

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 9:30 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

Reader #1: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	53
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	24
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	91

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

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:

Pinellas County has developed a PBCS with four components (weight) for the pilot year:
Professional Expectations Data- 30%
Student Performance Data- 30%
Peer Review Data- 30%
Professional Development Data- 10%

The weights are initial recommendations: the narrative says that the ratio for implementation in year 2 will be "developed during the planning year with data from the pilot schools in conjunction with input from key stakeholders, including support from PCTA" (p. 4-13).

In the teacher appraisal instrument, 30% weight is given to student achievement data based on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test in reading and math. Guidelines for annual learning gains on the high stakes test are determined by the state (p.4-23). A research specialist will work with the PCS research and accountability office to develop a value added model to determine student growth. Student growth will be combined with

the data from the appraisal system to generate an "effectiveness score' (p.4-23). A team of stakeholders will use this information to determine the "effectiveness scale' during the planning year.

In the planning year, only math and reading scores will be included, but PCS plans to develop additional assessments for areas where FCAT data is unavailable (p.4-17). The newly developed assessment will categorize students, like in the FCAT, into 5 achievement levels.

Instructional personnel's student growth scores will serve as the foundation for a value-added model to be used in conjunction with teacher and administrator evaluations to determine teacher effectiveness' (p.4-18)

Appendix C provides FCAT performance levels and the performance appraisal tool.

Peer reviewers and administrators will conduct observations using the teacher appraisal instrument twice per year for the Professional Expectations and Peer Review pieces of the plan.

Inter-rater reliability is assured through training on the appraisal instrument. Principals and APs receive training on both the teacher and administrator instruments. The training will "include instruction for understanding the instrument and interpreting the data collected for the purpose of improving administrator effectiveness' (p.4-27). The Research and Accountability Office will review completed appraisal instruments and assist in the assurance of inter-rater reliability (p.4-27)

The proposed ratings for each indicator in the professional expectation and peer review categories are "highly effective, effective, or ineffective' and a score is assigned to each rating (p.4-20). Student performance data and professional development plan data are automatically populated in the appraisal instrument.

The administrative appraisal instrument is being revised and will mirror the teacher system, and then be piloted during year 1 (same as teachers instrument) (p.4-13). There is no discussion of other indicators that may be included in the Principal evaluation process.

"Teachers and principals would receive an effectiveness score based on a combination of their appraisal score and any determined value-added measures. This score would place them on an effectiveness continuum." Based on where they are on the continuum, "some teachers or principals may receive up to \$9000" (p.4-19).

The Budget Summary, pages 2-18 provides some additional information for purposes of budgeting, but no explanation is provided. "PBCS payments to benchmark 40% of teachers and administrators- estimated: 25% at highest amount (\$9000), 50% at middle amount (\$3000), and 25% at lowest amount (\$1000).

TEXT TOO LONG TO BE UPLOADED. TO BE CONTINUED IN PRIORITY 2 TEXT BOX

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:

PRIORITY 1 ANSWER CONTINUED

These values are significant based on the average teacher/administrator salaries (\$45284/\$73284). Some teachers may not receive compensation. All teachers and principals would be provided prescriptive professional development opportunities to assist in improving their performance and impact on student achievement' (p.4-19)

It is not clear how the FCAT achievement levels will be translated into a value added measure of student growth, and how that measure will factor into the "effectiveness score" as part of the teacher appraisal tool. In the Draft rubric for Performance of Students Data (Appendix C-16), the document states "Teacher Performance data will be based on class average gains or school wide average gains based on the subject area taught," but there is no further explanation.

Appendix C also provides a point system for "developmental points needed" for learning gains in FCAT Levels 1 or with no supporting explanation (p. C-16).

PRIORITY TWO ANSWER (FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY) BELOW:

A complete budget summary and match summary are provided in the Budget Narrative, including parameters for stipends and awards.

PCS will pay an increasing share of the costs of the PBCS. In years 4-5, PD resources will be paid with district funds and a share of one staffing position. PCS also plans to pay a share of the incentive awards, 25% in year 4, and 50% in year five (p.4-37). PCS provides a clear summary of the match amounts, and will use district operating funds at the end of the grant period to continue the PBCS.

