

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality,
Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

Reader #1: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	8
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	88

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	10	9
------------------	----	---

Total	110	97
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality, Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

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:

1-The applicant meets priority 1 because it intends to offer differentiated levels of compensation for effective teachers and principals through a performance-based compensation system (PBCS). The proposed PBCS, called the New York City Department of Education's (NYCDOE) Urban Excellence Initiative, is under development and will build upon a roster of local and state school reform initiatives targeting student achievement and leadership (i.e., Children First and the Teacher Effectiveness Project: Pilot Teacher Evaluation System)

a-The applicant intends to establish a PBCS for NYCDOE in which student growth will be a significant factor, but does not detail how much consideration/weight will be given to student growth in the metric that assesses teacher or principal effectiveness.

b-The narrative includes references to at least two observations of teacher performance (p. 29) and an annual review of principal performance by the superintendent (p. 26-27) to include a focus on p. 28.

c-There is evidence in the narrative that the applicant intends to use mentoring and coaching as ways to establish new opportunities and capacity for targeted, effective professional development (p. 34, 35).

The applicant intends to hire Executive Principals, Executive Assistant Principals, Master Teachers and Turnaround Teachers for PBCS schools. In the proposed PBCS program, Executive Principals and Executive Assistant Principals are eligible to receive stipends of \$25,000 and \$12,500, respectively. Also, Master Teachers may receive an incentive bonus equal to 30% of their base salary. Turnaround Teachers may receive an incentive bonus equal to 15% of their base salary.

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 met priority 2. The applicant has provided a budget that addresses costs referenced in the narrative. The applicant also, on p. 43-44, intends to identify non-TIF additional funding sources to support project continuation. It should be noted here, that the applicant has a long history of receiving grant dollars (p. 43-44).

b-The applicant does not address continuing support of the Executive Principal or Executive Assistant Principal. The applicant also states that the NYCDOE will assume up to 25% of PBCS costs in year 5 through tax levy sources (p. 43). It is unclear to what degree of certainty the applicant can anticipate availability and size of funds generated from taxes.

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 met priority 3 because the proposed Urban Excellence Initiative PBCS is based on two other system-wide initiatives designed to improve education and the positively impact the community. Children First laid the ground work for student achievement inclusion in teacher evaluations (p. 10). The Teacher Evaluation System pilot of the Teacher Effectiveness Project was the first iteration of the current TIF proposal.

In a discussion of value-added data, the applicant addresses not only the importance of using data and evaluations for professional development, but also and using of data in LEA retention and tenure decisions (p. 51-52).

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 met the requirement because differentiated pay encourages PBCS participants to accept responsibilities and leadership roles beyond those of regular classroom teachers. The applicant intends to use Master and Turnaround Teachers, and Executive Principals and Executive Assistant Principals to provide targeted professional development, mentoring, and data analysis to non-PBCS teachers (p. 34). Veteran teachers in the district, with a proven history of student achievement, will be assigned to high-need schools, teach 80% of the regular load for Master Teachers and a full load for Turnaround teachers in addition to providing grade-level/subject-specific professional development either during or after the school day, or during the summer (p. 24).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

General:

The applicant intends to use established district communication strategies to communicate with teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large about the PBCS initiative (p. 31). Communication channels include the NYCDOE website, principals' portal and teacher page.

The use of this system to inform current and perspective employees will ensure that position availability is widely communicated and competition for spots yields a highly qualified pool of Master and Turnaround Teachers, and Executive Principals and Executive Assistant Principals.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant has demonstrated a long, productive history with unions, as indicated in the narrative and by letters of general support from the United Federation of Teachers and the Council of School Supervisors & Administrators in the appendix.

While teacher involvement in program development is not fully discussed in the narrative, the applicant states that the involvement and support of teachers, school leaders, and the unions are fundamental to the development and operation of the Urban Excellence Initiative" (p. 15). The idea of performance based compensation systems was systemically introduced by the Legislature in 2010. All schools must, by 2013-14, include student achievement in teacher and principal performance reviews and a value-added 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:

The Gates Foundation is assisting the applicant in creating a new teacher evaluation system that provides an objective, evidence-based protocol for teacher observations. Observations are included in both plans for teacher and principal evaluation procedures as well as a process to calibrate dual rater observations (interrater reliability) (p. 30-31). Both teacher and principal evaluation will be informed by multiple measures and varying pieces of evidence (p. 26, 28). Because many of these evaluative measures were included in the pilot, the inclusion of them in Urban Excellence Initiative will provide for advanced refinement of all evaluation protocols.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant provides a summary of the current NYCDOE data system and describes how it links student achievement data to payroll system. The data system, though somewhat complex, is familiar to end users. The current system uses unique identification numbers to link students to courses (Achievement Reporting and Information System-ARIS), courses to teachers (Automate The Schools-ATS/Scheduling, Transcripts and Academic Reporting System-STARS), teachers to principals (ID numbers), and principals to schools (ID Numbers). The applicant is at an advanced stage of implementation because the district currently uses this technology. (p. 32)

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:

Specific components of the PBCS, including measures of teacher and principal effectiveness, have yet to be defined by the applicant.

