

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 5:02 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

**Reader #4:** \*\*\*\*\*

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	9
---------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	101
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.385A

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

### 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 meets this priority. However, an additional explanation regarding the significance of the pay incentive would clarify the justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen.

The applicant indicates that significant weight will be given to student growth as well as observation-based assessments in the PBCS (Page 1). The applicant indicates that learning gains will be reflecting more than 51% of the incentives and measures of effectiveness (Page 25). The applicant indicates that evidence of leadership roles will be used as well (Page 2). The applicant indicates that the project will include an achievement factor for administrators as well as teachers (Page 26). The applicant clearly defined the Teacher Incentive Plan by modeling the Earnings Statements (page 28).

The applicant did not clearly indicate if the incentive amounts will be substantial. A justification for the level of the incentive amounts chosen was not clear. Therefore, it

is difficult to determine whether the amount will be substantial and provide for changes in behavior.

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 meets the requirements of this priority.

The applicant indicates that the TIF leadership team met with Financial Officers to determine that projected costs were appropriate as outlined in the budget (Page 68). The tables on page 69 clearly delineate the non-TIF funding and the performance pay projections. These elements indicate that the applicant is supporting fiscal sustainability.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

#### General:

The applicant meets this requirement.

The applicant does address a recruitment plan and includes a recruiter for the high needs schools. The application identifies attraction and retention incentives to address this issue (Page 13-14)

The applicant does plan to for the use of data for professional development decisions as is indicated on page 25. The applicant states the Teacher-Selected Professional Development is to be tied to needs data.

The applicant does include the use of data and evaluation for professional development and retention and tenure decisions for the selected schools and the staff members in those schools (Page 33). For example the OCPS teacher and principal evaluation system has been established and will be revised during the planning year.

**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 meets this requirement.

The applicant includes a possible component of leadership roles for the building principals through the federally-funded School Leadership Program as outlined on page 17.

**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 partially meets the requirement of this core element.

The applicant defines clearly the communication plan in the table on page e79. This clearly includes teachers, administrators, other school personnel and the community at-large. Several types of media will be used including electronic as well as printed information. The applicant demonstrates that the planning year will used to accomplish the requirements of this element (Page 4).

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 meets the requirements of this element.

The applicant indicates that the other personnel from TIF I schools will be given opportunities for input into the TIF II plan. The applicant indicates that participation has been active as the TIF I plan has taken effect. The applicant indicates that the TIF II will continue to use techniques in developing the new plan (Page 70e).

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 partially addresses the requirements of the core element.

The applicant refers to the Orange County Public Schools Instructional Personnel Preliminary Assessment Report as one of the measures used to evaluate teachers (Page e71). Although instruments appear to be rigorous and transparent, it is not clear how they take into account student growth as a significant factor.

The applicant does indicate that observations are part of the evaluation process (page e72).

The applicant does not specifically identify additional forms of evidence that will be collected. Although the applicant does indicate that administrators have received training regarding the rubrics used in the teacher evaluation, it is not clear how staff assessments will be ensured of a high degree of inter-rater reliability.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

##### **1. Core Element 4:**

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

##### **General:**

The applicant has partially met the standards regarding this element.

The applicant identifies a strong plan to meet this element during the planning year. The applicant indicates that the data management system links the student achievement to the teacher and the incentive payout (page 72e). On page 40 of the narrative, the applicant indicates that the Enterprise Data Warehouse will be piloted as part of the project (Pages 39-40). The applicant also includes a data-base analyst as part of the personnel for the project.

**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 partially meets the requirement of this element.

The applicant defines in a general manner that the professional development plan could be a Harvard Wide World Course or a College Board Institute. This type of professional development is not linked by the applicant to the use of student data generated to improve practice (page 73e).

The applicant does identify the professional learning using the Framework for Teaching and Learning (page 45). This type of professional learning is linked to improved teacher practices.

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 meets the requirements of this component.

The applicant demonstrates that a specific plan is in place for professional development using the Effective Schools research as a basis for that plan (Page 44). A plan is identified that incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement. The applicant identified that the Framework for Teaching and Learning is the basis for the systems job-embedded professional learning. The applicant defines the professional development that will be designed during the planning year to meet the needs at the high-need schools that are a target for this grant (page 46). The applicant includes a menu of choices for professional development for administrators as well as paraprofessionals.

The applicant does not clearly delineate what types of professional development will be offered and/or required of those participating who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness.

The applicant does have in place a plan to assess the effectiveness of the professional development activities that are chosen. For example, on page 53, the applicant states that in years four and five of the grant the schools will use assessment data to

determine needs for further coaching and professional development.

The teacher professional development plan includes several choices. For example on page 47-48, the applicant identifies that the professional development could be based on a school-wide initiative, the needs of the class, a collaborative effort between the principal and teacher, or teacher desire for leadership training. These choices do not specifically enable the teachers to receive professional development that helps them to use data generated to improve their practices.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies the high needs schools as those who have more than 63 percent of the students eligible for the free and reduced price meal program (page2). The applicant also identifies the need to expand the TIF to include additional staff at 10 TIFI secondary schools that were not previously served by the PBCS.

