher observation tool used employs protocols and standards developed by TAP, however their alignment to state standards is not known. Participating educators will receive multiple observations throughout the school year to assess their instructional practice. Data collected will be classroom artifacts, interviews, student work as well as summative data from state assessments. Student growth will be a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation. Data will be collected by administrators, master teachers and peers allowing for inter-rater reliability. Additionally these individuals will receive professional development on the evaluation instrument.

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 LEA will contract with NIET to use its Content Online Data Entry (CODE) data management system. It will link Human Resources and payroll to student achievement data.

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:**

During the planning period, participating teachers and administrators will be involved in year-long professional development to build their understanding of the PBCS program and the TAP model. They will work learn about the evaluation instrument and leadership opportunities available to them.

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 proposed project will address the academic needs of thirteen chronically underperforming schools in a LEA (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty and high minority, have lower achievement data than comparable schools, and low graduation rates.

The evaluation system will collect data on student performance on formative and summative assessments to inform professional development activities targeted to the teacher or the school.

Teachers have multiple supports if they are not meeting standards indicated on the evaluation rubric. Master or mentor teachers can work with them individually through modeled lessons. They can work in cluster groups with peers and participate in the TAP professional development modules. Teachers and principals meeting the evaluation standards will earn additional compensation for their performance and have the opportunity to apply for additional leadership responsibilities. The PBCS model immerses participating teachers and principals into a culture of common language and support using the evaluation instrument as the foundation of their conversation and professional development. The assessment of educators in this model is ongoing as well as the monitoring of student growth. The model provides a feedback loop so that professional development and instructional practice is tied to student performance.

Interconnected is a periodic assessment to ensure that professional development is improving teacher and leader development.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed project will address the needs at thirteen chronically underperforming schools in a LEA (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty and high minority, have lower achievement data than comparable schools, and low graduation rates. Detailed student achievement analysis exposes the proposed schools to be as low as or lower than schools with similar characteristics in the LEA or the state. (E8) The applicant provides clear criteria for defining a comparable school.

**Weaknesses:**

A needs assessment of the LEA reveals that educator salaries are lower than neighboring districts. In state identified hard to staff subjects, the LEA has difficulty hiring qualified educators (E6). However, the specific impact this has on recruitment in the thirteen schools participating in this PBCS is not shared. Although turnover data is shared for the district, it is not clear what impact this has on all participating schools. Allusions are made to the impact this may have on teacher quality but no concrete data is provided to assess the real educator need in the thirteen particular schools.

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:**

The LEA seeks to expand the success identified in student achievement in four pilot sites currently participating in this PBCS program. These 13 schools were chosen because they are of highest need as indicated on state assessments (E12). It is supported by LEA strategies identified by the superintendent to improve the process for rewarding teachers and principals (E14), as well as the state's Race to the Top application.

The selection of the TAP methodology was chosen for its alignment to the LEA's strategy for rewarding effective educators in selected high need schools (E11). TAP will offer the district a PBCS program that creates differentiated compensation for principals, opportunities for career advancement, job embedded professional development and teacher and principal evaluations (E11).

In collaboration with the LEA, the applicant identifies an adequate compensation size of five percent over base pay as sufficient to influence retention behaviors of principals and teachers. Additionally it will offer recruitment and retention bonuses funded by the LEA.

Educator effectiveness will be determined using multiple measures using the state's assessment, observations using TAP's evaluation instrument and other classroom based artifacts (E19). Effective teachers and principals would be defined as those who qualify for any portion of the awards (E33). Student growth is a significant part of the effectiveness measured.

The classroom observation tool used is a standardized instrument used in all TAP schools. It provides multiple rating categories focused squarely on the connection between student performance and instructional practice. Classroom observations will occur multiple times over the course of a year.

The proposal enjoys support from the LEA Superintendent, the school board chair and the Great Schools Partnership (E39).

During the planning period, participating teachers and administrators will be involved in comprehensive year-long professional development to build their understanding of the PBCS program and the TAP model. They will work with the evaluation instrument as well as understand the leadership opportunities available to them.

The LEA will contract with NIET to use its Content Organization Data Entry (CODE) data management system. It will link Human Resources and payroll to student achievement data.