On p. 21, the applicant has stated that that Executive Principal and Executive Assistant Principal evaluations will be based on district-created School Leadership Competencies and Master and Turnaround teacher evaluations will be based on Professional Teacher Standards (p. 21). These two protocols are currently used across the district.

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 intends to allow each school site to participate in the identification and delivery of professional development (p. 34). This decentralized approach to professional development makes the school and the teacher accountable for analyzing their data, identifying need, and choosing a trainer that meets the needs of their staff.

Master and Turnaround teachers may use feedback from information from program assessment (class, teacher, school) to inform what type of professional development is at the school level. The use of the Achievement Reporting and Information System (ARIS) may then assist teachers in developing their own individual development plans to further refine professional development activities.

The applicant intends to engage all staff members in specific staff development that makes each teacher responsible for developing their own needs-appropriate professional development plan (p. 34-37). Principal/Assistant Principal PBCS participants will also receive support from coaches in the NYC Leadership Academy (p. 36). There is little, if any discussion of what professional development Master and Turnaround Teachers will receive as PBCS participants.

While the applicant has not yet developed a professional development plan to share with practitioners regarding PBCS, p. 40 of the narrative provides some definition of how and what the applicant anticipates to upon full implementation 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 evidence that TIF project schools have difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers in project schools. The location of schools in high poverty areas (p. 4) and the percent of alternatively certified teachers in project schools (p. 5) indicate difficulty in staffing. The applicant also provides evidence that achievement at project schools is 10-15% lower than achievement at other district sites through achievement data in New York State ELA and Math assessments (p. 6). Data on AYP status of project schools further contextualizes the applicant's hard-to-staff assertions (i.e., 75 in restructuring Title I status, 54 in advanced restructuring Title I status).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly state if principals were difficult to retain in project schools. The applicant mentions on p. 4 that the hard to staff assertions apply to administrators, but does not provide supportive evidence. Page three states that 8 high schools will be included in the PBCS, yet high school is not included in the graphic detailing grade levels served by the program on p. 6 or its subsequent discussion on student achievement (p. 6). The applicant provides a limited definition of comparable schools that does not address size or grade levels used for comparable schools.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools),

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed PBCS builds upon programs implemented as a part of New York City Department of Education's (NYCDOE) Children First reform effort. High-stakes accountability measures of graded school progress reports, on-site evaluations, school surveys, and an overall system portfolio management approach inform tenure and promotion decisions. Additional programs including the Lead Teacher Program and Teachers of Tomorrow Program provide evidence that NYCDOE is committed to creating performance-programs. New York state's legislated teacher and principal performance-based, value-added evaluation system also supports the proposed PBCS (p. 12).

The suggested level of bonus compensation 25,000 principal-15,000 assistant principal; 30% master teacher increase-15% turnaround teacher increase is of sufficient size to impact an employee's decision to continuously serve in high-need schools (p. 20).

The applicant states on p. 12 that teachers identified as Master teachers and Turnaround teachers would undergo a rigorous review of teaching performance. Such screening of Master Teacher candidates is appropriate and may even include required demonstration lessons or portfolios.

The applicant provides evidence of a long-term, positive relationship with local unions and state government, specifically regarding recent state legislation mandates for evaluation systems with differentiated pay scales based on student performance. The show of union support is quite evident as exhibited by two letters of support from two teacher unions. (p. 26, attachments)

The applicant discusses several points of connection between students and staff payroll currently in use in the district(p. 32). These systems are familiar to most district employees and can immediately be put to use or refined in PBCS project schools.

The applicant notes several strategies for professional development it envisions as a part of the PBCS, including laboratory classes, mentor teachers, coaching, and critical friends' discussions (p. 34-36).

The applicant has not yet developed the process by which teachers, principals, and other personnel would be determined effective under the PBCS. Therefore, determining if staff in non-PBCS schools are effective is not currently possible.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly commit to bi-annual observations for principals as it does for teachers (p. 26-27).