The applicant also identifies the student achievement levels in the selected schools using those schools's scores as well as the test scores of the schools that these elementary school feed. For example, on page 5 the applicant identifies that 70 percent or more of students are zoned for the TIF I high need middle and high schools. The table on page 6 exemplifies the high needs schools and the selection criteria used.

The applicant uses effectively a chart on page 14 to demonstrate the retention rates of the project schools. The majority of the identified schools have lower than the district average retention rate of teachers.

The snapshot of the participating high schools and their feeder Title 1 middle and elementary schools clearly indicates the needs based on the student achievement data. For example, the applicant includes a column for the percent of students scoring below grade level on the 2010 FCAT reading tests. The high schools and middle schools have higher percentages of student scoring below grade level than the district or state averages.

The applicant provides a clear pattern for selection of comparable schools as outlined on page 23.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant includes extensive data on the retention rates for teachers, the applicant does not as clearly delineate the needs for principal retention and recruitment. This is considered a weakness because there is an incomplete picture of the district with regard to their need for consistent high-quality leadership.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant relies heavily on the Florida's Race to the Top Phase II MOU as a basis for the measurement of student growth for the purpose of the PBCS (Page 24-25).

The applicant does include in the PBCS a minimum incentive bonus for working in the high need school (Page 27).

The applicant indicates that the potential amount of money earned is up to 25 percent of the targeted amount for both the differential pay and the incentive bonus.

The applicant indicates that an assessment process for teachers and administrators is currently in place (Page 34). The applicant also indicates that during the planning year and in connection with the Race to the Top project, a revised teacher and principal evaluation system will be developed utilizing the state-adopted teacher-level student growth measure (Pages 35-36).

The applicant included stakeholders in the planning process as is indicated by the narrative on page 37 and the letters of support located in the appendixes.

The applicant includes evaluation systems that are currently used as well as providing a commitment to review and revise those systems during the planning year of this grant (Page 39)

The applicant has indicated that a data warehouse is in the development stages. This warehouse will be used as a basis for the technology support staff to ensure that the data systems are designed to meet the priorities of the proposal (Page 41).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant provides several sample Earning Statements to indicate the amount of money for differential pay and incentive bonus, the applicant does not clearly indicate how it was determined that these amounts are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and additional staff. The applicant also includes data regarding the percentage of the bonus that would be in relationship to the average salary. For example, a \$1,000 bonus is equal to 2.2 percent of the average teacher's salary. However, it is still not clear whether that is of a sufficient size to affect behaviors of staff members.

Although the applicant defines staff development activities that may increase the

capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement, the applicant does not indicate how the selection by the specific staff member from a menu of choices will specifically meet the needs for that teacher.

On page 35, the applicant indicates a high level of dependence on the Race to the Top MOU. If funding does not occur through that resource, additional planning and funding may be necessary.

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 applicant clearly delineates the management plan with a detailed timeline on the charts on pages 57-64. The management plan includes the responsible parties and the major tasks to be completed. This plan is an achievable one.

The project director and other key personnel identified in pages 65-68 are supported by resumes of their qualifications. The time commitments appear to be appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively.

The charts on page 69 indicate the use of local financial supports that increase in the four years of the grant project.

The requested grant amount and the project costs appear to be sufficient to attain the project goals of this project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**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:**

In the District Strategic Plan (Appendix E) and the Framework for Teaching and Learning, the applicant includes the use of strong and measurable objectives for raising student achievement and increasing the effectiveness of teacher, principals and other personnel. For example, one of the outcomes of the Student Success--Leading the Way is to increase AYP percentages for all subgroups.

The TIF II goals and objectives include a focus on student achievement (Pages 70-73).

Objective 5 has a focus on recruitment and retention of highly effective teachers and principals (Page72-73).

The indicator relating to the objectives include both quantitative and qualitative data. For example the indicator that 80 percent of eligible teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals will earn some level of TIF incentive pay is a quantitative measure. In contrast the self-reporting by teachers address in indicator 2.3 is qualitative in nature (Page 71).

The evaluation plan includes procedures for feedback and continuous improvement using the Plan-Do-Check-Act process (Page 73).

**Weaknesses:**

At least two of the performance objectives were not strong. For example, Indicator 2.3 states that 90 percent of the teachers will report that the professional development received has helped improve their abilities at the school sites. Another example, Indicator 3.2 states that 90 percent of the administrators will report that the professional development received has helped improve their abilities at the school sites. These are examples of weaker objectives as there is considerable room for bias in the responses and no linkage to raising student achievement.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses the role that teachers will play in developing value-added end-of-course exams not covered by Florida State Assessments. There are identified by the applicant as value-added assessments. A sample communication was generated by the applicant that could be used to explain the chosen value-added model to teachers (Pages 41-44).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant uses a sample communication memo to explain to the selected teacher the incentive plan, the communication does not indicate how the teacher could use the data generated to improve classroom practices.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant defines the processes that will be used by a recruiter hired as part of the TIF II project which will be serving high-need students. The applicant indicates that retention of the teachers will be assisted by the bonus incentives and the attractive professional development opportunities (Page 17). The applicant indicates the plan is to use school-based performance evaluations to determine the effectiveness of new recruits to the high-need schools (Page 15).

