

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100088)

**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	10
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	44
<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	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	81

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100088)

### 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 Consortium will reallocate existing resources to fund the current award amount at progressively increasing levels and is committed to fund it after the grant period ends.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The Consortium seeks to expand the success identified in student achievement in the forty-five schools currently participating in this PBCS program across the state. The Consortium 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 strategies identified by the Consortium to improve the process for rewarding teachers and principals (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 Consortium 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 Consortium 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 collaborating LEA to ensure successful implementation of the program model. Participating teachers and administrators will be actively involved in the planning and implementation of the project. At this point the involvement of unions is not expected since the project resides in a Consortium of charter schools in a right to work state.

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 proposed evaluation system 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. 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. Student growth will be a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation.

**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 Consortium will contract with NIET to its their Content Organization Data Entry (CODE) data management system. It will link Human Resources and pay roll 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:**

Participating teachers and administrators will be involved in ongoing professional development to build their understanding of the PBCS program and the TAP model. They will work learn about the evaluation instrument as well as be made aware of the 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 a Consortium of five chronically underperforming charter schools (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty and high minority, and have lower achievement data than comparable schools.

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

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 Consortium seeks to expand the success identified in student achievement in forty-five schools currently participating in this PBCS program across the state. These five charter schools were chosen because they are of highest need as indicated on state assessments (E12). It is supported by the Consortium's strategies to improve the process for rewarding teachers and principals (E14).

The selection of the TAP methodology was chosen for its alignment to the Consortium's strategy for rewarding effective educators in selected high need schools (E11). TAP will offer the individual charter schools 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 Consortium, 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 measure.

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 Charter Superintendent, the individual charters' board chair and staff (E39).

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 Consortium will contract with NIET to use their Content Organization Data Entry (CODE) data management system in each individual school. It will link their Human Resources and payroll to student achievement data.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's evaluation instrument rating system for value added growth was unclear. It differentiates effectiveness with broad categories that do not present a clear picture of individual strengths and weaknesses (E20).

**Reader's Score: 44**

**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.

**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: 2**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The PBCS will collect a variety of quantitative or qualitative data including student assessment data, teacher 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. Value-added data will be analyzed to provide teachers at faculty meetings and individual conferences feedback to improve classroom practice (E29).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

Proposed project will address the academic needs of a Consortium of five chronically underperforming schools (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty, high minority, and have lower achievement data than comparable schools.

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

**Weaknesses:**

The recruitment activities to attract effective experienced teachers and teachers in high need schools seem minimal and do not seem to give the Consortium an advantage in selecting from a quality applicant pool.

**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 -- , (S385A100088)

**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	45
<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	79

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100088)

### 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 (page 12). The narrative notes that for teachers, student 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 \$2500 to \$5000, which is up to a 10% of base salary amount. For principals, the incentive amount can be up to \$10,000. The applicant included in the narrative research that indicates an award of 5% is sufficient to incentivize teachers (page 29). 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 the Consortium will increase its share of the performance based compensation payouts each year, covering 60% in year 5 (page 57).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The application fully meets this absolute priority. The narrative notes that the Consortium explored various reform options that aligned to their strategy for increasing educator effectiveness. The Consortium selected TAP, which has a 10-year record of implementation, because TAP aligned with district needs, organizational goals, and initiatives regarding recruiting and retaining effective teachers for instructing high need students.

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. Teacher retention decisions (receiving a letter to continue employment) are based upon value added scores from the teacher's students (or school) along with teacher professional growth. All of these components of TAP are aligned with the Consortium's strategy for improving the workforce.

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 \$5,400 additional and Master teachers receive \$13,500 additional pay, which is sufficient to incentivize. Movement toward becoming a Master teacher is based upon a competitive, performance-based process (page 14). 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).

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 narrative provides a thorough explanation of the internal and external communication strategies. Communications begin prior to beginning TAP, as teachers learn about the TAP system through a variety of forums and meetings. Following these opportunities to learn about TAP, a vote is taken. To be accepted by NIET into the TAP program, a school must have a positive vote of at least 75% of the teachers in the schools to move forward. The schools in the Consortium had positive votes ranging from 86%-96%, indicating a high level of support from the staff. Communications continue throughout the TAP implementation as various components of TAP are reviewed and acted upon during weekly TAP Leadership Team meetings, staff meetings, cluster meetings, and meetings between a Career teacher and a Mentor teacher.