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:

Reviewer Comment Priority 3:

The PBCS is building on the LEAs overhaul of both the teacher and principal evaluations systems to incorporate student achievement data and other indicators of teacher performance. The applicant has adequately described and provided supporting evidence of the participating schools' struggle to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and that the target schools had lower achievement rates than comparable schools. PCS has depended on alternative routes to fill vacancies. The schools also have high numbers of teachers hired in the core subject areas, especially reading, math, science and exceptional student education (p.4-3). Retention is an issue in these schools as well

with high rates of teacher transfer requests and the number of new teachers hires (p.4-2).

The applicant believes that the incentives for additional leadership opportunities will help recruit and retain effective teachers (p.4-4).

In filling vacancies, PCS said it would consider teacher effectiveness scores (as they become available in year 2) in hiring decisions. Additionally, the Asst. Supt. for Human Resources provided notice that human resources will factor teacher effectiveness into the interview and hiring process. (Appendix B).

Professional development activities are directly linked to the process of appraisal as a measure of effectiveness and to the IPDP/ILDP as a measure of improvement (p.4-27).

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:

Teachers or principals who take leadership opportunities such as becoming a master teacher, mentoring new teachers, peer reviewer or tutoring students in reading, math or science beyond the contract period may receive up to \$2000 per year (p.4-19).

More detail is needed to understand how teachers can take on these roles, how the incentives are directly connected to the PBCS and specifically what role they play or how they contribute to the system.

The narrative does not adequately explain if the roles and responsibilities discussed in the PBCS are new, or if they already exist are being incorporated into the planned system.

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:

PCS benefits from a recently created department charged with coordinating all internal communication as well as marketing information to the community at large (p.4-9). The coordinator will "develop and oversee a plan that will address effectively communicating the components of the districts PBCS" to key stakeholders (p.4-9). Plan to contract with a public relations and communications consulting firm to assist in communicating details of the PBCS (p.4-10). Plans include using printed materials, web-based materials, in-person sessions, and the use of the PCS television station to disseminate information. Plan to roll out information to key stakeholders and keep all teachers apprised of developments with the evaluation system seem thoroughly considered.

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:

Stakeholder letters of support were provided from key stakeholders including the Pinellas County Teacher Association. PCTA, administrators, and principals are working with the TIF project team (Appendix A).

"PCS has the support of the superintendent, district leadership, region administrators and the Pinellas Classroom Teachers Association. The association supports the new teacher appraisal instrument and joined district leadership in presenting the new format to the PCS Board for approval in the 15 pilot schools" (p.4-21).

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:

PCS has revised the teacher appraisal instrument to include measures of student achievement, professional expectations and observations. In the planning year, PCS will pilot the instrument in 15 schools, including the 4 proposed for the TIF grant (p.4-13).

Appendix C provides FCAT performance levels and the performance appraisal tool. There are four components and weight for the pilot year:

Professional Expectations Data- 30%
Student Performance Data- 30%
Peer Review Data- 30%
Professional Development Data- 10%

The ratio for implementation in year 2 will be "developed during the planning year with data from the pilot schools in conjunction with input from key stakeholders, including support from PCTA" (p. 4-13).

Peer reviewers and administrators will conduct observations twice per year (p.4-22).

The proposed ratings for each indicator in the professional expectation and peer review categories are "highly effective, effective, or ineffective" and assigned a score (p.4-20). Student performance data and professional development plan data are automatically populated in the Instrument.

The administrative appraisal instrument is being revised and will mirror the teacher system, then piloted during year 1 (same as teachers instrument) (p.4-13)

The administrator's instrument is based on the Florida Professional Leadership Standards (p.4-21).

Training for both teacher and administrators appraisal instruments will provide a strong foundation for ensuring inter-rater reliability (p.4-27).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1.Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant provided a thorough discussion of the existing capabilities and planned developments of the district data management system

The PCS management information systems department is currently converting previous systems into the PCS Portal which will be used by all district employees "for storing and accessing student records and information," and with "components to integrate the storage of teacher and principal certification, appraisals, IPDPlans, and professional development records" (p.4-14).