Moreover, it is unclear how many schools the applicant intends to serve in the Urban

Excellence Initiative. On p. 3,4, and 18, the applicant refers to 75 participating sites, but on p. 45, and 48, the applicant refers to 65 schools.

It is also unclear why only 10 executive principal/assistant principal pairs will be assigned to targeted 75 project schools (p. 15, 46) and if impacting leadership in 10 schools will produce desired district change anticipated by the applicant.

The applicant does not address how teachers, principals, and other personnel in possible expansion sites are determined to be effective.

The applicant did not provide any evidence that it has shared information with additional school sites regarding the PBCS program. The applicant does provide letters of support from local teacher's unions in the attachments.

Reader's Score: 55

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed management plan includes appropriate personnel, a feasible timeline, and provisions for the creation of an action plan that identifies project benchmarks (p. 40). Identified project personnel are qualified to implement the program and will be supported by a number of district personnel (p. 42, attachment). The grant budget is adequate to reach project goals. The applicant does not mention assuming costs associated with the Executive Principal or Executive Assistant Principal incentive pay (p. 43). The applicant mentions that other funding sources will be identified, but does not provide enough detail to ensure that services currently offered to support improvements in the schools will be continued beyond project closure. (p. 43-44)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not mention assuming costs associated with the Executive Principal or Executive Assistant Principal incentive pay (p. 43). The applicant mentions that other funding sources will be identified, but does not provide enough detail to ensure that services currently offered to support improvements in the schools will be continued beyond project closure. (p. 43-44)

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant intends to use multiple qualitative and quantitative performance measures to assess the proposed PBCS and a local evaluator. The inclusion of performance review analysis should yield valuable insight into program effectiveness. The use of descriptive, correlation, and HLM techniques will produce additional quantitative data to assess program effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

New York State legislation mandates that all teacher and administrator evaluation include value-added data. Systemic integration of value-added requisites is commendable. The ability of the district's identified Teacher Data Initiative model to collect data and its previous training of all district staff (p. 52) demonstrates capacity at the district level to use the Teacher Data Initiative web tool. Use of value-added data is explained to teachers. All teachers and school leaders were participated in training on how to interpret and use value-added reports (p. 52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 states on p. 12 that teachers identified as Master teachers and Turnaround teachers would undergo a rigorous review of teaching performance and that satisfying the components of the rigorous review ensures the presence of pre-identified effective teacher qualities. The presence of these teachers would likely serve as a counterpoint to characteristics found in project schools (large numbers of alternatively certified teachers, high teacher turnover, school poverty index; p. 5-6). The applicant states that the existence of the district's alternative certification process is an indicator that identified subject areas (math/science, bilingual, special education) are hard to staff areas (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides little, if any, discussion of how they will inform district staff that certain areas are identified as hard-to-staff or which subject areas are identified as hard-to-staff (p. 4-5). The applicant should communicate what subject areas they will identify and share with district personnel. Identifying staffing areas will assist with hiring.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality,
Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	10
---------------------	----	----

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	19
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	1
Sub Total	100	75

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	4
------------------	----	---

Total	110	79
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality, Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant states it will develop a rewards system that is differentiated, rewards both teachers and principals, and bases those rewards with some weight on student achievement gains.

A) The applicant will use NY state tests to develop a value-added metrics to determine student achievement gains in core subjects. Proven teachers and principals will be eligible for bonus pay in high need schools. The applicant does not give explicit weight to student performance for PBCS impacted teachers, but does reference a pilot program for new teacher evaluation tool.

B) The applicant described a system of observation based evaluations that are aligned with the district's new Urban Excellence Institute. The process involved multiple evaluation points and multiple reviewers. The design of the evaluation process is in development.

There are no details as to how many observations will be done for these Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers or Executive Principals.

C) The applicant described additional measures, such as leadership positions of Master Teacher and Turn Around Teacher, Executive Principal and Assistant Executive Principal.

Teacher bonuses will earn between 15-30% more for taking on leadership roles in high need schools. Administrators can earn up to 19% more in high need schools (pg 20). These are substantial awards and will likely be enticing to many teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant does provide projected costs associated with development and implementation of the PBCS for the project period and beyond. The applicant has accepted some responsibility to provide such compensation after the TIF monies run out. The applicant will provide some non-TIF funds, though limited to 25%, to the project during the first five years (budget index).