With TAP, the compensation system is aligned and integrated with professional development, promotion or retention, and instruction. Therefore, weekly meetings and communications in the school with teachers, as well as professional development activities, all are directly connected to the compensation portion of TAP.

External communications include recruitment for teachers and principals at the Consortium schools.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1. Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

The teachers in the consortium voted 93% in favor of using the TAP system. This indicates substantially more support from the teachers in these schools than the 75% level required by NIET for acceptance into the TAP program. The principals at each school provided letters of support for TAP (page 33).

**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. 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 40-41). 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 does not clearly describe the data management system (CODE) to determine how well and in what form student achievement data can be linked to payroll and HR systems.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

##### 1. Core Element 5:

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

##### General:

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).

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. 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.

**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 narrative provides in text and tabular form strong evidence that the Consortium schools have a history of low student achievement compared to similar schools in the state, and that each of the project schools are high need schools as defined by the state (pages 4-6) and the NIA. All of the Consortium schools were previously taken over by the State because of their low achievement. The narrative documents that each of the schools has a large percentage of first year teachers, indicating difficulty in retaining teachers in the school (page 8). The narrative provides the criteria for selecting comparable schools, which included selecting schools in close proximity to the project schools, with comparable percentages of students living in poverty, and same grade levels in the schools, which are appropriate selection criteria (pages 9-10). The Consortium schools have lower achievement than the comparable schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

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 TAP system is consistent with Louisiana's efforts to improve teacher quality and increase student growth. Because so many schools are using TAP in LA, the State created a statewide network for TAP schools, which will provide support to members of this consortium.

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 responsibility surveys for principals and teachers (page 18). Results from the Responsibilities Surveys are included in the total Skills-Knowledge-Responsibilities (SKR) score, which is 50% of the total evaluation score.

The performance awards can be as large as up to 10% of base salary (\$5000 for teachers, \$10,000 for principals). That is a sufficient amount of money to impact behavior (page 30).

Of the staff in the consortium schools, 93% voted in favor of the TAP system, well above the 75% required by NIET.

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

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative does not include how a year's growth is calculated on the assessment.

The narrative does not address how much above a year's growth is "much more than" a year's growth, how that is determined, and whether it is a statistically significant difference in growth.

The narrative does not specify the assessment on which the growth measure will be calculated. Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether the instrument provides reliable measures of student growth.

The narrative does not clearly describe the data management system (CODE) to determine how well and in what form student achievement data can be linked to payroll and HR systems (pages 40-41).

**Reader's Score: 45**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The application management plan includes tasks to ensure full and complete implementation of the TAP system. This focus on fidelity of implementation, a positive part of the management plan, ensures sustainability of TAP after the grant funding (pages 49-50).

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 a timeline for when it will be completed (pages 50-52).

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 52-53).

The narrative notes the Consortium will increase its share of the funding for the program, and by year 5 cover 60% of the performance-based compensation payouts. The narrative describes a plan to redirect other federal and state funds to support implementation of the TAP program beyond the grant period (pages 57-58).

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 timeline should be more precise, providing specific months for completion rather than just yearly timeframes, which would assist in monitoring progress and knowing that the project is on track.

**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 narrative provides a thorough description of the evaluation plan. The goals are reasonable and appropriate, and aligned with the overall project objectives (pages 60-62).

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.

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 the consortium (page 64).

**Weaknesses:**

The performance objectives in the narrative are not sufficiently measurable as they do not include targets or percentage of improvement desired (pages 60-62).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Consortium will use student value-added growth as 50% of the weight for both teacher and principal evaluation processes. The Consortium will contract with a vendor to calculate value-added scores (page 21). The narrative notes the Consortium will use CODE, a data management system designed for the TAP system, to manage teacher observations and other data collection activities which are a part of TAP. 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.

