

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

**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>	<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	45
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	10
<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	5
--------------------------	---	---

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	72
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

### 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 New York State Board of Education proposes a TIF project to fund a PBCS that establishes a ladder reward system for teachers and principals in 48 schools located in four urban districts. The background and development of the NYS evaluation process, as recently mandated by the legislature, make up the major part of the proposal.

a) The NYSED Teacher and Principal Career Development Continua (TPCDC) emphasizes student growth as a primary measure in teacher effectiveness. The State's new evaluation procedure will take into account student achievement as measured using a state-mandated value-added growth model as well as classroom observation and other measures. It will provide a platform on which to build accountability throughout the state's education system. A committee, Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee (p 20) will be formed to provide recommendations to the Commissioner and the Board of Regents. Other measures will be devised locally.

b) Although classroom observation is mentioned in passing, there is little description of its importance in the evaluation process. A table describing other examples of evaluative tools is provided.

The decisions about incentive amounts, tiers of effective teaching status, relationship

to tenure, promotion and leadership responsibilities are built into the state wide mandate (p 16).

c) The PBCS will be aligned to the NYS teacher and principal career ladders - the Teacher and Principal Career Development Continua (TPCDC). The development of TPCDC is in currently in process, and funded by other means than TIF. It is being developed through collaboration between LEAs, teacher and principal certification systems, unions, and other relevant entities. There is no input from a TIF viewpoint. According to the budget narrative, the laddered PBCS awards will range from 13% to 20% of the rewarded teacher and/or principal salary. The state based the reward amount on extensive research summarized in a report cited from the Center for Educator Reform (2008) (p 47).

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:

a) The applicant will use little of the TIF funds for development, administration or implementation of the TIF project. Those functions will be provided through state funding and/or other grants. TIF funds will be used almost exclusively for PBCS incentives awards with a very small percentage dedicated to the planning year expenses, professional development, and evaluation procedures (budget narrative).

b) The incentive reward strategy will continue to be an integral part of the NYSED policies; therefore the state will be responsible for the funds necessary to continue the program after the grant period. The applicant indicates the state funds will assume an increasing portion of the incentive rewards during the grant (budget narrative).

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The applicant indicates the TIF funds will be used for an important Professional Development strategy - Network Teams - if the requested RTTT proposal which includes that strategy is not funded. Other than that, TIF will be used to fund an evaluation and incentive plan devised under other means. NYSED has put in motion a comprehensive and far-reaching teacher remuneration plan that hinges on rigorous evaluation of teachers and principals. A system of professional development for new teachers and teachers with difficulties as well as for the entire teacher/principal population is included.

**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 describes in detail the Transfer Fund and the Innovative Supplemental Compensation Fund (p 43) that will be used to provide incentives for teachers who take teaching assignments in high-need schools and principals who assume administrative responsibility for those schools. The funds are not a part of the TIF PBCS - they are requested in the RTTT proposal. TIF funds are to be devoted to PBCS incentives for the ladder teaching and leadership awards; extra responsibilities incentives are not included. A chart is provided that describes the levels of teacher incentives from "Professional" through "Master" to "Leader" (p 45).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

NOT MET: WILL DEVELOP THE PLAN DURING THE PLANNING YEAR.

NYS will use the planning year to develop and implement a plan to effectively communicate interactively with teachers, principals and each school's community. A rich process of engagement with the involved populations through print, video, in-person workshops, etc., will insure their continued involvement in the project (pp 48, 49).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

- 1. Core Element 2:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's involvement and support of teachers, principals,**

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

**General:**

NOT MET: WILL DEVELOP THE PLAN DURING THE PLANNING YEAR.

Unions were involved in the development of the state legislative process that produced the educational evaluation program, as was all other relevant populations. The impression received from the proposal is that of a distancing of the TIF project from the state mandate, other than funding the PBCS, with little input from any personnel dedicated to the TIF program. Planning for the overall state mandated principal and teacher career development continua will include participating LEAs, faculty and administrators. Unions will have input to the performance pay scales (p 49). A Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee (TPEAC) will be formed to provide recommendations to the Commissioner in conjunction with the development of the student growth model.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

NOT MET

New York State has mandated a new evaluation system that includes student growth and classroom observation. The law mandates a statewide value-added growth model that will comprise 40% of the teacher evaluations. Measures to document student growth are noted. The remaining 60% of evaluations will be based on locally developed measures through collective bargaining and can include classroom observations. Although classroom observation is included, there is no mandate for multiple (at least twice a year) observations. Inter-rater reliability is not mentioned (p 18, 19). A rating rubric will be implemented.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation or plan to implement, a data-management system that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register

notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

**General:**

NOT MET

NYS will develop a state-wide instructional reporting and improvement system. It will provide student-level data and analysis in a customizable format. Access will be through an online Education Data Portal which will be available at some level to all relevant parties (p 25). Reports and data will be made available to LEA teachers, superintendents and boards to assist their instructional programs in comprehensive evaluation. Student achievement linkage to payroll and Human Resources systems is not mentioned.