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 plan is aligned with the district's overall strategy, Children First, created in 2003 by the Mayor and Chancellor's office. The reforms have begun to use data to reward teachers and principals serving the most needy schools. The applicant demonstrates willingness to use data and evaluations for professional development, retention and tenure decisions during this project and beyond.

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 has a strong plan to entice proven educators to take on additional responsibilities. The district currently offers, and will expand, a program to place Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers on the most high need campuses, where they will receive a differential pay rate of 15 to 30% more than if they just continued to teach in non-TIF schools. Proven principals are offered up to \$25,000 over three years, and opportunities to earn 19% more than base salary if they are willing to work in needy schools. These pay increases are significant enough to encourage positive outcomes.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

General:

The applicant demonstrates a thorough plan for communications. The district will use its website, existing communications staff, and meetings with local staffs to communicate the components of its PBCS. The teachers union will also play a role in distributing information. Efforts will be made to communicate the plan to the community at-large.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

- 1. Core Element 2:**

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

General:

The applicant states that the district and the teachers union will work together to create the final metrics to be used to evaluate teacher effectiveness. The union has worked with the district before on efforts to reward teachers for taking on additional responsibilities or working in hard to staff schools. However, the union is not overly supportive of this grant, based on vague commitments from leadership, and a slow proposed timeline to implement such measures. It is difficult to gauge the true commitment and involvement of principals and teachers as a whole in regards to this proposal because no survey data was presented, nor was there a joint taskforce in creating this grant.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant states it will include an evaluation system for teachers and principals that is fair, differentiated, and will use multiple rating categories. The teacher evaluation is piloting in 31 schools in 2010 (pg 30). The applicant does not state an evaluation system for teachers receiving differentiated pay. Those teachers are Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers and Executive Principals. The proposal is silent as to how student growth will factor into the evaluation of educators receiving differentiated compensation.

- 1) The applicant is working with the Gates Foundation and its union to establish an objective rubric aligned with district standards.
- 2) The proposal will include multiple observations of both the teacher and principals, at least twice per year. However, the proposal is silent as to how Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers, and Executive Principals are to be observed.
- 3) The evaluation will use additional forms of evidence, beyond test scores, by measuring teacher competencies and school-defined measures (pg 29).
- 4) The plan will ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability by training evaluators, especially Talent Coaches, on how to objectively measure performance and meet together to align multiple evaluations (pg 30).

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 district currently has a sophisticated system (ARIS) that tracks student-level, teacher-level, and principal-level data (pg 32). Student performance is tracked in another system, called STARS. Using student ID codes in STARS, individual students can be linked to teachers through the scheduling system. The plan is to link those data

points together and get it to human resources. Additional work needs to be done to make this system work, while respecting the student's privacy (pg 32).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant states that participating teachers and principals will be able to see the specific requirements and expectations of the jobs through the TIF website, which will be maintained by the district.

The plan is to use already proven Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers to provide the professional development at struggling school sites. In addition, proven principals and assistant principals will be incentivized to relocate to struggling schools, where they will provide onsite professional development to help the faculty gain the necessary skills to improve student achievement. It will be up to these leaders to communicate the specific expectations and strategies to each school site. Principals will receive training through the district's principal training program. It is unclear where Master and Turn Around Teachers will receive their training.

Based on job evaluations, participating PBCS staff will be given an individualized professional development plan through the district's ARIS program (pg 35).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice); (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

The professional development piece of this grant is a little unclear. Master and Turn Around teachers do not have a specific evaluation. Therefore, assigning professional development based on needs is not entirely clear. Principals do have an evaluation tool that identifies and prescribes professional development.

The proposal is to identify proven Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers and relocate them to struggling campuses, using bonuses to get them to transfer to those campuses. Proven principals will also be relocated using the same model. Once those persons are on those high-need campuses, they will be charged with developing a rigorous Professional Development plan. Professional Development is decentralized, and therefore, each school comes up with its own plan, based on student needs, and local staff needs. The goal of Professional Development is to improve student achievement and reach or exceed goals for student growth. The program's effectiveness will be measured by the district, using data and surveys.

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:

1) The applicant identified 75 schools in the major restructuring phase, based on failure to meet AYP for seven or more years. These schools are poor, have high English learner populations, and are located in crime-ridden neighborhoods. These schools traditionally have high turnover rates, and the majority of their teachers have to come from

alternative credentialing programs, because traditionally trained teachers do not tend to apply to these schools. Having high percentages of less experienced teachers, and teachers that are learning on the job is not an effective way to raise student achievement. The applicant recognizes this and this is why it is focusing on attracting proven experienced teachers to the school sites.