The Portal will combine multiple existing systems and seems to provide sufficient access and reporting capabilities to support the PBCS. Student achievement, human resources information, and payroll reporting systems will be integrated through the SIF database (p. 4-25).

Additional discussion about a Schools Interoperability Framework compliant database system that allows real-time access to student achievement data and the necessary support for such system is provided on page 4-24.

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:

In summer 2010, administrators and peer reviewers at the participating schools (and others in the appraisal pilot) will be trained on the process of "appraisal, understanding and communicating effective teaching and learning using the teacher professional expectations rubric, collecting and analyzing multiple data sources, and indentifying the target for improvement through the IPDplan for the purpose of improving teacher effectiveness" (p.4-15).

Some teachers may not receive compensation. All teachers and principals would be provided prescriptive professional development opportunities to assist in improving their performance and impact on student achievement" (p.4-19).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1.High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

- (1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;
- (2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;
- (3) Provide --
 - (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
 - (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
- (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
- (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

"Professional development activities are directly linked to the process of appraisal as a measure of effectiveness and to the IPDP/ILDP as a measure of improvement" (p.4-27). Professional development includes inquiry-embedded professional learning facilitated by teacher leaders as mentors and coaches. High quality professional development for "early career teachers and teacher leaders include core components and evidence-based learning strategies such as lesson study (early career) and mentor training (teacher leaders)" (p.

4-27).

Teacher's performance appraisal will identify targets for improvement. The applicant discusses leadership based professional development based on the needs of administrators determined by the performance appraisal (p.4-29).

Professional development for principals at the schools includes an inquiry-oriented community of practice and mentor support. "Professional development will include the process of appraisal, understanding and communicating effective teaching and learning using the teacher professional expectations and rubric, collecting and analyzing multiple data sources, and identifying a target for improvement through the Individual Professional Development Plan for the purposes of improving teacher effectiveness" (p.4-15).

Teachers at the proposed schools are participating in existing initiatives on STEM, Digital Math Instruction, and teacher inquiry (p.4-28).

Some teachers may not receive compensation. All teachers and principals would be provided prescriptive professional development opportunities to assist in improving their performance and impact on student achievement" (p.4-19).

"A teacher's performance appraisal data will identify a target for improvements. Teacher inquiry may be used as an action plan to address the targeted goal in the Individual Professional Development Plan" (p.4-29).

The narrative does not describe any plans to assess the effectiveness of the professional development.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has adequately described and provided supporting evidence of the participating schools' struggle to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, and provided comparable schools that show the target schools had lower achievement rates. PCS has depended on alternative routes to fill vacancies. The schools also have high numbers of teachers newly hired in the core subject areas, especially reading, math, science and exceptional student education (p4-3). Retention is an issue in these schools

as well with high rates of teacher transfer requests and the number of new teachers hires (p. 4-2).

The applicant provided comparable schools using demographics, free and reduced lunch eligibility, and minority populations. The comparable schools had higher student achievement rates than the PCS schools and received higher ratings on the Florida School Accountability Report (p. 4-5).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the

capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

Strengths:

The applicant has diligently partnered with key stakeholders and has a thorough plan for sharing information across all interest groups, especially teachers and principals impacted by the PBCS (p.4-10).

PCS has thoroughly illustrated how they will use their data management system to link student achievement data with other measures of teacher effectiveness in the teacher and principal appraisal system and other necessary systems (p.4-25).

The proposed system is built around an overhauled teacher and principal appraisal system that considers student achievement as a significant factor in determining teacher effectiveness.

Teachers and administrators will develop individual professional development plans (p.4-27), and will receive targeted assistance in identifying goals and seeking out support (p.4-19).

Classroom observations of teachers are conducted by administrators and peer reviewers twice annually (p.4-22).

Weaknesses:

More clarity is needed on how incentive amounts will be associated with each level of performance.

More clarity is needed on the process for creating, testing and adopting district-developed assessments. The narrative does not adequately discuss how the district will ensure that the assessments developed for areas not covered by the FCAT will meet the same rigorous criteria for validity and reliability as the FCAT (p. 4-23).