**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:**

MET

The Professional Development Network Teams and Inquiry Teams will ensure that teachers and principals will be informed and understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS and receive PD that enables them to use data generated to improve their practice. The Data Portal System will give access to teachers so that they can communicate with each other to share strategies and resources. (p 34, 38).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development**

**1. High Quality Professional Development:**

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and

skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to

(1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

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

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

**General:**

- 1) The professional development will be based on comprehensive data collected that identifies the needs of the student (p 32). The PD program will be based on model system currently used in New York. Resources will be available to learn about appropriate intervention which will be particularly helpful for teachers in the lowest performing schools. The system will draw on best practices from other states nationwide. The system proposed is comprehensive.
- 2) The state has as model system in place that provides integrated professional development based on data. The NYS school staff and faculty will have access to that state-wide instructional reporting and improvement system. Education Data Portal will make available comprehensive data information that will be used to design PD based on needs assessed at high-need schools and can be targeted to group and/or individual needs. The design of the professional development component of the NYSED state-wide evaluation program is funded by the state and various other agencies (p 32).
- 3) The system described above is state wide - it applies to all teachers in all schools; therefore, is available to teachers who do not receive differentiated compensation. The PD described is focused on student achievement goals.
- 4) The DATA Portal provides constantly up-graded information on student reports and student growth, thus giving access to student needs (p 34).
- 5) The Data Portal is a powerful tool in allowing access to information necessary to make modifications in relevant procedures, whether student achievement or improving PD (p 34). Teacher and Principal Career Development Continuums have been developed. These will guide development through Professional through Master to Leader career steps and direct regular assessment. Input from peers and students will be sought along with many other indicators of a deeper level of proficiency.

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:**

High-need schools are documented in terms of free and reduced lunch and in the on-going difficulty to recruit and retain highly effective teachers in those schools. Numerous statistical tables are provided to support the decision of the NYSED to mandate a comprehensive evaluation and incentive program. Forty schools in four large urban districts will be included in the TIF program - All have 60% or above free and reduced lunch students. Most schools chosen all have very low proficiency averages in both ELA and Math - at least 20 percentages points lower than the statewide average.

**Weaknesses:**

There is little rationale given for schools with relatively high proficiency rates (such as JCW HS, World of Inquiry: Table A, p 10), were chosen as participant schools by their districts.

Comparable school comparison is not provided as required in the TIF guidelines. Only state figures are used for comparison (Table A, p 10).

The applicant's definition of comparable school is not given.

**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 PBCS will be aligned to the NYS teacher and principal career ladders - the Teacher and Principal Career Development Continua (TPCDC). The graph provided indicates the steps - Professional, Master, and Leader - are clearly defined. Eligibility criteria, roles and responsibilities are listed. The outline meets TIF guidelines. The development of TPCDC is currently in process, and funded by other means than TIF.

The NYSED TPCDC emphasizes student growth as a primary measure in teacher effectiveness. The decisions about incentive amounts, tiers of effective teaching status, relationship to tenure, promotion and leadership responsibilities are built into the state wide mandate. The TIF budget narrative is a documentation of the incentive reward levels and categories. Research indicated the size of the awards necessary so that they would be of sufficient incentive to teachers to teach and remain, at high-need schools. Tables are provided that show the NYS Teacher Development Continuum (p 29) and the Principal Development Continuum (p 31).

Relevant populations, particularly unions, had input in the state mandated legislation that guides the evaluation system.

Two PD strategies are discussed at length: The Education Data Portal (EDP), and the Network Teams. The Network Teams support school-based inquiry teams (p 37). They work together to analyze data from the EDP and develop intervention strategies. The purpose is clear - to provide professional development linking student achievement to specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness.

#### **Weaknesses:**

It is not clear how or by whom the professional development information generated by the EDP will be organized and presented other than through the network teams. The make-up of the network teams is provided, but the manner in which they are recruited is not clear. There is no provision indicated for professional development management as it applies to the TIF grant.

It is not indicated if the Data Portal can link student achievement to the teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

Although classroom observation is mentioned in passing, there is little description of its importance in the evaluation process.

There is no oversight provided specifically for the TIF funds.

It is not clear if there is any continuing input requested from teachers.

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 TIF program is under the aegis of the NYSED. It is incorporated into the much larger state-wide restructuring of the teacher evaluation and pay determination that is mandated by the state. The management and administration will be under the State Education Department.

The state will assume increasing responsibility for the awards as the grant progresses, and to maintain the PBCS program after the grant funds are gone.

Dr. John King, Senior Deputy to the Commissioner of Education is listed as Project Director (Application form). The applicant notes that LEAs participating in the TIF program will be supported by NYSED's Office of District Services (p 7).

The state will assume increasing fiscal responsibility for the PBCS awards as the grant progresses (p 50).

The TIF project will continue to be supported by other State and grant funds after the TIF funds are gone (p 50).