**Weaknesses:**

Teachers in nine of the selected schools voted for the implementation of the PBCS. Not all selected schools participated in this vote so it is unclear as to their participation in this project, which could reduce the number of participating schools. However the principals from all thirteen schools signed a letter of support for this proposal. (E37). There was mention of the support provided by the unions for the TAP program in existing schools; however their level of involvement in planning and implementing this particular project is not known (E38).

**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 management plan was developed with input from multiple stakeholders. It provides an adequate planning period timeline needed to secure buy-in from participating schools, especially those whose teachers have not had the opportunity to vote on this PBCS.

The project director and other key personnel are more than capable to carry out their responsibilities. The time commitments are adequate and responsibilities are clearly defined.

The collaborating LEA will support the program with graduated non-TIF funds throughout and after the grant period.

The project costs and requested amount are acceptable to meet project goals as described.

The project costs and requested amount are acceptable to meet project goals as described.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant documents a focused local evaluation plan centered on two purposes: to provide feedback for continuous improvement and to examine the implementation of the TAP program between schools (E1). The evaluation proposed identifies adequate performance objectives related to the goals of the project.

The comprehensive data collected will be both qualitative and quantitative including performance data collected through its data management system, TAP produced rubrics, state standardized assessments, student work, surveys, interviews and observations (E3).

**Weaknesses:**

There is limited evidence of how the local evaluation results will connect to continuous improvement and feedback of the overall project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The PBCS will incorporate the innovative TVASS assessment system, a value added system into its data collection methodology (E-3) of student assessment data, teacher's evaluation results, and teacher recruitment and retention data. This information can then be compared at the LEA level as well as nationally to provide the project additional feedback on its performance. Data will be analyzed to provide teachers at faculty meetings and individual conferences feedback to improve classroom practice (E29).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

This proposed project will address the academic needs of thirteen chronically underperforming schools in a LEA (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty and high minority, have lower achievement than comparable schools, and low graduation rates.

The PBCS includes student growth data to inform tenure decisions (E26), and to transfers from within the district. The LEA will offer a recruitment and retention bonus (E15) for educators willing to teach hard- to-staff subjects.

**Weaknesses :**

A needs assessment of the LEA reveals that educator salaries are lower than neighboring districts. A needs assessment of the LEA reveals that educator salaries are lower than neighboring districts. In state-identified hard to staff subjects, the LEA has difficulty hiring qualified educators (E6). However, the specific impact this has on recruitment in the thirteen schools participating in this PBCS is not shared. Although turnover data is shared for the district, it is not clear the impact this has on all participating schools. Allusions are made to the impact this may have on instruction but no concrete data is provided to assess the actual educator need in the thirteen particular schools.

Previous success in existing TAP schools in the LEA support the position that increased retention in hard to staff subjects and recruitment into high-need schools will occur with this proposal although no evidence is provided to that effect.

Minimal promotion of vacancies is offered. The LEA will post job openings and indicate if they are high- need or hard-to-staff on the announcement (E18). This recruitment strategy may not be effective in encouraging new educators to the school or hard to staff subjects.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

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

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

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60  | 54 |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |     |    |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25  | 20 |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |     |    |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5   | 4  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100 | 88 |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

|                  |    |   |
|------------------|----|---|
| <b>Sub Total</b> | 10 | 9 |
|------------------|----|---|

|              |     |    |
|--------------|-----|----|
| <b>Total</b> | 110 | 97 |
|--------------|-----|----|

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

### 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 narrative provides strong evidence that the applicant will implement a differentiated compensation system for teachers and principals. The narrative notes that for teachers, students growth constitutes 50% of the weight of their score; the same applies to principals. Both the teacher and principal evaluation system includes multiple observations throughout the school year by trained evaluators using the TAP rubric. The incentive amount for teachers can range from \$0 to \$5000, which is up to a 10% of base salary amount. For principals, the incentive amount can be up to 12% of base salary (pages 32-33). These amounts appear to be sufficient to create change in behavior to improve student outcomes.

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 narrative provides sufficient evidence that the applicant has adequately budgeted projected costs and will provide performance based compensation to staff during the grant period and beyond.