2) These schools score considerably lower than comparable schools in the district, even when controlling for high poverty rates (pg 6).

3) The district does provide a definition of comparison schools, based on demographics, size, and poverty levels.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

principal payroll and human resources systems; and

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

Strengths:

1) The applicant's plan is consistent with Children First, established by the district and mayor in 2003 (pg 7). The district strategy focuses on standards, leadership and teaching.

The applicant plans to use quantitative data from NYS tests in ELA and math in grades 4-8. It is unclear how the data will be measured. High schools will use credit accumulation and Regents completion (pg 8). This data is part of a larger evaluation of the school's principal and is used to determine differentiated compensation for principals. The applicant states the plan to be developed will have direct ties from student achievement to educator compensation. Up to 40% of the review (pg 28) may be used on a teacher's evaluation.

However, for the proposed PBCS, there is no defined weight given to student achievement or student growth for the Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers, and Executive Principals. They are simply being incentivized to relocate to high need schools from other campuses.

The district already has a bonus plan in place for teachers. Lead Teachers can earn \$10,000. School-wide performance bonuses can be as much as \$3,000 per teacher at schools meeting AYP. However, a planning year will be necessary to finalize the metrics to be used for TIF funded bonuses. The plan would pay for proven teachers to go into high-need schools (pg 14). TIF funds would be used to incentivize teachers to go to and remain at most high-need schools.

3) The applicant states it will include an evaluation system for teachers and principals that are fair, differentiated, and will use multiple rating categories. The teacher evaluation is piloting in 31 schools in 2010 (pg 30). For eligible teachers for this PBCS, there no defined evaluation system.

2) The applicant does provide evidence of support for the proposal. The UFT is working with NYCDOE to develop a new teacher evaluation system that will utilize data and value-added metrics (pg 12). The UFT president drafted a letter of support for this grant in the appendix.

4) A data management system is in place to track value-added measures in grades 3-8. The applicant states that the district will expand that system's capabilities. For the teachers and principals affected by this TIF, there is no data management system mentioned, because there are not awards tied to student growth or achievement for those educators.

5) The applicant states the plan to be developed will have direct ties from student achievement to educator compensation. Up to 40% of the review (pg 28) may be used on a teacher's evaluation.

However, for the proposed PBCS, there is no defined weight given to student achievement for the Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers, and Executive Principals.

Weaknesses:

The proposal is two tiered. The applicant is asking for TIF funds to pay Master Teachers, Turn Around Teachers and Executive Principals. However, the applicant does not define their evaluation process or professional development. The applicant is also asking for a planning year to develop a whole other program that will expand differentiated compensation to all teachers in schools identified for TIF. However, that proposed plan is vague.

The applicant's proposal is somewhat vague because the district's management and teachers' union have not agreed upon the criteria for using value-added metrics to judge and reward teacher effectiveness.

There does not appear to be a robust data management plan to track student achievement and tie it back to human resources and payroll.

Because the specifics of the measurable data have not been established, there is not a clear plan for professional development in the proposal that would ensure student achievement is raised. Until it is agreed upon what the goals are, it is not possible to train for those goals.

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 applicant demonstrated that it does:

- A) Have a management team that is likely to achieve the goals on time and within budget. The goals are broadly defined, and therefore, manageable. The budget is broad, and the timeline is attainable.
- B) Have a proposed director and key personnel that are qualified. They have dedicated positions to implement such a project. The team is well educated and accomplished in public management.
- C) Have the will to gradually take on some of the costs. The district commits to eventually take on 25% of the project's costs by Year 5, and mentions that it would look into tax adjustments, if necessary, to fund the project thereafter. It is unclear how the district will pay for the 25% of the costs it commits to fund.
- D) Request a grant amount that is sufficient to attain the project goals. All related costs are accounted for in order to plan and implement such a plan.

Weaknesses:

Most of the management team, though highly intelligent and accomplished, do not have a background as a classroom teacher or school site administrator. When determining the metrics to be used to evaluate teacher performance, it is unclear as to whether or not the management team will seek the input of teachers, either through a taskforce, survey, or union discussions.

The district only commits to absorbing up to 25% of the costs of the program by Year 5 (budget index).

The budget, timeline, and broad goals all set low expectations that can easily be met.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

2) The proposal will produce quantitative and qualitative data through student test scores and staff feedback via surveys.

The district will contract out the evaluation process, reducing bias and ensuring adequate evaluation procedures.