**Weaknesses:**

No management plan is provided. No person is charged with the responsibility of the TIF funds. Although Dr. King is listed on the required application page as PD, there is no note of time commitment or duties assigned to him.

No other key personnel devoted to the TIF grant are identified.

No time commitment to the TIF program per se is noted.

Reader's Score: 10

**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:**

A broad outline of a local evaluation plan is presented. An external evaluator will be selected through a competitive RFP who will evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the state's teacher and principal performance-based compensation system (p 51). The evaluator will follow the same basic design as is proposed for the TIF national evaluation, using study schools in comparison with control schools. The Educational Data Portal will be used to provide the required data elements. Performance objectives are listed. The evaluative tools will not only be quantitative data, but in-depth phone interviews, case studies and surveys will be employed.

**Weaknesses:**

The expected performance improvement of the study schools is very small - 4% and 5% over the five year grant period (p 52).

Formative evaluation procedures to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the program are not addressed. Few of the data elements to be used are provided.

The evaluation plan is very sketchy. It depends on an understanding of the details of the national evaluation procedures for the TIF program - those details are not elaborated here.

**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:**

NYSED is promoting a major thrust toward value added measures (p 20) for student growth and will apply those measures to the evaluation process that determines the differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers and principals. The State's Educational Data Portal (EDP) will provide the necessary data and ensure data quality.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes in detail the Transfer Fund and the Innovative Supplemental Compensation Fund that will be used to provide incentives for teachers who take teaching assignments in high-need schools and principals who assume administrative responsibility for those schools. (p 43).

**Weaknesses:**

The funds discussed above are not a part of the TIF PBCS - they are included in a RTTT grant proposal. No TIF oversight or TIF funds are designated for this competitive priority.

The applicant does not define which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff, other than using the usual list of math, science, ELA, ELL, etc.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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



Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

**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>	<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	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	10
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	69

**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	76
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

### 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:

Other initiatives in the state and in the participating districts demonstrate that the proposed project would be part of a coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce. The statewide approach is comprehensive in that it includes transformation of teacher and principal preparation programs, new performance-based credentialing, a high-quality evaluation system, career ladders, and incentives to teach in high-need schools (pp. 13-14). Two of the districts have developed principal leadership academies that are the foundation of a broader statewide network. All four districts have teacher mentors. Career ladders and value-added initiatives are in place in individual districts (pp. 8-9).

Student achievement growth is given significant weight in teacher and principal evaluations. Forty percent of the evaluations will be determined by value-added measures of student growth, using a combination of state and local assessments (pp. 19-20). The incentives are substantial, ranging from 6 percent salary increase for initial designation as professional role to 20 percent for initial designation as leader role. These percentages increase to 12 and 32 respectively by year 5 of the project (p. 45).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The application includes a budget narrative that projects costs during the 5-year grant period. Costs for implementation beyond the grant period are not clearly outlined. The proposal includes an increasing share of the PBCS costs to be assumed by the applicant beginning in year 3. (Year one is a planning year; therefore, no PBCS funds will be issued.) Year 2 PBCS will be funded 100 percent through TIF, reducing to 75 percent in year 3, 50 percent in year 4, and 25 percent in year 5. This increasing share is reflected in the budget narrative (p. 6, budget narrative).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The proposed project will incorporate the 2010 state legislation addressing how teachers and principals are evaluated for promotion, retention, tenure, supplemental compensation, and professional development. The new legislation requires a "rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation . . . that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories," including value-added student achievement growth. Teachers and principals will be rated with one of 4 categories of effectiveness: highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective. Their dismissal will be expedited if they score in the developing or ineffective levels for 2 consecutive years (p 18).

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 project will provide several opportunities for incentives to teachers and principals to assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles. Teachers designated as professional will allow colleagues to observe their classes and will participate in their schools' inquiry team. Master teachers and principals will serve as mentors. Educators designated as leaders will assume some curricular and programmatic decision-making responsibilities and coach colleagues (p. 46).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

**1. Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

The application does not meet Core Element 1. A communication plan is outlined to include multiple modalities such as print, video, and in-person workshops. Year one of the project is designated as a planning year, during which a non-profit organization will be contracted to facilitate full development of the core elements (pp. 48-49).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1. Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

The application does not meet Core Element 2. Letters of support and commitment are included from the superintendents of the 4 participating school districts, from teachers' unions in the 4 districts, from the principals' union in 3 of the districts, and from the state teachers' union. However, no description or documentation is provided concerning the level of teacher and principal support of the proposal at the selected schools.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a**

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

**General:**

The application does not meet Core Element 3. The evaluation system is based 40 percent on value-added measures of student growth and 60 percent on locally developed measure which must comply with state regulations yet to be developed to ensure rigor and validity (pp. 19-21).