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative does not provide complete information about the capacity of the applicant to implement the value-added model. Without a description of the value-added model that the applicant will use, along with information about the test that will be administered, it is not possible to assess the ability of the applicant to ensure data quality or communicate how to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Each of the schools in the Consortium is a high need school, and has a history of large percentages of first year teachers each year. In the position postings, the schools will note which positions are considered hard to staff. The consortium high school has a high percentage of first year teachers each year, covering all content areas. The narrative notes that in Louisiana, at the high school level, all subject areas have been denoted by the USED as hard to staff subjects.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not sufficiently articulate how it will determine that a teacher filling a hard to staff position is likely to be effective, except that if the teacher is willing to accept the position with the incentives instead of going to another district, they assume that teacher is higher "quality" than otherwise would have been hired without the incentives. It is unclear from the narrative whether the TAP system will be effective in retaining teachers in teaching positions in 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 -- , (S385A100088)

**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>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<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>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	7
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	40
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	15
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	65

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	3
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	68
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

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

Applicant: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching -- , (S385A100088)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

The applicant has designed a system that provides different rewards for different types of positions (teacher, principal). The amounts are adequate to influence teacher and principal behavior.

The applicant has included observation-based assessments for the teachers and principals and has provided a tool to review student growth, although the explanation is not detailed. It is clearly stated that there is significant weight given to student growth in determining teacher and principal effectiveness.

The applicant discusses two to three observations per year, but does not explain when the evaluation will take place or if they will be at multiple points in the year. The pre- and post- conferences will have significant impact on the success of the evaluation (p. 40).

The applicant mentions other roles, but does not explain these roles, other than being a mentor or master teacher.

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 established a 60 month budget and has accepted the responsibility for continuing the program after the 60 months with other funds; however, it is unclear to the reviewer what non-TIF funds will sustain this project (Budget Narrative). Non-TIF funds are proposed to increase over the five years to pay for compensation.

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 applicant discusses connecting the data and evaluations to professional development, but does not link a budget item for this professional development nor indicate how the professional development will be provided other than during the school day and through tuition reimbursement. The applicant states that this proposal is in alignment with the state strategy for strengthening the educator workforce.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

**General:**

The applicant discusses career teachers becoming mentor and master teachers (p. 14-15), but does not provide much detail on what these additional responsibilities will require. These additional roles should be effective incentives for the best teachers to stay and assist new 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 applicant demonstrates a strong plan for communication in this application. It includes training and information sessions on the performance pay plan, postings on the web, a data bank, and assistance from a communications director. The plan calls for a strong communication piece since many of these schools are no longer run by the district, but by a charter organization. They have both internal and external communication systems in place (p. 35).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1.Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

The applicant has plans for teacher involvement. The use of the TAP system, which has ten years of history in other districts, gives the applicant data to backup their claim of teacher support. The applicant provided letters of support from leadership teams that have experienced this system. There is little evidence that the teachers and principals have had significant influence on this particular application.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1.Core Element 3:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The**

evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

**General:**

The applicant has designed systems to be put in place to ensure at least two, if not three observations per year will occur for teachers and principals. The applicant provided a description of the evidence-based rubric that will be used to evaluate principals and teachers (p. 42). There will be meetings between principals and teachers to facilitate teacher growth. These meetings will be used to evaluate principal effectiveness. It is not clear how this meeting will improve leadership performance. Student growth will be a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluations. There is no factual evidence of inter-rater reliability.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The applicant plans on using a data management program (CODE) that links student data to teacher data and human resources. This program is managed by a third party and little evidence is given to the reader to explain the web-based software (p. 40-1).

**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 explains the specific measures for teacher and principal effectiveness. The plan calls for professional development to explain the guidelines to the staff. In addition, the firm that is planning on implementing this program within the schools has extensive experience with measurement using value-added data. The firm that will be used to help implement this PBCS has extensive relationships with teachers in this state, so experience should help drive communication. The professional development should be beneficial because it appears to be linked to the teacher/principal evaluation results.

**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:**

These schools are some of the lowest performing in the state. A company has taken them over for the state and they have become charter schools. The firm taking over these schools has extensive experience nationally with professional development that has proven to be highly effective.

The application also indicates that the leadership plans on adjusting the professional development according to the needs of the staff (and students) as identified by teacher evaluations and student growth measure results. The applicant indicates that it will regularly monitor the professional development to ensure it is effectively improving teacher and leadership practices.