Weaknesses:

1) The goals to be measured are centered around developing a plan, not necessarily goals for improving student performance. This grant is asking for funding to invent a program, not implement one. Therefore, evaluation of a non-existent plan is difficult to project.

3) Because the program has not been invented yet, there is not a demonstrated evaluation procedure in the applicant's grant. It does not yet know what there is to evaluate.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

1) The applicant demonstrated that it has a plan to use value-added measures to judge teacher effectiveness, and it has the capacity to do so. The district has already piloted a program to do this, using the Teacher Data Initiative (pg 51), developed by accomplished researchers. This system is currently used in 100 schools.

Weaknesses:

2) It is not clear what the measures exactly are and how they were chosen. Previously in the grant, the applicant stated that it may be until 2012 (pg 12) until a value-added model is agreed upon by all stakeholders. The existing model is only used in grades 4-8 (pg 52). There are no clear plans to use in high schools or lower grades.

Reader's Score: 1

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

1) The applicant clearly demonstrates that these funds will only assist the most high-need campuses in the district. Each school is in the major restructuring phase of NCLB sanctions.

2) The monies will be used to entice proven leaders and teachers to those campuses, where they will work day-by-day to improve the rest of the faculty and raise student achievement.

Weaknesses:

3) The proposal does not give a clear plan as to how it would use funds to attract hard to fill vacancies, based on subject matter. It is not clear how non-Master or Turn Around teachers will be recruited to high need schools. Retention for non-Master or Turn Around teachers is also not addressed. The plan is solid for attracting key, lead teachers, but not the vast majority of teaching positions at these schools.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality,
Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

Reader #3: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	7
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	92

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	98
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Panel - 16: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New York City Department of Education -- Teacher Recruitment and Quality, Division of Human Resources (S385A100137)

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:

Met

The results of a pilot project mandated by the state legislature, as well as the TIF funding guidelines, will assist in the development of the proposed project. The NYCDOE has an evaluation process for teachers, assistant principals, and principals in place; however, revisions to the evaluation process are in progress. These revisions will also be based on results of the pilot project.

The evaluations for teachers include value-added data and other test/non-test evidence of student learning and teacher skills and knowledge measured through annual observations by principals or someone in a supervisory position, possibly a master teacher. Full-lesson classroom observations (including pre- and post-conferences) for each teacher will take place twice per year. (p 29) The rubric for observation used is a research-based instrument developed by Charlotte Danielson and is aligned with national standards. Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers mentor and assist other teachers in the school

to be successful. These teachers in leadership roles must maintain a rating of highly effective to receive differentiated compensation. Master Teachers are eligible to receive incentive amounts equal to 30% of their base pay and Turn Around teachers-15% of base pay. These amounts appear to be sufficient to encourage a teacher to take on one of these leadership roles. Measures for insuring inter-rater reliability are included in the PBCS (p30).

The principal and assistant principal performance review which is related to differentiated pay is largely based on student performance and achievement of personal goals related to the NYCDOE Leadership Competencies. Performance review scores are also based on observations and data collected on their effectiveness in serving populations with special needs. In addition accountability reports which measure the effectiveness of the school (Progress Reports, Quality Reviews, School Surveys) are also taken into consideration. Incentive amounts are sufficient to encourage principals to strive for the goal. Pp 15-18

Because much of the planning for the proposed grant will rely on the pilot already being conducted, clear descriptions of specifics such as the evaluation rubric for teacher/principal, training on the rubrics will be carried out in the planning year.

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:

Met

The extensive budget outlined in the proposal (p113) has taken all aspects of the development and implementation of the project into consideration including providing incentives for differentiated pay, personnel, equipment, etc. However, the intention of taking over only 25% of the funds through year five of the TIF funding is a concern. The applicant has established a plan for providing non-TIF funds through in-kind services and other means. The school district does have a demonstrated record for obtaining and managing significant grants. In addition, after the 5 year grant term is over a plan is in place to provide funding to sustain the program.

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:

Met

Great strides were made in significantly improving the NYC DOE through the implementation of the Children First reform efforts. Phase one focused on raising academic standards, implementing core curriculums, leadership development, streamlining the management structure, and introducing system-wide accountability measures. Phase 2 focused on instilling three principles across city schools: leadership, empowerment, and accountability. (p 6) These efforts set the stage for improvements set forth in the TIF guidelines.

The ability to disaggregate data from each school in many different ways provides important information on the progress of the school, the principal, and even the teachers in the classrooms. Schools have the flexibility to determine the professional development needed based on the data and evaluations. (p33) This provides the opportunity for each school to target aspects to the student population, teacher instructional practices, and principal leadership roles specific to their own location and academic needs. The Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers will be providing training and support to teachers within the schools to assist in the professional growth of the teachers. (p 34) These approaches to the PBCS will continue after the TIF funding ends.