Little supporting discussion is provided illustrating how the proposed PBCS is part of an LEA wide strategy.

The narrative was not clear on how many observations inform the administrator evaluation.

Reader's Score: 53

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The management plan has clear goals and objectives and benchmarks established with assignments, timelines, and evidence of completion included (p. 4-30).

A project director has been identified who is qualified for the assignment.

Job descriptions are provided for other key staff, including the project coordinator, instructional staff developers/mentors, applications specialist, and support staff (p.4-34). The project coordinator position is dedicated 100% to the grant activities.

Consideration has been given to PCS taking on an increasing share of the costs of the PBCS. In years 4 and 5, professional development resources will be paid with district funds and a share of one dedicated staffing position. PCS also plans to pay a share of the incentive awards, 25% in year 4, and 50% in year 5 (p. 4-37). PCS provides a clear summary of the match amounts, and will use district operating funds at the end of the grant period to continue the PBCS.

Costs are sufficient to support and sustain the project. The budget includes provisions for data system costs, including consultants, servers, and other equipment.

Weaknesses:

The project coordinator position will be filled with a principal or assistant principal on special assignment, but the applicant doesn't indicate the length of the assignment.

Reader's Score: 24

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:

PCS has provided plans to hire an external evaluator. The goals and objectives of the grant are clearly stated with benchmarks established, and the evaluator will look at both process and outcomes. The evaluator and staff will review data quarterly to update school leadership and teachers on grant progress toward meeting objectives and informing decisions about implementation (p.4-42).

Weaknesses:

The Local Evaluation section does not mention interim or final reports being produced for key stakeholders (p.4-38).

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:

PCS has demonstrated that it has a plan to begin building value added measures of student performance into the evaluations of teachers and principals and will contract with outside experts to provide guidance on the VA component. Goals and objectives are proposed for VA to develop and implement a system (p.4-7).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant is dedicated to using value added measures of student growth as part of the teacher and principal appraisal instruments, some details are not clear (p.4-23). For example, it was not clearly illustrated how the FCAT growth levels are attributed to a teacher or classroom or school.

More clarity is needed on how individual student growth is attributed to a classroom, grade or school and how these fit into the appraisal instrument. For example, it is unclear as to whether or not student learning gains on the math and reading FCAT are the primary indicator for a science teacher, or only for teachers of those subject areas. The applicant does not clearly describe how PCS will ensure that plans exist to explain the model to participating educators.

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:

PCS has demonstrated that the proposed schools are high need with high turnover rates. The areas of reading, math, science, and special education are hard to staff areas for the schools. The applicant believes that the incentives for additional leadership opportunities will help recruit and retain effective teachers (p.4-4).

In filling vacancies, PCS said it would consider teacher effectiveness scores (as they become available in year 2) in hiring decisions (p.4-4). Additionally, the Asst Supt for Human Resources provided notice that HR will factor teacher effectiveness into the interview and hiring process. (Appendix B).

Weaknesses:

No discussion is provided for how the LEA will communicate to teachers which schools are high-need, and which subjects are hard-to-staff.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 9:30 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/9/10 5:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

Reader #2: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	87

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	7
------------------	----	---

Total	110	94
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

- a) Student achievement will count 30% toward effectiveness during the planning year but will be "primarily based on student achievement data" in the remaining years of the project (p. 13).
- b) No apparent discussion was included about whether or how often principals will be observed. However, teachers will be observed twice yearly by administrators and peer reviewers (p.22).
- c) Additional compensation will be awarded to teachers or principals who assume additional leadership responsibilities beyond the contract period (p. 19).
- d) There was no apparent discussion related to the selection of incentive amounts.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

a) Projected costs were included in the application (budget narrative). No apparent discussion was included about accepting responsibility for providing performance-based compensation to those earning it.

b) In the last 2 years of the project, the applicant will use non-TIF funds to pay for the equipment required for new staff, resources for professional development, and partial salaries for 2 individuals (p. 34, 35). In addition, the applicant notes that they will assume an increasing share of the responsibility for funding the incentives (p. 38).