Potential criteria for the local component include content knowledge, content and pedagogical preparation, instructional delivery, classroom management, student assessment, and effective collaboration. Five of the possible local criteria call for observations by trained evaluators and the use of rubrics (p. 23). Year one of the project is designated as a planning year, during which a non-profit organization will be contracted to facilitate full development of the core elements (pp. 48-49).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The application does not meet Core Element 4. The state's longitudinal data system will be finalized during the planning year and piloted in October 2011 (p. 50). The application does not discuss linking this student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. Year one of the project is designated as a planning year, during which a non-profit organization will be contracted to facilitate full development of the core elements (pp. 48-49).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1. Core Element 5:**

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

**General:**

The application does not meet Core Element 5. School Inquiry Teams and Network Teams are presented as a mechanism through which teachers can become knowledgeable in the use of data to drive instruction. Year one of the project is designated as a planning year,

during which a non-profit organization will be contracted to facilitate full development of the core elements (pp. 48-49).

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 utilize 2 existing state structures in its professional development program. In the Collaborative Inquiry Model, 3-member network teams work continuously to support principals and school-based teacher inquiry teams in approximately 25 schools. The network team is comprised of experts in curriculum development, data analysis, and instruction. The school-level inquiry teams analyze student skill gaps and the instructional strategies, thus linking professional development to the identified needs in the schools (p. 37). This on-going, job-embedded professional development model will allow teachers to develop and immediately implement improved instructional strategies.

Leadership Academies will prepare principals to lead high-need schools to overcome poverty, low achievement and a history of high principal turnover (p. 39).

Improvement plans will be developed for teachers and principals who rate in the developing or ineffective categories under the new evaluation system (p. 18). The project will use the data portal to identify systemic classroom-level problems coupled with the teacher and principal evaluations to target professional development to the needs of specific teachers and principals, thereby addressing the needs of teachers and principals who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness (p. 34). Like the

network teams, this model will also allow teachers to develop and immediately implement improved instructional strategies.

Teachers and principals who are proven to be effective may advance on the career ladder to professional, master, or leader status. Each of these levels has corresponding incentives and professional development and leadership opportunities (pp. 28-30). Provisions for regularly assessing the professional development program and making modifications as necessary to improve its effectiveness are not addressed.

**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 48 participating schools have free/reduced lunch rates above 50 percent, therefore meeting the Federal definition of high need (pp. 9; 10-11).

The application states that the NYC DOE selected 20 schools that have newly entered the restructuring phase of accountability. The other three districts, with a total of 28 participating schools, are reported to have selected "many schools that are part of the State's School Improvement Grant" (pp. 7-8; 9).

The majority of selected schools have a lower percentage of students scoring proficient on state assessments than the average in their respective districts, and the collective average scores for the TIF schools in each district are lower than the district averages (pp. 10-11).

The average teacher turnover rate in the TIF schools is 15 percent, which is higher than the state average (p. 13). Collectively, the teacher turnover rate in TIF schools from Yonkers and Rochester exceed the district averages. In fact Yonkers' percentage (30 percent) is more than double the district average (13 percent) (p. 10).

The application reported that Yonkers School District consistently has a need for teachers in math, science, secondary special education, technology, bilingual education and English as a Second Language (p. 13).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The rationale for school selection is not adequately explained. Six participating schools are described as exceptions to the lower student achievement picture painted for the participating schools, with proficiency levels well above district averages. The most extreme example is Rochester's World of Inquiry School No. 58 with 92.1 percent proficient in ELA and 98.2 percent proficient in math (district averages 54.3 percent and

51.0 percent respectively). Therefore, the application does not adequately demonstrate need in these schools based on low student achievement (p. 10). Teacher turnover is not demonstrated as a problem in all of the selected schools. From 2007-08 to 2008-09, seventeen of the 20 NYC DOE participating schools had a teacher turnover rate lower than the district average. Two of the district's schools, one of which is also an achievement exception school cited in the paragraph above, had zero percent teacher turnover. Collectively, the TIF schools in NYC DOE average 6.8 percent turnover compared to the district average of 15 percent (p. 10). Hard-to-staff areas were not identified for NYC DOE, Rochester, or Syracuse (p. 13). No information is provided concerning the degree to which the selected schools have difficulty retaining effective principals, which is a component of sub criterion (1)(ii), (pp. 10-13). The applicant does not identify comparable schools on a school-to-school level. Specific school-to-school comparisons are needed to demonstrate the need of selected schools to similar schools that were not selected for the project (p. 11).

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 proposed project is part of a statewide strategy for providing incentives to teachers and principals who have positively impacted student growth. Statewide efforts include new performance-based credentialing and a high-quality evaluation system which use student growth measures as significant factors (pp. 13-14). The measures of effectiveness for the proposed project include value-added measures of student growth. The state has contracted with an organization to develop a value-added model. This organization has successful experience in similar endeavors in other states and will also form an advisory committee as a mechanism for input from unions, teacher and principal preparation programs, and professional educator organizations (p. 20).