The application notes that Knox City Schools (KCS) will increase its share of the performance based compensation payouts each year, covering 40% in year 5 (page 65).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The application fully meets this absolute priority. The project will use the TAP system, which has a 10-year record of implementation. The TAP system incorporates analysis of data throughout the process, including staff meetings, small cluster meetings, and individual meetings with teachers. Professional development is planned based on needs from student achievement data, and data from teacher and principal observations, and evaluations.

TAP aligns with the KCS's main priority on high schools, as well with the State (TN) education strategies (page 15). Tennessee's education strategy includes teacher effectiveness reform, use of value-added data, and an innovative teacher compensation system. All of these components are a part of TAP.

**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 proposal includes extensive narrative on incentives for additional responsibilities with corresponding compensation increases. Teachers can receive additional compensation as they move from career teacher to mentor teacher to master teacher. Mentor teachers receive \$7,000 additional and Master teachers receive \$12,000 additional pay, which is sufficient to incentivize. Movement toward becoming a Master teacher is based upon a competitive, performance-based process (page 18). The position responsibilities and requirements increase, as well as the compensation. Also, the evaluation level needed to be eligible for performance based compensation increases from a 2.5 for career teacher to a 3.5 for Mentor teacher to a 4.0 for Master teacher (on a 5.0 scale) (page 29).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

**1.Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

The applicant will use a planning year to develop the communication plan (pages 40-43). The narrative includes a thorough description of the process the applicant will use to modify existing communication structures and develop new ones to effectively communicate to staff and the public about TAP and the PBCS.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1.Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

The applicant notes high support of staff in the project schools for TAP, with an average of 87% (of the schools that already voted) voting in favor of implementation (well above the NIET required 75%) (page 36). The local union endorses the program, with a memorandum of agreement with KCS (page 36).

**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 narrative provides thorough and clear descriptions of both the teacher and principal evaluation systems (pages 20-27). The evaluation systems for both teachers and principals use a multi component process. Included in the process is student growth, which comprises 50% of the calculated score. Both teachers and principals are observed multiple times during the year, and rated using an evidenced based rubric. The results from observations and ratings are put into a data collection system, which supervisors can review to ensure consistency of ratings.

**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 narrative provides a brief overview of the CODE data management system (pages 45-47). The applicant indicates that the TAP data management system (CODE) can match teacher evaluation data and value-added student assessment data, as well as link these data to HR and payroll systems. The narrative notes KCS will import recruitment, retention and other HR data into a specially designed protocol in CODE (page 46).

**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 thoroughly describes the manner in which teachers and principals learn about the evaluation process and how the evaluation links to professional development. Each component of the evaluation process (used to determine effectiveness) produces data, which is then used to structure professional development activities. The activities may be for an individual teacher (e.g., based on a classroom observation from a Mentor teacher), or they may be group activities (e.g., based on error patterns from a

particular group of students on a test) (pages 47-52). The narrative describes modifications for high schools to align with their structural differences (page 47).

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

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

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

##### General:

The applicant's professional development system in TAP meets the required criteria. The professional development for teachers and principals in the TAP system is directly linked to results of components of the evaluation system (pages 47-53). Classroom observation provides data for individual teacher professional development plans. Principal professional development activities may come from survey results, staff observation data, or student achievement results. The effectiveness of professional development is evaluated through a yearly NIET school review process, as well as by district-level TAP staff during regular visits to schools (page 53).

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 narrative provides ample and appropriate documentation that the schools selected for this project are high need, with more than 50% of students living in poverty (page 4). The schools' minority percentage is disproportionately high compared to other schools in the district. The project schools have lower achievement levels than the district average. The project high schools are high priority schools as defined by the state (page 4).

The narrative states the project schools lose teachers to nearby districts because those districts have higher starting salaries and higher average salaries (page 5). Thus, recruitment and retention of highly qualified and effective teachers is difficult.

The proposed project schools perform generally lower on the state assessment than comparable schools in two counties (pages 8-9).

The application includes a complete description of "comparable" schools, which includes size of school, poverty levels, and percent minority (page 10). The KCS project schools are matched in an appropriate and reasonable manner.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant has experience with TAP, as four district schools are using the program with positive results (page 12). TAP aligns with both district and State improvement strategies (page 14).

The evaluation process uses multiple components, including student growth (which is 50% of the overall weight for both teachers and principals), observation (classroom for teachers; team and leadership for principals), and surveys for principals and teachers.