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 district has been able to show that the high-need schools in these Louisiana districts are truly high-need. The application specifically highlights the need for math, science and special education teachers, especially in the upper grade levels. The turnover rate is very high (p.8).

In addition, the free and reduced meals percentage for this group of campuses is over 90%. The application demonstrates the poor achievement of students at these schools as all campuses in this application have been rated Academic Unacceptable for the past five years (p. 5). These schools have been taken over by the state because they have a history of under performing (p. 4). This application will include not only the secondary schools, but the elementary schools that feed into those low performing high schools (p.5).

All of these negative attributes contribute to being a high need set of schools. Evidence is provided that these schools have a hard time finding teachers and will be challenged to pass whatever assessments are required.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The selection and definition of comparable schools is unclear (p. 8). This makes it challenging to evaluate the performance of the applicant schools compared to the comparable schools.

**Reader's Score: 7**

#### **Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The project design that is proposed is in line with district and state strategies to improve teacher effectiveness as measured by student growth. The measurement for effective teachers is at least 50% affected by student growth. The measures used in this project include a value-added score (p. 18). The compensation plan is significant enough to affect the behaviors of the professional employees to be recruited to these schools and stay in these high need schools. The applicant provides a clear explanation of effective teachers and principals as evidenced by the explanation of the evaluation system that includes the multiple rating system. The faculty of the district has already overwhelmingly voted to support this proposal.

The application provides an adequate description of the professional development that is targeted to assist teachers in need (p. 42). The applicant provides the names of a number of conferences that will be available to staff, especially in the form of learning more about PBCS. The use of teacher leadership meetings and clusters will allow the campus leadership to focus on the individual needs of his/her campus and teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

The application states that the data management program, CODE, can link student achievement data to teacher/principal pay, but it doesn't explain how or what will cause the achievement to raise the staff incentive amount (p.40-41). CODE is used in the majority of the nation's TAP schools, but the applicant fails to identify how the data is gathered into CODE and what happens to the data after it has been entered. It is unclear if CODE is effective or not in aligning to district data functions.

The methodology is a bit confusing on how the value-added score will be used and derived. The value-added score rubric on page 19 does not specifically state what is "more" or "much more," or "less" or "much less." The applicant fails to state what assessment instrument will be used to determine the value-added scores.

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 team from NIET has well-documented success with federal grants and at-risk schools. The key personnel in place are well-qualified to carry out their responsibilities. The positions that have not been filled have significant required qualifications to make a positive impact on this project. The applicant's consulting team has a strong history of success. The projected costs are reasonable to attain the goals necessary (p. 59).

**Weaknesses:**

The consortium has plans to support the proposed project, but those plans are based on trying to get five different schools to redirect funds already allocated to other programs (p. 57). The applicant also is expecting serious enrollment growth to generate additional funds to support the ongoing efforts, but no evidence is provided on how districts will be able to double the enrollment (p. 58). It is difficult to evaluate the management plan because the timeline is vague.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation is ongoing and designed to provide constant feedback for student success (p. 64). The schools have the support and evaluation tools from the consortium, the NIET research team and a data specialist. The application calls for a solid action plan on how the district and the support teams plan on providing continuous improvements and feedback by hosting a variety of meetings, from weekly cluster meetings to whole district and national reviews. These meetings will provide excellent opportunities for an ongoing dialogue. There is a plan for storing the data in a web-based file server so it is easily retrievable by an evaluation team.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not state their objectives in measurable terms. It will therefore be difficult to do quantitative evaluations.

**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 the capacity to implement the proposed model through the data management system and with the experience of the contracted management team. The applicant has a plan to explain the value-added model and how to use the data generated to the teachers through faculty meetings, local and national conferences, and an internal website (p. 32).

**Weaknesses:**

The value-added system is not clear. On page 19, it discusses a point system which states, "much more growth" or "more than a year's growth" and so forth. It doesn't explain what constitutes "much more growth."

**Reader's Score: 2**

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has designed a program that will be able to recruit teachers in hard to fill positions by advertising and offering competitive salaries and incentives (p. 17).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not demonstrate how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. TAP uses measures to identify minimum performance levels to determine performance based compensation and they define "effective" as "teachers who qualify for any portion of the performance award."

Reader's Score: 1

---

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