The incentives are substantial, ranging from 6 percent salary increase for initial designation as professional role to 20 percent for initial designation as leader role. These percentages increase to 12 and 32 respectively by year 5 of the project (p. 45). The application includes an award rationale to justify the size of the awards as being large enough but not excessive (pp. 47-48).

Letters of support and commitment are included from the superintendents of the 4 participating school districts, from teachers' unions in the 4 districts, from the principals' union in 3 of the districts, and from the state teachers' union (Appendix). The evaluation system is based 40 percent on value-added measures of student growth and 60 percent on locally developed measure which must comply with state regulations yet to be developed to ensure rigor and validity (pp. 19-21). Five of the possible local criteria call for observations by trained evaluators and the use of rubrics (p. 23). Teachers and principals will be placed in 1 of 4 categories based on their effectiveness - highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective.

The application describes a plan to ensure that educators have access to relevant student achievement data, including an Education Data Portal that will allow educators to select data specific for their individual classrooms and schools and generate customized reports. Accompanying the data will be a dashboard which will include an analysis of each assessment standard, a curriculum scope and sequence showing the where students are behind or ahead, and matching interventions (p. 33). Network teams will provide ongoing, integrated professional development on using data to improve instruction (p. 37).

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not include a clear definition of effective teacher and principal other than being an educator who makes a positive impact on student growth. More information is needed concerning the level of growth expected and any other impact factors that will be considered for effectiveness.

No description or documentation is provided concerning the level of teacher and principal support of the proposal at the selected schools.

The application does not discuss linking this student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

**Reader's Score: 50**

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

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

**In determining the adequacy of the support for the proposed project, the Secretary**

considers the extent to which--

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

**Strengths:**

The application outlines activities that will occur during the planning year, including the full development of the TIF core elements, teacher and principal evaluation systems, Career Development Continuum process and rubrics for placement, and collective bargaining agreements (pp. 48-49).

Two key leaders with credentials that are both impressive and relevant are identified as intricately involved in the project, Dr. David Steiner, NY State's Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York, and Dr. John King, Senior Deputy, District Services (p. 6, resumes). District Services will serve as the point of contact for TIF and will oversee and coordinate the State's professional development efforts (p. 50).

The applicant identifies several other funding sources that will be used to support the project, including district- and state-level Title II funds and Race to the Top Funds if the state receives an award. Race to the Top is specifically included as a funding source for the professional development network teams (budget narrative, p. 5).

The budget narrative includes reasonable costs and adequate funds for implementing the incentives-based component of project. The vast majority of the funds will be used for incentives for principals and teachers in the PBCS schools and 1 percent across-the-board increases in the evaluation schools (budget narrative).

**Weaknesses:**

The outline for the planning-year activities does not provide detailed timelines or defined responsibilities (pp. 48-49).

A detailed management plan is not included for years 2-5 of the project. Information is needed concerning project implementation objectives and their corresponding timelines, milestones, and defined responsibilities in order to demonstrate a plan to successfully implement the proposed project (pp. 50-51).

The time commitments that can be expected from Dr. Steiner and Dr. King are not provided. No information is given relative to the administrative staffing for the project's implementation, such as the roles and responsibilities of key staff, their qualifications, and their time commitments (pp. 50-51).

Funds are not budgeted for required TIF grantee meetings (budget narrative).

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan establishes expected performance outcomes for PBCS schools as compared to schools within the control group. These outcomes address the areas of student achievement on state assessments, the percentages of effective teachers and principals, and teacher retention (p. 52).

**Weaknesses:**

The expected performance outcomes do not address recruiting effective teachers and principals or retaining principals (p. 52).

The evaluation plan does not include objectives for project in totality; therefore, the degree to which they are strong and measurable has not been demonstrated, as required in sub criterion (1).

The performance outcomes resulting from the comparison of group 1 and group 2 schools do not appear to be strong since the expected difference in increases between the two groups for student achievement is minimal - 1 to 2 percent per year (p. 52).

No information is included in the evaluation plan relative to the data sources or the degree to which the data will be quantitative and qualitative, as required in sub criterion (2).

No information is included concerning procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project, as required in sub criterion (3).

Note: The proposed project includes 28 schools, 20 of which are designated as participating in the National Evaluation Competition. It is unclear how the remaining 10 PBSC schools will be evaluated if this project is funded in the evaluation competition.

**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:**

To comply with 2010 state legislation, the proposed project must implement a value-added measure in determining teachers' and principals' impact on student achievement growth, and that measure must comprise 40 percent of teachers' and principals' evaluations (p. 19). The NY State Department of Education is designing the model that will be implemented in the state as well as regulations to govern the local components that district may implement (pp. 20-21). The state has contracted with an organization to develop a value-added model. This organization has successful experience in similar endeavors in other states and will also form an advisory committee as a mechanism for input from unions, teacher and principal preparation programs, and professional educator organizations (p. 20).