The applicant proposes to use flyers, brochures, the TIF website, newsletters and email lasts to publicize the existence of the special performance-based compensation system incentives exclusively at the targeted schools (Page 15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 7/29/10 5:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 2:58 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	9
---------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	88

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.385A

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

Applicant: School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

### 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 clearly met all requirements for Absolute Priority 1.

The applicant demonstrates a clear, well-organized, and comprehensive plan to develop and implement a PBCS that rewards at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement as part of the coherent and integrated approach, not only of the district but of the state as well, to strengthening the educator workforce.

Building on three years' prior experience with an earlier TIF grant, the applicant's proposal includes detailed plans for calculating and awarding differential incentive payments based significantly on student growth as determined by objective data on student performance (p. 9); multiple observation-based evaluations of teacher (p. 33) and principal (p. 34) performance using objective evidence-based rubrics aligned to standards for teachers and principals (p. 33) conducted by trained evaluators; additional incentives for taking on leadership roles (p. 17, p. 25), and a clear focus on using data

and targeted professional development to guide improvements in teaching and learning outcomes (p. 11, p. 25).

The applicant provides an explanation for how the incentive amounts were determined, based on a desire to address stakeholders' request that the incentives be based on their negotiated contracts as a starting point and provide a transparent, logical, and consistent approach to setting the amount of supplemental compensation available to teachers, administrators, and other personnel (pp. 29-30).

**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 clearly met all requirements for Absolute Priority 2.

The applicant uses their previous three years' experience with a different PBCS grant to project reasonable and realistic costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, and has accepted responsibility to provide performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel who earn it under the system (Budget Narrative). The proposal includes sufficient funding for project management, evaluation, costs associated with professional development, recruitment efforts, enhancements to their data-management system, and, of course, incentive payments.

As a district that has signed an agreement with the state in relation to their Race to the Top (RTTT) application, Orange County is committed to extending the PBCS to the rest of the schools from the initial 2007 TIF grant, using the new and improved model for PBCS it intends to develop during an initial planning year, if the state's RTTT grant is funded (p. 4).

Regardless of RTTT funding status, the applicant includes a plan to provide from non-TIF funds an increasing share of the performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (budget narrative).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

**Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -**

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

**General:**

The applicant met all requirements for Absolute Priority 3.

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce, embraced by the district as well as the state, as evidenced in the district's Strategic Plan (p. 9) and the state's RTTT application, currently under review (abstract, p. 75). The proposal emphasizes meaningful use of data (p. 11) and evaluations (p. 33) to guide decisions about professional development as well as hiring and retention and tenure decisions (p. 15).

The professional development that is a critical component of the district's strategy to strengthen the workforce, clearly ties decisions about what professional development opportunities will be offered to data about student learning (p. 25) and identified teacher and principal needs (p. 38).

**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 fully met the requirement related to describing how its proposed PBCS will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

The applicant's plan provides incentives for evidence of leadership roles, such as "heading a writing team, conducting family math nights, or mentoring" (p. 25) and the district has identified an additional funding source, in the federally-funded School Leadership Program, that can provide funding for "graduate level professional development in educational leadership, a stipend for mentoring, and other professional learning opportunities" (p. 17) intended to help support new principals, assistant principals, and teachers aspiring to be principals while providing a mechanism by which experienced principals can serve as mentors.

**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 has partially met the requirements for Core Element 1.

The proposal includes convincing evidence that the applicant has a plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its PBCS, in reference to the other personnel eligible for TIF awards from the TIF 1 cohort (p. 4). This plan includes specific examples of how the payments might look on an employee's monthly stipend report as well as a question and answer page that addresses common questions employees might have about how they can earn incentives in the system (pp. 28-29, 41-44, Appendix).

Although the applicant indicates that they do not yet have these same elements in place for the TIF II teachers, principals, assistant principals, paraprofessionals and other personnel (p. 4), it is clear from the materials that they have already produced that they will be able to meet this element in fairly quick order during their requested planning year if they are funded.

**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 fully met the requirements for Core Element 2, while also indicating a plan to continue to expand stakeholder involvement through the TIF II Advisory Council and School-Based TIF Leadership Teams (p. 4).