The performance awards can be as large as up to 10% of base salary (\$5000 for teachers) which, combined with a recruitment bonus (\$3000), will overcome salary discrepancies with neighboring districts and foster retention (page 16).

The staff in most of the KCS project schools have voted on implementing the TAP system, with 87% in favor, well above the 75% required by NIET. The schools that were unable to have a vote will vote in August 2010. The principals at those schools support TAP implementation (page 37).

Teacher and principal professional development plans are directly linked with results obtained from a component of the evaluation process.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The narrative is insufficient in the description of what one year's growth represents on the achievement measure.

The narrative is insufficient in the description of the data management system (CODE) and its ability to integrate and provide the data and reports necessary to link value-added performance to effectiveness of teachers and compensation (pages 45-46).

**Reader's Score: 54**

#### **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 management plan is thorough and somewhat detailed. Included in the plan are tasks related to ensure full and complete implementation of the TAP system, which is a positive part of the management plan, as it addresses sustainability after the grant funding period (page 56).

The management plan in the narrative includes milestones for each of the five years of the grant, with appropriate activities denoted for each of the project goals. The plan includes the responsible party, and the year in which it will be completed.

The narrative includes information related to the qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project staff. The key staff, including the project director, have experience with similar projects, and the time commitments are sufficient and appropriate for carrying out their project responsibilities (pages 60-61).

The narrative notes KCS will increase its share of the funding for the program, and by year 5 cover 40% of the performance-based compensation payouts (page 65). The narrative describes a plan to redirect other federal and state funds to support implementation of the TAP program beyond the grant funding period. Local funds have been allocated for additional master teacher positions, which indicates support for the success of the project (page 66).

The NIET has over ten years experience with the TAP system. As a project partner, NIET indicates the funds are sufficient and reasonable for full implementation with fidelity.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The milestones presented in the narrative are insufficient. Dates need to be specific to a particular month in the project rather than tied to a yearly timeline (pages 57-59). This enables more precise monitoring to ensure the project is on track for successful implementation and completion.

The hiring and training of two staff for the project in the district may delay activities and postpone completion dates and milestones (pages 61-62).

**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 application narrative documents an appropriate evaluation design and plan which addresses all of the required criteria and components.

The narrative provides a thorough description of the evaluation plan. The goals are reasonable and appropriate, and aligned with the overall project objectives (pages 69-71).

The evaluation design for all three goals include both qualitative and quantitative measures, using appropriate tools and methods of data collection. When possible, comparison data on a state, regional, or national level will be used (page 72).

The design seeks to provide maximum information for feedback to make the project more replicable and ensure improvement throughout the funding period. The narrative states the evaluator will provide regular communications to NIET and KCS (page 73).

##### **Weaknesses:**

The performance objectives are not measurable as described in the narrative. They do not specify targets for performance or the amount of increases in performance (pages 69-71).

**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:**

KCS will use student value-added growth as 50% of the weight for both teacher and principal evaluation processes (page 20). The district has the capacity to implement the model, as it has been using the State value-added system for over ten years. The application narrative clearly describes the communications it used with staff to explain the evaluation process, and how components of the evaluation process are directly linked with professional development activities and improved classroom practices. Tennessee and KCS have used the TVAAS value-added model for over ten years, so teachers have substantial experience with it.

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative does not provide much information about the value-added scores. For example, the application does not define what one year's growth represents. However, KCS has reported and used the State value-added system for over ten years, so teachers should know how the value-added results connect to the TN state standards, district curriculum, and classroom practices to improve student achievement.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The KCS project will focus on TAP implementation in the district's four neediest high schools (page 15). A recruitment bonus will be offered to teachers of hard-to-staff subjects (page 16). To receive the bonus, teachers must return the following year and demonstrate effectiveness. The applicant indicates they will note on websites which schools and subject areas are hard to staff (page 18). In addition, recruitment efforts with local colleges will be undertaken with graduating students (page 18). KCS uses the Teacher Insight survey to predict (and identify) classroom teaching effectiveness (page 17). That survey instrument is thoroughly researched and tested to identify potentially

superior teachers. This combination of the TAP components, recruitment bonuses, and Teacher Insight survey should result in the identification of effective teachers who remain in this project's high-need schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