The application describes a plan to ensure that educators have access to relevant student achievement data, including an Education Data Portal that will allow educators to select data specific for their individual classrooms and schools and generate customized reports. Accompanying the data will be a dashboard which will include an analysis of each assessment standard, a curriculum scope and sequence showing the where students are behind or ahead, and matching interventions (p. 33). Network teams will provide ongoing, integrated professional development on using data to improve instruction (p. 37).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's Race to the Top proposal includes 2 types of incentives to address recruitment and retention. First, incentives will be offered to teachers certified in critical areas and with at least 3 years of outstanding experience and to principals with 3 outstanding evaluations for accepting assignments in high-need schools. Second, a supplemental compensation fund is designated to reward teachers and principals for effectiveness (pp. 43-44).

For the transfer funds, the district will seek teachers and principals with at least 3 years of outstanding experience demonstrated by a variety of measures including

evaluations and student growth. These parameters demonstrate the characteristics the district will use to indentify effective teachers and principals to fill these positions (p. 43).

**Weaknesses :**

The applicant has not yet been awarded Race to the Top funds. If these funds are not secured, the PBCS, as described, does not specifically address recruitment in hard-to-staff areas.

The applicant does not provide adequate information concerning to what degree certain disciplines are hard-to-staff and how this information will be communicated to teachers.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

**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	53
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	13
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	76

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	84
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.385A

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

Applicant: New York State Education Department -- , (S385A100126)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

(a) The state recently passed a new law dealing with a new comprehension evaluation system. It uses multiple measures of effectiveness for teachers and principals and includes student achievement as a significant factor (pg. 2). According to the law student achievement will comprise 40% of teacher and principal evaluations - 20% student growth on state assessments and 20% other locally-selected measures. Subsequent years after 2012-1013 the % growth on state assessments or comparable measures will increase (pg. 19).

b) The applicant identifies observations by trained evaluators as a measure of effectiveness will be conducted (pg. 18). Rubric will also be used to rate effectiveness. The rubric is in development at this time. The applicant doesn't address the evaluation procedure associated with these observations or rubric.

(c) The application addresses the NY State Teacher Career Development Continuum, which moves teachers from novice to professional teachers to master teacher to teacher leader. Compensation is based on advancement through four levels (novice, professional, master,

and leader) (pg. 44). Teachers have to have been rated "highly effective" to receive supplemental compensation (pg. 45). As teachers progress through these different levels there are numerous other measures that address effectiveness. These measures help increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school - co-teaching, mentor, develop videos of own practice, etc. (pg.28).

**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:**

(a) The applicant provides the projected costs needed to cover the cost of implementation of incentives. The chart on pg. 45 breaks down the individual contractual costs through 2015.

(b) To sustain the program, the applicant has addressed the decrease in TIF funding to support the project. In year 3, only 75% of PBCS costs are allocated to TIF funding; in year 4, only 50%; and in year 5, only 25% (pg. 50). The applicant states various sources of funding can be used to support the project, including district and state level ESEA Title II (pg. 51). However, the applicant does not address what the various sources of funding are except for ESEA Title II.

**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:**

Due to the new legislation passed, the state is now in the process of developing a statewide longitudinal data system. The TIF project will be closely aligned with the data system to provide critical information for instructional decision-making, teacher and principal evaluations, and professional development (pg. 4).

NY's new evaluation system differentiates effectiveness by using multiple rating categories that take into account student achievement. Educators will be rated as highly effective, effective, developing and ineffective. "The evaluations will support the expedited removal of teachers and principals rated as ineffective for two years in a row" (pg. 18).

The state is working with a partner to design and implement a value-added model to be completed by 2011. Potential evaluative tools were identified in the application (pg. 23). These tools include observations. A Principal Performance Evaluation System will be developed.

Professional development "will be based on information from the statewide instructional reporting and improvement system." To assist with data and identification of professional development, the state has developed a two-part plan to access relevant data: (1) create a best-in-class instructional reporting and improvement system and (2) provide ongoing, integrated professional development on using data to improve instruction (pg. 32). Education Data Portal will be the system used to provide data-driven professional development. The statewide launch of this system as a pilot is October 2011 and then statewide in October 2010 (pg. 36).

The state will continue to provide ongoing, integrated professional development through its "Collaborative Inquiry Model" and the "State's Leadership Academies" (pg. 37).

Network teams are developed under the inquiry model.

The applicant states that the new evaluation system addresses tenure and retention; however, the applicant doesn't provide specific details about what is addressed about tenure & retention in the evaluation system. The state's RTTT application addresses a plan for recruitment and retention of teachers in hard to fill areas (pg. 43). However, RTTT grants have not been awarded.

**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:**

As teachers and principals advance through the career continuum they have the opportunity to take on other responsibilities. Teachers and principals can also be part of the network teams. These incentives are sustained as long as student growth is evident.

The Transfer Fund and Innovative Supplemental Incentive Fund will be used to increase the recruitment and retention of effective teachers to teach in high-need schools and hard-to-staff subject areas. Beginning 2011, eligible teachers will receive \$30,000 in total bonuses over four years. To continue this pay over the four years - they have to demonstrate student growth (pg. 43). However, these funds are in the RTTT application which have not been awarded yet.