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:

Information is provided describes a system for improving the educator workforce, using data and evaluations for professional development (p. 2).

No apparent discussion was included about how the system will be used for making retention and tenure decisions.

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:

Teachers and principals will be provided with opportunities to earn additional incentives for assuming leadership responsibilities, such as such as serving as master teacher, mentoring new teachers, tutoring students, etc. (p. 19).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1.Core Element 1:

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

General:

The plan includes using the district's strategic communications office, contracting with a public relations and communications firm design a plan for communicating the system; putting information and videos on district television; creating fact-sheets, brochures, and mailers; town hall meetings; and utilizing online and social networking outlets such as YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter (p. 10).

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 reported that the district currently is working with region administrators, principals, and the local teachers' association to garner support for the PBCS (p. 13).

The applicant noted that the teachers association supports the new teacher appraisal system and, together with the district, presented the new system to the school board for approval (p. 22).

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:

- 1) The rubric for scoring effectiveness will be based on several pieces of evidence including observations and student achievement (p. 15) and aligned with leadership standards (p. 21). There is no apparent discussion about professional standards.
- 2) Classroom observations of teachers will be conducted twice a year by administrators and peer reviewers trained in using the rubric (p. 21). It is unclear whether principals will be observed.
- 3) Insufficient information is provided to determine whether the collection of additional forms of evidence will be incorporated in the evaluation of principals or teachers.
- 4) To ensure high inter-rater reliability, training will be provided for both the teacher and administrator appraisal instruments the district's Research & Accountability Office will review completed appraisal instruments as an additional level of reliability (p. 4).

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 noted that the existing data management system will require purchasing a new data warehouse. Once data has been migrated and the new system is operational, it will link student achievement data with teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems (p. 25).

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:

Together the project coordinator, the grant team, and the Office of Professional Development, district instructional staff developers will provide and coordinate professional development for educators to ensure that they understand of the appraisal instrument and how to use the resulting data to improve classroom practice (p. 36).

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 provided evidence that professional development would be based on the results of principal needs as determined through the appraisal system (p. 29).

Professional development opportunities will be offered through existing program for all educators needing it, including those who do not receive differentiated compensation. For example, some teachers are offered the opportunity to participate in STEM professional development based on the needs resulting from their appraisals (p. 29).

The applicant noted that training will be provided for understanding the appraisal instruments to be used as part of the evaluation of effectiveness (p. 25).

The applicant noted that training will be provided to educators for understanding the appraisal instruments and use the data for improving practice (p. 28).

No discussion is apparent related to assessing the effectiveness of professional development.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided data indicating that the schools selected for participation have had a significantly higher number of new teachers over the past 4 years (p. 3).

The applicant provided student achievement data showing that the target schools selected for participation in TIF lags behind that of similar but higher performing schools (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant noted that student achievement, which encompasses growth, will carry a weight of 30% toward determining effectiveness during the planning year but will be "primarily based on student achievement data" in the remaining years of the project (p. 13). The validity and reliability of some measures, such as the state achievement test, has been established (p. 15).

The applicant noted that Substitutes will offer teachers the opportunity to observe a master teacher's classroom (p. 29). The proposed system also would provide principals with mentors (p. 35).

The applicant noted that the local teachers association was involved in the planning and development of the system (p. 8).

The applicant stated that observations would be conducted twice a year as part of the effectiveness appraisal system (p. 23).

The applicant noted that the existing data management system will link student achievement data with teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems (p. 25).

The applicant noted that professional development is directly linked to the measures of effectiveness and to individuals' professional development plans as a measure of improvement. In addition, the district has developed systems for providing support that meets educators' needs (p. 28).

Weaknesses:

Insufficient information was provided to determine whether individual teachers and other personnel were included in the input and feedback process.

Insufficient data was provided to indicate whether or how reliability and validity of student achievement measures will be established.

No explanation is included regarding the proposed plan for providing professional development "through training pathways" for teachers or "leadership pathways" for principals (p. 15). Applicant does not explain how teacher evaluation will be used in designing "prescriptive" professional development or how it will be linked to the measures of effectiveness (p. 19).