The proposal includes letters of support from the President of both the CTA and OESPA, the superintendent, area superintendents, principals from each of the eligible schools, and the proposed project director. The applicant describes the intended Advisory Board to include representatives from both unions, teachers, principals, paraprofessionals and community partners (p. 24) and indicates that each school will also have a TIF leadership team to make recommendations about the proposed PBCS during the planning year (p. 37).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each

teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

**General:**

The applicant has partially met the requirements for Core Element 3, based on a fully-implemented PBCS for 500 TIF I teachers and administrators who support the proposed plan to add other personnel to the incentive program (p. 4), and a plan to implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year (pp. 25-26). On page 4, the applicant has identified the need to develop this core element during a planning year.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

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

**General:**

The applicant has partially met the requirements for Core Element 4, as evidenced by a functioning data system that, in conjunction with manual linking of student academic achievement to teachers and principals, addresses this element. Through a self-assessment, the applicant states that they have not yet met the requirements of this core element (p. 4) for their TIF II cohort. The applicant describes plans to automate the data system as part of the implementation plan to be carried out in year 1. The specific capacities of the current data system, including the student data it currently holds, are described on page 13 and 31, and components that need to be addressed as part of the current PBCS project are described on page 39. The budget includes a significant line item to address this need, with \$600,000 included in the year 1 budget for "Identify Management System: QAL Security System", 3.0 FTE related to data-system support, and approximately \$250,000 per year for site licenses (Budget Narrative).

**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 has partially met the requirements for Core Element 5, as evidenced by documentation used by the existing TIF I Cohort, whereby participants "sign an assurance stipulating all three elements required for incentive pay, including individual professional development plans, professional development through Harvard Wide World and College Board" (p. 4), and the statement that they have not yet met this requirement in relation to the TIF II participants (p. 4).

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 meets the requirements for demonstrating a plan for high quality professional development.

The applicant describes the intention of using the planning year to develop a high quality, comprehensive professional development component for teachers and principals that will expand on the existing professional development system in the district. The plan includes a detailed description of the opportunities that will be available for teachers (pp. 46-48), principals (pp. 49-50), and paraprofessionals (pp. 50-51) to attend trainings, to share their expertise with others, to participate in national and state conferences related to the subject areas they teach or specific instructional practices identified as areas of need for them, to have access to professional books, and to attend online courses offered through an existing arrangement with Harvard Graduate School's professional development classes (pp. 54). The budget includes sufficient funding for each of these professional development needs, allocated each year of the grant.

As described by the applicant, the professional development will be based on needs assessed at the high-needs schools and will be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process and needs assessment and linked to objective measures of student need. The professional development plan has a strong focus on data and its appropriate use to improve practice and student achievement (pp.

46-54).

The list of project tasks provided in the Management Plan (pp. 57-59) includes quarterly assessment of the effectiveness of the professional development opportunities in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement and modification to the plan as needed to improve its effectiveness.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant includes information to document that the schools identified for participation meet the criterion of high-needs, as indicated by lower teacher retention rates (for most of the schools) than other district schools (p. 16), over 90% of students qualifying for the free or reduced-price meal program (p. 5) and low academic achievement, with 34% or more students performing below grade level on the FCAT or other respected assessments (at the one school in the group that serves only K-2 students and thus has no state test data) (p. 5).

The applicant provides a definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purpose of paragraph (2) of this selection criteria. At the high school level, the comparable schools are the "next tier of high schools selected based on lowest performing student achievement...and their Title I middle schools would then be comparable schools" (p. 23). For elementary schools, the applicant identifies as comparable those schools that are Title 1, where 90% or more of the students are eligible for the free or reduced price meal program and where 34% or more of the students are reading below grade level according to the Florida state assessment of reading, but who do not matriculate into one of the highest-needs middle and secondary schools in the district (p. 23). Using these criteria, the applicant identifies six Title 1 middle schools and five elementary schools as comparable to the 25 schools identified as potential participants in the TIF program.

The applicant shows that the retention rate at the schools eligible for inclusion in the program (67%) is lower than for the district overall (83%) (p. 14).

**Weaknesses:**

In addition, the proposal does not provide sufficient information to determine the degree to which the high-needs schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas. The applicant states that the schools eligible for this project have a retention rate that ranges from 67% to 100%, with an average retention rate of 83% (p. 14). Without additional information, such as the retention rate in comparable schools, these numbers are not interpretable.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant reports that the proposal is aligned with the use of student growth data in the state's Race to the Top proposal (p. 1) and with the district's ongoing use of evidence-based rubrics to carry out observation-based assessments of "teacher and principal performance at multiple points in the year" (p. 1). The proposal expands on a previous TIF grant awarded to high-need secondary schools in the district (p. 3) with the hope of using funding from the state's Race to the Top application to expand the incentive offerings to additional schools in the district (p. 3).

The applicant's description of the criteria that will be used to determine teacher and principal effectiveness, which include student growth on assessments, participation in professional development activities, and evaluations at multiple times during the year (abstract) is clear.

The applicant states that their recently funded BRIDGE Leadership Program "will contribute to recruitment and retention of principals in high needs schools" (p. 17) through providing mentorship opportunities for beginning administrators and funding for graduate courses.

The applicant describes a variety of ways in which the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel will be sought (p. 24, p. 37), including supplying tangible evidence of support in the form of letters from the presidents of the teachers and classified employees' unions, district superintendent and area superintendents, principals at all of the schools where the plan will be implemented, and the project director (Appendix).

The proposal addresses the need to enhance the existing data system to enable it to link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems (p. 13, 31, 39), along with the budgeted support to hire additional staff to make the enhancements (Budget Narrative).