Research was conducted to determine an appropriate incentive amount that would help with recruitment and retention.

**Reader's Score: 0**

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

### 1. Core Element 1:

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

#### General:

Core Element 1 had not been met.

The applicant has developed an outline about how to communicate effectively with teachers, administrators and other stakeholders, but has not developed a plan

The TIF application and components were discussed with various stakeholders. Support letters were obtained from these stakeholders. District Services will serve as the contact for the TIF. The network teams will assist teachers and leaders with understanding and implementation of the TIF initiative (pg. 50).

Weakness: The application does not address how the information is disseminated into the general public.

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:

Common Core Element 2 has not been met.

The applicant appears to have appropriately involved and gained support from various stakeholders. Support letters were obtained from unions, schools, district and higher ed. representatives.

Input and involvement will begin in the 1st year.

"Both continua will be developed through a collaboration between LEAs, teacher and principal preparation program providers, unions, professional associations, experts in the field, and NYSED (pg. 47)."

"Sixty percent of the evaluations and ratings would be based on locally developed measures through collective bargaining."

TIF will work closely with bargaining units to develop local collective bargaining agreements related to the performance pay schedules (pg. 49).

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:

Common Core Element 3 has not been met.

The evaluation process is in the planning stage. As of now no plan has been drafted. However, the applicant does state some of the components to be used in the evaluation system.

The evaluation process will provide a quality evaluation system that:

1) Will use teaching and principal standards (in the process of development) that will serve as the foundation for an integrated set of initiatives that will drive increases in teacher and principal effectiveness (pg. 3). According to applicant, standards are in the development stage.

2 & 3. Will use the "annual professional performance review evaluation criteria" as an evaluation tool. The criteria reference several criteria and the method to evaluate the criteria (pg. 23). Observations are referenced as an evaluation tool for some of the criteria. Criteria for principals will be developed in pretty much the same format as the teachers.

4. Weakness - inter-rater reliability not addressed.

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:

Common Core Element 4 has not been met.

The state is making great strides in developing a data-management system that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resource systems. The plan to make this connection will be completed during the planning year.

The state recently passed a new law dealing with a new comprehensive evaluation system. The State's new comprehensive evaluation system is based on multiple measures of effectiveness and includes student achievement as a significant factor (pg. 2).

The TIF is designed to align with the new longitudinal data system (to begin in 2011) and a statewide instructional reporting system.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

##### 1. Core Element 5:

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

##### General:

Common Core Element 5 has been met.

To ensure that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve instruction, the project will build upon two existing models: Collaborative Inquiry model and the State's Leadership Academies (pg. 37).

The collaborative inquiry model consists of three-person teams who continuously support principals and school-based inquiry teams. The network teams consist of an expert in curriculum, data analysis, and instruction

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 addresses a professional development plan for teachers and principals that focus on student achievement and teacher and principal needs. Within the next year, the state will develop an instructional reporting and improvement system. (pg. 33).

(1 & 2) The Education Data Portal will be an online professional community, allowing teachers to connect with each other and share ideas and strategies. Additional user uses of the system can be located on pgs. 33-35. The inquiry team with help with the identification of needs and professional development to address those needs.

(3) An extensive list of possible additional responsibilities and leadership roles are addressed on pg. 29. However, to move to those areas where additional roles and responsibilities are identified, teachers have to at least have been evaluated as "effective" or "highly effective."

(4 & 5) Network teams will be implemented to support leaders and teachers with professional development resources and understand the measures of effectiveness and evaluate effectiveness of the professional development.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides data on free and reduced lunch counts for the TIF schools. Percent of schools identified for free and reduced lunch: NY Dept. of Ed. - 82.5%; Rochester City School District - 82%; Syracuse 69.1% and Yonkers 74% (pg. 7). Performance based on percent of students proficient in math and English language arts was also an indicator of need (pg. 9). The applicant addresses two initiatives designed to attract effective teachers and principals to hard-to-staff subjects or specifically areas (pg. 43). These initiatives are identified in the RTTT application that the state recently submitted. The two initiatives, Transfer Fund and Innovative Supplemental Compensation Incentive Fund, focus on recruiting and retaining effective teachers who are certified in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) or teach English language learners or students with special needs. The Innovative Supplemental Compensation Incentive Fund provides highly effective principals, and highly effective teachers teaching in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas with supplemental compensation based upon effectiveness. Supporting data was identified to support the need in these areas (pg. 42).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide information about comparable schools to make an informed decision about how the schools compare. The applicant doesn't address recruitment and retention issues if they are not awarded RTTT funds.

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 state has taken action by passing legislation to develop a new comprehensive evaluation system to provide a basis for decision relating to promotion, retention, tenure, supplemental compensation, and support and professional development. The applicant has identified a plan that aligns to and enhances the efforts of this new legislation.