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:

Met

The NYCDOE plan calls for differentiated pay for teachers and principals who take on leadership roles in high-need schools. The amount of incentive pay is based on several measures of performance, as well as the amount of student growth in the school served. An in-depth description of the process for determining an effective principal and teacher is included. Master Teacher/Turnaround Teacher selection will be based upon their proven track record as highly effective teachers and evidence of student growth. Principals will provide evidence of their effectiveness in promoting student growth over a multi-year period and will be selected based on student achievement and school data, interviews, and the results of unscheduled school walk-throughs. (p18) Teachers and principals must maintain their highly-effective evaluation rating.

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:

Information will be provided through the NYCDOE website and other existing communications channels to inform staff in the schools about the goals, objectives and activities of the proposed project. In addition to members of the school district disseminating the information, representatives from the teachers union will visit all schools to inform staff directly about the project in order to ensure that they are receiving accurate and consistent information. (p 32) Various groups will also carry the message to community members and others. The efforts for this process are well-organized and already in place. The information provided is hoped to encourage teachers and principals to move to the 75 high-needs schools included in the proposed TIF program. (p 32)

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 school district understands the importance of gaining support from all stakeholders in order to effectively carry out the project. The NYCDOE has worked closely with the local unions (UFT and CSA) in the past on reform initiatives and will work closely with the unions to gain their support and develop a project that is accepted and supported. (p e24) Teacher voice in the involvement with development plan is connected to the union input.

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:

A well-developed evaluation process for teachers and principals is in place; however, some modifications to the current system used during the implementation of the pilot project will have to be made. The evaluation of teachers and principals involved in the TIF project will be evaluated using a process that takes into account many different elements to provide a clear picture of their knowledge and skills. Evaluations are based on value-added student achievement, observations by well-trained personnel, and other measure specific to the job description. In addition, inter-rater reliability (p 30) is maintained through observer training. The instruments for observations are research-based and developed around national standards to insure that teachers and principals are assessed on the most current elements indicative of effective educators. (p 25) These instruments were developed with the Measurement of Teacher Effectiveness study funded through the Gates Foundation. (p 27)

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 NYCDOE already has an extensive data collection and management system in place but plans to expand the system with the assistance of this grant. The current system collects a wide range of data relevant to the students, teachers, and principals. Data are stored and can be retrieved through student and personnel ID numbers. Principals' and teachers' ID numbers also allow for linkages to the payroll and human-resources systems. Many sources are linked and in-depth reports can be made available for review. Further systems development will be needed to support the teacher, assistant principal, and principal performance systems. (p 31-32)

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:

Teachers and principals will be able to access information about the TIF project through the NYCDOE website which includes the Principal's Portal and the Teacher Page. These sites provide access to a broad range of information related to hiring which would include the job descriptions and expectations (p 31). The school system has also defined the specific skills, behaviors, and knowledge expected of principals and teachers to carry out their jobs effectively through the establishment of the School Leadership Competencies and Professional Teaching Standards (p 29). These standards provide a common definition for understanding the expectations.

Training will be provided on the new school leader and teacher evaluation system to insure that these educators fully understand the effectiveness measures included in the

system and to increase their knowledge in using the data from the evaluation systems to improve their leadership and instructional practices (p 36)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

General:

Professional development for teachers and principals is largely on a school-based system. This insures that the professional development is better connected to student achievement goals of the school and to the specific professional development needs of the teachers and principals. (p 34)

The Master Teachers and Turn Around Teachers provide training and observation opportunities for teachers in the high-needs schools to improve their instructional practices and improve student achievement. However, there is no specific description of how these specialized teachers will be evaluated to measure their effectiveness in the leadership roles.

Teachers and principals who receive differentiated pay receive targeted professional development on mentoring and coaching. Specific information generated from classroom observations, student data, and interim and summative evaluations provide meaningful feedback which creates individualized professional development plans for each teacher.

The Master and Turn Around Teachers utilize this information in coaching and mentoring the classroom teachers. The ARIS Learn system will store and organize many professional development tools, content, and resources for easy access and use when specific needs are identified for the school personnel. (p 36) An explanation of how the effectiveness of the professional development program will be assessed is not included.