In addition, the applicant has identified a variety of professional development activities to which teachers, principals, and other staff will have access, and designed to address identified needs of the school and individual employee (pp. 46-51).

**Weaknesses:**

This section of the proposal has one fairly significant weakness and two more minor weaknesses.

Although the alignment with the Race to the Top proposal may result in additional reach, it is unclear how the applicant intends to meet the financial needs the proposal currently identifies as being covered through the RTTT efforts (such as "the design of student growth models, assessments and value-added features" (p. 12)) if Florida's RTTT proposal is not funded.

The description of how performance, particularly in terms of student growth, will be measured is currently unclear (p. 25). The applicant states that they will use 3 weighted performance measures but then lists 4 ways by which they will measure performance (p. 25) and states that they will weight these measures "based on their assigned importance" (p. 25). Additional information is needed in this section of the proposal to ensure the plan is fully developed.

The proposal includes funds for teachers to attend national conferences because "teachers have shown through their reflections upon return from a conference that nothing has energized them more than being able to talk with other teachers from around the world and learn from the experts in their field about the latest research findings and strategies to be used in the classroom" (p. 51). The applicant has not included more objective evidence of the impact of conference attendance on teaching effectiveness and student learning, instead focusing on the opportunities conferences provide "for teachers to travel and visit other parts of the United States they may have never seen before" (pp.

51-52).

The proposal is lacking in sufficient detail related to the measures to be used to assess student growth. The proposal indicates that local assessments will be created and field-tested in the first year of funding (p. 18), and provides an example of an Art Assessment to demonstrate the way in which the district might approach the development of performance assessments (p. 19). Insufficient information is provided about the expertise in measurement development that those involved in creating the district's measures will have, the framework under which the assessments will be developed, the intended plan to field test and pilot them to ensure they provide reliable assessments of important constructs, and that they assess what they are designed to assess. Assessment development is a challenging endeavor, and when the assessments have high stakes, such as those described in the proposal, one year may be insufficient for assessment design, development, and validation.

It is unclear from the description provided who is responsible for evaluating principals (p. 34). It is unclear from the proposal how the use of self-selected goals related to student improvement (p. 42) will result in un-biased plans to evaluate teacher effectiveness equitably at each participating school.

The proposal indicates that each of the 15 participating schools will be provided with either one math or one science coach (p. 47), but no information is provided to explain how the district will decide which content area coach to provide.

**Reader's Score: 50**

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

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

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

**(1) The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks;**

**(2) The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively;**

**(3) The applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources; and**

**(4) The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.**

##### **Strengths:**

The proposal includes a detailed timeline for each of the five years of the grant, with responsibilities for different features of the work assigned to different people in the district, major tasks listed, and dates by which the work should be completed clearly marked (pp. 57-64). This management plan is comprehensive and provides evidence that the applicant will be able to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

The project director identified to head up this work and the other district administrator staff named in the proposal have experience managing grants and working with educators from across the district (pp. 56-57), including ongoing involvement with the initial TIF grant the district received in 2007. Their experience implementing a PBCS in this district and history of serving in oversight and evaluative roles increase the likelihood of success in the current effort.

The proposal identifies funds from other Federal programs, such as the BRIDGE Leadership Program, funded in 2009 (p. 17), and the state's RTTT grant currently under review (p. 9) to supplement the current TIF funding. The charts on page 69 show a decline in TIF contribution over the years of the grant.

The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the program. The professional development opportunities are fully funded, the budget includes specific line-items related to the different travel options participants will have, and the management team, evaluators, and computer programmer / data system teams are provided with a sufficient allocation of FTE to be able to fulfill their responsibilities as outlined in the proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**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 proposal includes monies for hiring an external evaluation team responsible for providing objective feedback on the implementation of the project (p. 68). The management plan included quarterly evaluation reports, with opportunities to modify the project as needed based on the evaluation data.

The evaluation plan includes a variety of measurable performance objectives that are clearly related to the goals of the project for raising student achievement, increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel (pp. 8-9).

The plan will provide a variety of quantitative and qualitative data (pp. 71-73) to assist in ongoing formative evaluation as well as the final summative evaluation at the end of the funding period.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide evidence that four of the performance objectives, in particular, are strong. Indicator 2.2 under Objective 2 on the evaluation plan indicates that teachers will self-report the degree to which they are using new teaching strategies

learned from coaches in their classrooms and that the strategies are having an impact on improved student learning (p. 71). It is unclear why the evaluation plan would depend on self-report survey data for this indicator when both observational data and student growth data will be available. Similar self-report data are included as Indicator 2.3, 3.2, and 4.1, where principals and paraprofessionals are asked to indicate the degree to which the professional development they have received has impacted their classroom practice, effectiveness, and student outcomes (p. 71-72).

**Reader's Score: 4**

### **Priority Questions**

#### **Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

##### **Strengths:**

The applicant partially meets the requirements for Competitive Preference Priority 1.