1. The state recently passed a new law dealing with a new comprehension evaluation system. It is based on multiple measures of effectiveness and includes student growth as a significant factor (40%) (pg. 2). Since the law was recently enacted the evaluation to assess teacher and principal effectiveness is in the development stage. However, the applicant provides details about specific PBCS components that will be linked to the new evaluation system. To qualify for additional compensation teachers and principals move through a career development curriculum. The teacher's ability to advance through the continuum depends on evaluation ratings (highly effective or effective). (i) The career continuum moves teachers from novice to professional teacher to master teacher to teacher leader. Teachers are rated in one of four categories of effectiveness - highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective. Teachers have to have been evaluated as highly effective or effective with evidenced student growth to advance through the career development curriculum. Additional compensation is applied and opportunities to take on additional compensated leadership roles (pg. 28) are available as teachers and principals advance through the continuum (ii) Compensation is of sufficient size. The applicant addressed research that was conducted to determine effective compensation amounts. (iii) It appears the PBCS will affect all teachers and principals in the TIF schools. If not, this has not been clearly articulated. 2. Support has been garnered from several entities. Support letters from these entities are included. Unions will be involved in several aspects of the development of the plan for collective bargaining purposes and support. 3. The applicant describes in detail the differentiated levels of effectiveness using rating categories: highly effective, effective, developing and ineffective. These categories will be linked to the career development curriculum. The value-added model has not been developed, but measures will include student growth, as well as observations and other measures. 4. The state's new longitudinal data system will provide a composite effectiveness score linked to student achievement (pg. 15). 5. Adequate and appropriate professional development opportunities and tools are identified in the PBCS. The Education Data Portal will be an online professional community for teachers and principals to collaborate and share ideas and strategies. Network teams will work with schools to identify and provide professional development based on need. Need is based on teacher and principal evaluations.

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation of effectiveness tool is not developed and won't be launched until the 2011-2012 school year. There is no clear linkage between student achievement data to teacher payroll and human resources systems. The applicant does not address how the information is going to be communicated outside the school environment. The application does not provide a detailed implementation plan, and the plan it does provide does not

project out past the 2011-12 school year.

**Reader's Score: 53**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(3.) Other funding resources have been identified to help support the project, such as state and district ESEA Title II funds. The state will begin to assume more program costs in year three: 75% TIF funded in year 3; year 4 - 50% and year 5 - 25% (pg. 50). (4.) The requested grant amounts and projected costs appear sufficient to attain project goals (pg. 4).

**Weaknesses:**

(1) The applicant does not supply a detailed management plan indicating clearly defined objectives, responsibilities, detailed timeline, or milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (2) Only a couple of key personnel are identified in the plan. The plan doesn't detail their time commitments or responsibilities. (3) Objectives are vague or not addressed. The only clearly stated objective is the charted expected increases in student achievement (pg. 51).

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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:**

(1) The applicant provides detailed descriptions of systems already in place and those to be developed to document raising student achievement, increasing effectiveness, and recruitment and retention of effective teachers and principals. (1 & 3) The state will identify a program evaluator to gather baseline data to evaluate the three components of the PBCS throughout the grant period: student achievement, educator effectiveness and recruitment and retention (pg. 51). The evaluation plan will be developed in the planning year.

**Weaknesses:**

(3) The evaluation process for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement is unclear. There is no clear evaluation process of the project. An evaluator will be identified to gather baseline data but it is unclear if this person will be evaluating the project. (2) The use of quantitative and qualitative evaluation data is not addressed.

**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:**

NYSED is working with the Center for Assessment in order to design and implement a value-added model by June 2011 for use in making growth calculations for educator evaluations.

The Center for Assessment developed the highly regarded growth models for Colorado and Massachusetts (pg. 20). "In order to apply the student growth model within the context of the teacher and principal evaluation systems mandated by the new State law, NYSED will

also seek input from the field by forming a Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee (TPEAC)." The committee members will be representatives from a variety of stakeholders

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

The applicant has designed a plan to rate effectiveness of teachers and principals. It identifies a plan for identifying high-need schools and subjects. Strong recruitment and retention initiatives are addressed to recruit and retain effective teachers in hard-to-fill subject areas and schools - Transfer Fund and the Innovative Supplemental Compensation Incentive Fund. The Transfer Fund initiative is a recruitment tool that addresses hard to fill subject areas, such as STEM, ELL and Special Ed. The Innovative Supplemental Compensation Incentive Fund provides compensation incentives significant enough to retain highly effective teachers and principals in other hard-to-fill subject areas and schools.

**Weaknesses:**

The funds for recruiting and retaining are addressed in the RTTT application - Transfer Fund and the Innovative Supplemental Compensation Incentive Fund - however, as of now those funds have not been awarded. At this time the applicant does not identify a plan to communicate to teachers and principals about vacancies in high need schools and subjects and incentives available. This will be developed in the planning year.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

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