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

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

|   |            |           |
|---|------------|-----------|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60         | 53        |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |            |           |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25         | 20        |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |            |           |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5          | 3         |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | <b>100</b> | <b>86</b> |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

|                  |           |          |
|------------------|-----------|----------|
| <b>Sub Total</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
|------------------|-----------|----------|

|              |            |           |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>110</b> | <b>94</b> |
|--------------|------------|-----------|

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100090)

### 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:

This application does have a planning year to complete Core Element 3 related to the evaluation system design. The applicant has developed a plan for a PBCS that rewards teachers and principals that have demonstrated effectiveness with various amounts of money (p. 15). These amounts should be significant to impact teacher and principal behavior. Student growth is 50% of the measurement. The awardees are evaluated at least twice per year by multiple evaluators. Both announced and unannounced observations are used and this will ensure consistency in the teachers' performance. The plan does use a rubric from the TAP system called Skills and Knowledge. It has 19 indicators and a 5 point rating scale providing a wide range of information (p. 20). Other roles such as mentor and master teachers can provide leadership opportunities for teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

- (a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and
- (b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

**General:**

The applicant has provided a budget with great detail, including professional development activities, recruitment bonuses, salaries, benefits, audit, communication, grant evaluation, and travel (see Budget Narrative). The district matches 10% in year 2 and increases 5% per year up to 40% total at the end of the grant. There is no indication of other federal funds or the sustainability from local funds to show where the district funds would come from after the five years.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The application does tie into the districts' and the state of Tennessee's strategy for improving student performance (p. 14 - 15). Hard-to-staff areas, retention bonuses, and salary augmentations for the most effective teachers will be used to strengthen the educator workforce of the schools (p.16). The NIET will assist the district with the implementation of the CODE data entry system to help monitor the professional development, student performance, and tenure decisions of the PBCS campuses (p. 22).

**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 PBCS that is proposed will give significant bonuses to motivate the best teacher to take on mentor and master teacher responsibilities (p. 16). The concern is that there is only one master teacher per campus and this may not have the impact that it is designed to have because master teachers are needed to assist the new teachers and improve ineffective teachers. The applicant suggests plans that will provide training and incentives for teachers to take on the additional roles. The use of mentor and master teachers can assist the campus leadership in working with young and inexperienced teachers.

**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 plan calls for \$30,000 a year in communication costs for a professional public relations firm. This should enable the administrators to focus on education and let the communication experts focus on the communication.

NIET has already met with most of the campuses that have been selected and has already engaged in a dialogue about PBCS (p.40). Professional development activities, the Knox County Schools website, and conferences will be used to communicate during the grant period (p.41).

**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:**

NIET is the fiscal agent for this grant and has already partnered with the Knoxville schools (p. 53). Letters of support from community organizations and the superintendent are included. This previous relationship with the district will strengthen the outcomes of this grant. The teacher organizations have written support of this grant.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

The applicant demonstrated that it will use multiple observations conducted at least twice per year and use evidence-based rubrics (P. 21- 26). The plan calls for selected campuses to incorporate a number of data pieces to evaluate the teachers and principals (p. 27 - 33). NIET has had experience with the TAP system for ten years and this experience, coupled with evidence-based evaluation systems, will ensure a solid, fair system. Inter-rater reliability was documented in the proposal. The student growth measures will be a significant factor in addressing teacher effectiveness.

**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 grant calls for the use of a data-management system called CODE (p. 45-46). This system will provide reports that can drill down to the individual teacher and be used by the evaluator for continuous growth (p. 46). CODE has been used before by TAP systems, which means an easier transition for the applicant. The applicant indicates they will use a web-based software program, CODE, to connect the data to the district's financial and human capital systems. Inadequate information is provided about CODE.

**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 TAP programs schedule time during the day for ongoing professional development on the PBCS (p. 48). Cluster meetings and other support systems are in place to assist with understanding the specific measures of the teacher and principal effectiveness program

(p. 49). In addition, the contractor has demonstrated a successful history of teacher satisfaction when implementing the TAP system. Professional development is directly tied to the evaluations because the master teachers are regularly in the classrooms evaluating teachers and coaching. This coaching serves as informal professional development.