The applicant indicates that they intend to either use the state's value-added measures of student achievement (if the state is successful in their RTTT application) or will contract with an assessment expert to develop a formula for calculating value-added scores in-district. The budget includes monies allocated specifically to the development of their own value-added measures (p. 41). In the discussion of the data-management system, the applicant demonstrates the capacity and commitment to create a robust data system and ensure data quality (pp. 13, 31, 39).

##### **Weaknesses:**

The example for how the applicant might explain the chosen value-added model to teachers (pp. 41-43) does not specifically address how they can use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Reader's Score: 4**

#### **Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

##### **1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need**

**Schools. (Up to 5 points):**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high needs schools to serve high-need students, as evidenced by 90% or more of the student population being eligible to participate in the free or reduced price meal program and 34% or more of the student population scoring below grade level on the FCAT or other measures (p. 5) , retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, as evidenced by the incentives for working in such assignments.

A real strength of the proposal is the use of a recruiter, at .5 FTE dedicated to the project in years 1 and 2 and 1.0 FTE dedicated to the project in years 3-5 (budget narrative). The recruiter will not only publicize openings in teaching, administrative, and support positions, but will also screen candidates for evidence of effectiveness in their prior job placements (p. 15). A focus of recruitment efforts will be continuing to develop professional networks through connections with local teacher preparation programs, as a means of identifying highly-qualified graduates of those programs who might be recruited to fill positions in the district. In addition, the proposal lists a variety of means by which vacancies at the participating schools will be communicated , including "flyers, brochures, the TIF website, newsletters and email blasts to widely publicize the existence of the special performance-based compensation system incentives exclusively available at the targeted schools" (p. 15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in this area.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 7/29/10 2:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 9:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	9
---------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	101
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.385A

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

Applicant: School Board of Orange County, Florida -- Grant Services, Academic Services  
(S385A100148)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

The applicant has met the requirement by providing a complete plan for differentiated levels of compensation for effective teachers and principals.

The applicant addresses on page 32 a description of the differentiated pay plan model that will be used to provide incentives for teacher effectiveness. On pages 24 -26 the applicant describes the use of a differentiated model of pay for teachers that supports the applicant's plan to develop and implement a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness at improving student achievement.

The applicant provides substantial information throughout the narrative regarding how the incentive plan will be based on a formula in which there is significant weight given to student growth. The applicant has included the formulas that will be used to calculate the growth model. The applicant specifically addresses how the incentives will be based on substantiated evidence of student growth.

The proposal includes a model for creating effective principals and teachers through needs-based professional development. There is significant detail on pages 24-26 about how teachers will collaborate and engage in reflective practice with one another to support effective instructional strategies and targeted student-centered instruction. The applicant further states (pages 24-26) that there will be multiple opportunities for the faculty to be involved in leadership roles.

The applicant also describes that there will be multiple observations for teachers to receive feedback from administrators to guide their instruction. These observations also serve to provide on-going professional development.

**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:**

OCPS meets the priority for maintaining fiscal sustainability for PBCS. The abstract clearly supports information contained in the narrative, which states that the district will sustain the program goals with additional non-TIF funds. The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS. The applicant provides a clear plan for expanding funding for the incentive fund program in the future. The abstract states that the district will increase funding to maintain and sustain this program. This is clear evidence that the applicant intends to sustain and support the effectiveness and full implementation of this project.

**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 meets the priority for creating a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce. This priority will be addressed with the use of data and evaluations for professional development and retention and tenure decisions in the district. In the strategic plan, the applicant has included evidence that supports the district plan for professional development. It is research-based and proven to improve teaching strategies and increased collaboration.

There is documentation on page 11 that there will be high quality professional development which includes Lesson Study and Response to Intervention that are both linked to student data to improve classroom practice.

The proposal includes a model for creating effective principals and teachers through needs-based professional development. There is significant detail on pages 13 regarding how teachers will collaborate and engage in reflective practice with one another to enhance effective instructional strategies and targeted student-centered instruction. The applicant further states (pages 13, 25) that there will be multiple opportunities for the teaching faculty to be involved in leadership roles. There is a clear description on page 25 of how the district will provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate to use student data to design effective instructional strategies to meet the students learning needs.

The applicant also clearly describes processes for multiple observations of teachers and opportunities for them to receive feedback from administrators that can guide their instruction. These observations will also serve to provide on-going professional development.

**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:**

There is clear evidence in the application that the meets the requirement and will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

The applicant documents on page 25 how teachers may be involved in leadership roles that are tied to improving student success. These leadership roles include: heading a writing team, conducting family math nights, or mentoring other teachers.

The applicant proposes (on page 71) to create an incentive program for the district's schools that will provide monetary awards to teachers. Awards will be based on: student gains on standardized test scores; classroom evaluations; and participation in collaborative meetings.

**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 has partially met this element. The applicant specifically states on page 4 of the application that they will use the requested planning year to fully meet the requirements of this element. The applicant provides a convincing argument and plan to address how they will improve communication to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system.