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 needs assessment section clearly addresses the selection criteria established in the TIF. There is a clear description of the district and the high-need schools that will be included in the project if funded. These schools have been identified for restructuring because of their levels of low-performance and high-need. The NYCDOE has developed its own measure of school need called the peer index which is calculated on student demographics and student proficiency. (p 3)

The proposal describes the difficulty in recruiting and retaining school personnel to the high-needs schools because of the large number of students from low income families and who have special needs, as well as the location of the schools. These schools are already labeled as low performing schools. The recruitment and retention of teachers is particularly difficult for the hard-to-staff subject areas of math, science, bilingual, and special education. (p 4)

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not clearly identify schools comparable to the schools included in the proposal. Rather the TIF schools are compared to all schools in the NYCDOE. In addition, the chart on page 6 only included data for elementary and middle schools. There is no comparable data to indicate differences in high school student performance.

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:

Well-developed, valid and reliable measures of student growth are utilized in the assessment processes and have been developed through the district's participation in the Gate's funded Measurement of Teacher Effectiveness study. (p 27) The performance awards of differentiated compensation for teachers and principals are well defined and give significant weight to student growth [32% of principal's rating (p 26) and 40% of teacher's rating (p 28)] The awards are anticipated to be of sufficient size to encourage these educators to move to or remain in high-needs schools. A clear description of what

the school district considers to be effective teachers and principals is provided and standards are established for teacher and principal assessment to insure a common language for clear understanding of the expectations. (pp 26-27) As noted earlier, the proposal outlines processes for obtaining input from unions in the development of the plan. The evaluation process of principals who are included in the PBCS are clearly described and are based on student achievement, observations, and other means. Teachers will be observed twice a year by the principal or supervisor and will receive feed back and assistance when needed. Master and Turn Around Teachers will serve as support personnel for these teachers to assist in their growth and improvement. The data management system is well developed for the current needs but will need to be upgraded to include the facets identified in the PBCS. Student data can be linked to individual teachers and principals. Unique ID numbers allow teacher and principal evaluations to be linked to human resources and payroll data systems. (p 32) The resources for professional development are vast. The data management system allows for a direct connection between student achievement and other specific measures of effectiveness in the PBCS and individual teachers and principals. This capability also ties these results to professional development to provide training for specific needs of these key personnel.

Weaknesses:

It isn't clear how input was gathered from teachers and other school personnel on the development of the PBCS. A clear indication of support from these groups is not evident either. Also, clear description of how Master Teachers and TurnAround teachers will be evaluated in their leadership roles is not evident.

Reader's Score: 55

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The management plan for the project is well thought out and includes the timeline for implementation, an extensive budget description, and personnel well qualified to carry out the responsibilities outlined in the project. The proposal also indicates the percent of time each person on the management team will allocate to the oversight of this project.(p 41) Funding from grants and other sources are clearly identified to provide support to the TIF funds (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (p 22), technology sources for data management and professional development, etc). In addition, a review of the

budget prepared for the proposed project indicates that the amount and projected costs are sufficient for accomplishing the goals set out in the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The local evaluation outlined provides measurable performance objectives for the four goals established for the project (p 45). A detailed outline of the process of program evaluation is provided with identification of a local evaluator. The data produced will be quantitative and qualitative as it will access data related to such aspects as student achievement and effectiveness ratings for teachers and principals. In addition, qualitative data will be collected through interviews, archival school records and other documents. (p 49) Valid and reliable evaluation techniques will be utilized to insure that information for feedback and continuous improvement is accurate. Guidelines and timelines for review of the evaluation results are established. In addition, the approach for using the data result to affect improvements is planned. (p 50)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes plans to utilize value-added data when possible to assess impact on student learning as a component of the teacher and principal review process. This will be possible with evidence provided for ELA and math teachers in (grades 4-8). The NYCDOE has partnered with the Battelle Memorial Institute to develop a sophisticated value-added model of teacher effectiveness (p e50). Training will be provided to teachers and principals in the interpretation and use of value-added data to improve classroom practices.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Evidence is provided in the proposal that emphasizes NYCDOE's commitment and process for recruiting and retaining well qualified teachers for the hard to staff subject areas and in high-needs schools.

Weaknesses:

No specific plan is in place to actually recruit effective teachers for these subject areas in the hard to staff schools. Because there is no plan in place, there are no guidelines in place to determine that a teacher is highly effective. The only indication of the extent to which the subjects (math, science, bilingual, and special education) are considered hard to staff is because of the geographical location of the schools and the label of "low performing". (p 4) There is no indication that the district has communicated to the teachers and principals which schools are considered high-need and which subject/specialty areas are hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:19 PM