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 that the applicant discusses is not specific, however, it indicates that the program of training will be based on the needs of the individual teacher and principal, based on their evaluations and value-added growth measures of the students. There are regular opportunities for assessing the effectiveness of the professional development and helping the teachers make improvements to their instruction (p. 47- 53). The principals will have weekly meetings with key staff which will allow for continuous feedback on a number of factors including the professional development needed and offered.

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a high need for this project. The applicant clearly explains the salary differences, travel time for employees, and high turnover rate of teachers and principals in the participating schools (p. 6-7). Research is presented showing that the less experienced teachers are less effective. The data is presented to demonstrate the difficulty in retaining highly qualified personnel. The state has also increased the requirements of science at the high school and the applicant provides evidence that this will cause difficulty in employing highly qualified teachers in this subject.

Student achievement in these selected schools is very low. The applicant provides data to show that these schools are in need of improvement. Some have missed AYP for 4 - 8 years in a row.

The applicant goes outside of the county, but stays in the state, to adequately document comparable schools from urban settings. The comparable schools have scores stronger than the selected schools of the application.

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

## Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The proposal of using TAP is aligned with the LEA and statewide strategies (p. 14). The superintendent, along with a community team, and the board, have established a 5 year plan to build on Knox County Schools' goals and objectives (p. 14). TAP was written into the Tennessee state plan for Race to the Top (p. 15). The proposal demonstrates how teachers and principals can earn performance bonuses (p. 16). TAP's experiences in other schools have shown an increase in teacher retention rates, which the PBCS campuses plan to accomplish with the help of this grant (p. 15). A strong communication system is in place to recruit potential candidates for hard-to- staff areas and to communicate with the community (p. 18). The teachers have given their vote of support for this project. Pre- and post- conferences with teachers are beneficial to the communication and continuous feedback necessary for student success.

The application does an adequate job in discussing the rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system, the data-management system, and how the district will incorporate high-quality professional development activities. The professional development is linked to the evaluation system. The evaluation system uses multiple ratings that consider student growth as a significant factor. All of these activities will boost the success of the PBCS campuses.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The rating system for value-added growth is vague; and the point value is labeled in broad terms, "Significantly more" or "less than," making it difficult to understand the rigor of the program (p. 20).

The data piece is a third party product called CODE (Comprehensive Online Data Entry System). The applicant explains that CODE will keep track of scores and give reports, but it is unclear on how it will calculate the growth and connect the data to the district's financial and human resources departments (p. 23).

**Reader's Score: 53**

#### **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:**

A majority of the teachers and leaders on the proposed campuses have heard presentations on TAP and have voted to move forward. The letters of support are from the principals of the campuses involved. The management has a solid history of working with federal grants and the TAP system. Key personnel have the experience with TAP that will lead to a successful grant as evidenced by the resumes of the management team. The district is in full support of this program, which will help when it comes time to fully fund the program without TIF money.

##### **Weaknesses:**

The timelines are not well-defined as they do not provide specific details on what needs to be completed beyond a given program year.

While the applicant discusses the transfer of funds from federal grant dollars to local dollars, the local share is still only 40% at the end of the five years which may affect successful sustainability of the project. The other concern is that the district does not identify where the local funds are going to come from, either during the grant or at the end of the grant period, for sustainability.

**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 application includes a section on how the applicant will provide a quality local evaluation. This section describes what the evaluator will have access to and how the evaluation will be tied to the goals of the program. The applicant describes the evaluation as quantitative and qualitative. (p. e3). The application includes adequate procedures for continuous improvement and feedback on the operation of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not indicate specific quantitative performance objectives. Without these objectives it is difficult to evaluate the quality of the program's effectiveness.

**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 has a significant history with PBCS and value-added performance measures. The state's use of value-added performance measures and KCS's experience will be a major factor in the successful implementation of this system. The applicant has a comprehensive plan to communicate the value-added measures to the teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

While the application discusses the data system as robust, it does not inform the reader on how i can guarantee data quality or how the district will work with district systems. This could lead to a problem in capacity to implement the value-added measures. It does not inform the reader on how it can guarantee data quality or how the data system will work.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant does an outstanding job selecting and demonstrating that KCS will target the neediest campuses in the area - both needy by student achievement and with regards to the availability of effective teachers in hard-to-fill subjects. The applicant proposes an extensive plan to fill the hard-to-fill subject areas. NIET has a history of strong communication systems to effectively reach teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:04 PM