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:**

This element has been met. There is evidence of the endorsement, communication, and letters of support from various stakeholders and collaboration and key partnerships to enhance the sustainability of this program. There is evidence on pages 24 and 37 that this proposal has been shared and communicated with groups of key stakeholders. The included letters of support provide significant evidence that there is buy-in from district staff to promote and fully implement the program.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3**

**1. Core Element 3:**

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

**General:**

The applicant has partially met this element. The applicant specifically states on page 4 of the application that they will use the requested planning year to fully meet the requirements of this element. The applicant provides a convincing argument and plan on pages 25 and 26 that address how they will improve the district multiple stage evaluation system for both principals and teachers.

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 has partially met this element. The applicant specifically states on page 4 of the application that they will use the requested planning year to fully meet the requirements of this element. The applicant provides a convincing argument on how they will flesh out and improve all of the capabilities of the data management system. The applicant addresses how, during the planning year, the district will continue to use and enhance a data-management system that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. The applicant addresses the current data system's capabilities and also plans for significant enhanced measures (pages 4). The applicant includes a clear time line with a plan to enhance and improve the current data management system. The applicant has described that the planning year will allow opportunities for the district develop how administrators and teachers will be trained to use the data-collection systems.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

##### 1. Core Element 5:

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

##### General:

The applicant has partially met this element. The applicant specifically states on page 4 of the application that they will use the requested planning year to fully meet the requirements of this element. The applicant provides a convincing argument and plan that address how they will improve professional development and the measure of effectiveness.

Administrators and teachers will be directly involved in improving the evaluation system and the data-collection systems. Higher-level leadership responsibilities will be offered to teachers. Teachers will be provided with enhanced feedback designed to improve instructional strategies and, in turn, improve both student achievement and principal effectiveness.

Pages 46-47 of the application clearly explains how teacher evaluations will drive the professional development for the staff. The applicant has included full details (pages 46-47) about how teachers and principals will use the scores from their evaluations. The applicant also included a detailed plan regarding the specific measures to teachers and principals' effectiveness that will be provided to staff.

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 proposal meets this requirement by including a model for creating effective principals and teachers through needs-based professional development. There is evidence of how the TIF II project develops a model to create effective principals and teachers through need-based professional development according to teachers and principals' individual professional development plan.

There are clear timelines and key leader descriptors on pages 61-64 of the application that are linked to all of the outcomes that state clear data and procedures that will take place to effectively implement TIF II Program in OCSD. There is evidence of how the OCSD application develops a model to create effective principals and teachers through need-based professional development. There is a timeline which projects an action plan for implementation of collaboration teams and professional development for teachers and principals to improve instructional practices.

The applicant explains on page 11 how the TIF II Program will use Response to Intervention and Lesson Study to design high quality structured instructional strategies and collaboration to students.

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The application shows that the criteria for the participating elementary schools includes: Title I schools with 90 percent or more of the students eligible for the free or reduced price meal program; large percentages of students are reading below grade level; and 70 percent or more of students are zoned for the TIF I high need middle and high schools.

All 15 of the elementary schools in the proposed TIF II program meet the definition of a "high-needs" schools, where more than 50% of the school enrollments were from low-income families.

On pages 6 and 7 of application there is evidence that shows the student achievement in each of the schools proposed for TIF II have between 34 - 54% of their students reading below grade-level (Below FCAT Level 3).

The applicant states on page 8 that the goal of the TIF II Program is to increase student achievement in the targeted high-need schools through developing and implementing a comprehensive performance-based compensation system for teachers, principals, and other personnel to increase educator effectiveness and student achievement, measured in significant part by student growth.

The applicant provides documentation of the need to improve the teacher attrition rates on pages 13 and 14. There is data that provides a comparison to the retention rates between schools in the district. This is documentation that some schools have retention rates at 34.8% in comparison to the district average of 83.2%.

#### Weaknesses:

There was no documentation or data provide to indicate that there is a need for increasing the retention of principals. There is no data provided in the application on the retention rates of principals within the district.

Reader's Score: 9

## Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly states on pages 8 and 9 the following objectives will be measured and met while implementing the TIF II One Vision, One Voice Program, which is an integrated strategy to provide an incentive program for educators: implementation of a performance-based compensation system that rewards educators with performance and incentive pay primarily for increases in student achievement; provide high quality professional development to TIF participants that is based on student data and instructional needs as documented by teacher individual professional development plans; build school leadership knowledge and skills of principals and assistant principals with high quality professional development; recruit and retain highly effective teachers and principals in high need schools through the implementation of a performance-based compensation system that rewards educators; and develop and implement a data system that links student achievement data with the performance-based compensation system.

On page 5 of the application there is substantial evidence that 10 TIF I schools will

expand their PBCS to "other personnel" to incentivize the remainder of their school leadership, team, including deans, resource teachers, guidance counselors, media specialists, coaches, and other certified educators. Evidence in the application further addresses that the 15 Title 1 elementary schools that feed into the TIF I middle schools will offer the PBCS opportunity to teachers, principals, assistant principals, deans, resources teachers, guidance counselors, media specialists, coaches and other certified educators.

The applicant states on page 8 that the goal of the TIF II Program is to increase student achievement in the targeted high-need schools through developing and implementing a comprehensive performance-based compensation system for teachers, principals, and other personnel to increase educator effectiveness and student achievement, measured in significant part by student growth.

The applicant states on page 11 how the TIF II Program will use Response to Intervention and Lesson Study to design high quality structured instructional strategies and collaboration to students.

The applicant includes a Teacher Incentive Plan II Earning Statement on page 28 which outlines the monetary incentives for teachers based on gains to standardized test scores, teaching in high need schools and targets made on standardized tests.

The applicant provides descriptions of how educators will receive an incentive based on the performance of students.

There is evidence of the methodology for assessing teacher performance in terms of increased student achievement and improved instructional practices.

The TIF II program will be a strong model for creating effective principals and teachers through need-based professional development according to teachers and principals individual professional development plan.

There is evidence that administrators and teachers will be involved in improving the evaluation system, data-collection systems, and professional development plans for teachers and principals. These systems will provide enhanced feedback to teachers to help them improve their instructional strategies. In turn, teachers will be able to improve student achievement.

The applicant state that OCPS teachers are assessed annually by using a research-based assessment procedure that includes formal observations, Individual Professional Development Plans, midpoint and final assessments to monitor and provide feedback to educators.

The applicant states that they will use a planning year to improve the data management system and explore other improvements of the previous teacher incentive program.

**Weaknesses :**

On page 25 of the application, the applicant states that 51% of the incentive will be based on student growth. However, there is no specific evidence of how the applicant defines how student growth will be measured.

The applicant is highly reliant on the funds from Race to the Top to support the implementation and improvement of the teacher incentive program, but the applicant does not have a guarantee that they will be funded from this source. There is a lack of evidence that there are guaranteed additional federal funds besides Race to the Top.

**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 application provides a substantial management plan (p61), which outlines by month and year the proposed design of the system and their plan to build capacity. The timeline for implementation and monitoring of the TIF II Program in OCSD contains clear performance indicators and key individuals that will be monitoring and leading the proposal.

The applicant included significant information on the key personnel's professional background in relation to this proposed project, which will foster and guide the implementation of this project. All of the key personnel are clearly well-qualified to implement this proposal. The applicant fully explains (page 61) roles and responsibilities for all key personnel who will be involved in the implementation of the proposal. Bios that indicate the qualified educational experience of key leaders involved in monitoring the OCSD TIF II Program were also attached.

There are clear timelines and key leader descriptors on pages 61-64 of the application that are linked to all of the outcomes. These objectives provide clear data and procedures that will take place to effectively implement TIF II Program in OCSD. There is evidence of how the OCSD will use a clear model to create effective principals and teachers through need-based professional development. There is a timeline, which projects an action plan for implementation of collaboration teams and professional development for teachers and principals to improve instructional practices.

The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain the project goals. On page 69 the applicant indicates that local funds will also contribute to the implementation of this teacher incentive program.

There is substantial evidence in the application that speaks to local support of the project. Various endorsements and letters of support from stakeholders and collaborators were attached. Key partnerships that will enhance the sustainability of this program were also described and documented.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

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:

There is substantial evidence on pages 70-73 regarding how administrators and teachers will be involved in improving the evaluation system and data-collection systems for teachers. These systems will provide enhanced feedback to teachers and will directly help them improve their instructional strategies. There is evidence that the evaluation data will be qualitative and quantitative and will provide specific feedback to professionals that will help them improve their practice and, in turn, improve student achievement.

The applicant states that OCPS teachers are assessed annually by using a research-based assessment procedure that includes formal observations, Individual Professional Development Plans, midpoint and final assessments to monitor and provide feedback to educators.

The applicant includes evidence on page 70 of performance objectives for raising student achievement by increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel. The objectives are clearly written and linked to the goal of the proposed program to increase teacher and principal effectiveness through pay incentives.

#### Weaknesses:

A few of the performance objectives were neither specific nor measurable. For example, Indicator 3.2 states (p70) that 90 percent of the administrators will report that the professional development received has helped improve their abilities at the school sites. This type of indicator is considered a weakness as it relies on self-reporting, which may not be a specific, measurable, valid and/or reliable indicator.

Reader's Score: 4

### Priority Questions

#### Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

Federal Register notice) as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

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

**Strengths:**

There is evidence that the applicant describes and defines how teachers will receive a monetary incentive based on the increased student achievement, improved instructional strategies, and involvement in higher-level leadership responsibilities.

On page 41, the application documents how the key personnel will provide communication to teachers to educate and inform them on the development of value-added assessments. The applicant provides clear and convincing evidence that teachers will be involved in creating end-of-course value added assessments (on page 41).

**Weaknesses:**

The plan does not include specific mention to how teachers will use the data from the value-added measures to improve their instruction and classroom practices.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides clear evidence of how teachers will be recruited and placed in schools to serve high-need students. There is evidence in the project design that there will be substantial incentives for effective teachers working with high-need students and difficult to staff subjects. The applicant completely addresses on pages 8 and 9 how the district will recruit and retain highly effective teachers and principals in high need schools through the implementation of a performance-based compensation system that rewards educators; and develop and implement a data system that links student achievement data with the performance-based compensation system.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/30/10 9:00 AM