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 applicant will use district funds to purchase a server for housing the test item bank and value-added software (p. 17) as well as new equipment needed for project personnel (p. 34). The management plan includes a timeline with tasks, persons responsible, and due dates (p. 29).

Weaknesses:

The design requires hiring 7 new personnel and as well as contracting with 4 external consultants. The need to hire so many new and contract personnel in addition to the 2 existing positions suggests that there is insufficient qualified existing staff to implement the program, requiring what could be a learning curve that could cut deeply into the planning year (p. 33).

A large part of the requested funds in the first three years are for developing additional testing items and an expanded data management system (budget narrative).

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant included relevant and measurable project objectives (p. 38).

The project will include using an external evaluator for implementing both formative and summative evaluation using quantitative and qualitative information (p. 40). Formative information is useful for making program improvements while summative information will provide data about whether the project is having the desired effect/impact.

Weaknesses:

The proposed budget of \$10,000 per year is insufficient to carry out a high quality "comprehensive multi-year" evaluation (budget narrative).

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 stated that the project director will collaborate with the district departments of Research & Accountability, Human Resources, Strategic Communications, MIS, and teachers' association to build a transparent value-added model of student growth using the newly updated data management system (p. 38).

Insufficient evidence was provided to determine whether there is a plan to explain to teachers the value-added model and how to use the data to improve practice.

Weaknesses:

The value-added measures involve creating a large item bank of new test items equated with the FCAT that can be administered to students online (p. 23). This process involved in developing valid and reliable test items will requires an extensive process and an expensive external consultant (budget narrative).

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:

A math or science teacher in 3 of the 4 schools could receive feedback recommending participation in job-embedded professional development provided through a STEM initiative offered in 3 of the 4 schools, which could potentially lead to a master's or specialist's degree. All 4 schools are participating in a math initiative that could lead to a certificate as a Digital Mathematics Educator (p. 28).

Weaknesses:

Insufficient evidence is provided that there is a high need related to hard-to-staff subject areas (p. 3). In addition, there are project objectives related to retaining teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, but little description as to how this will be accomplished. The opportunity to participate another professional development project leading to higher degrees in hard-to staff science, noted as a hard-to-staff subject, is possible only if evaluation feedback warrants it (p. 28).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/9/10 5:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 11:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

Reader #3: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	94

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	104
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: School Board of Pinellas County, Florida -- , (S385A100073)

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 plans to continue the process of revising its teacher appraisal (evaluation) to comprise of the PBCS teacher evaluation system. The appraisal is a performance observation protocol. In addition plans are intended to include student learning achievement as an added value model. In addition the use of peer observation and professional development data are to be included in this evaluation system. Each will be weighed in percentages for a composite score to measure degrees of teacher effectiveness. This evaluation system is to be developed during the planning year of the grant. The applicant plans to include a principal appraisal evaluation at a future date. The evaluations will be used to determine compensation according to effectiveness levels (p. 4 -12).

The nascent PBCS is designed to include incentive to teachers and principals based on their levels of effectiveness at level up to \$9,000.00 per year. Teachers and administrators who take on additional leadership roles such as tutoring students beyond their contract, mentoring student, or becoming a master teacher can earn an additional \$2,000.00 per year

(p. 3-1). Though the applicant does on provide research based data to justify these monetary levels as sufficient for leveraging a change in educators behavior, a reference to research on the benefits of financial incentives on performance (i.e., Figlio & Kenny, 2007) is cited (p. 4-3).

The appraisal observation tool is designed in accordance with the state education commission's competencies for teachers (Appendix C., p c-5) and is scheduled to occur by administrator and peer review twice a year (p. 4-13). The applicant explains that the appraisal instrument for principals will be developed in the future.

Leadership roles for teachers and principals will be compensated outside of the evaluation process at \$2,000.00 annually (p. 4-19).

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 reports Title I and district funds will be utilized to support program professional development (p. 4-37). The level of such funding has not been made clearly apparent. The district is committed to implementing the PBCS in the district. The initial three years of the project will be primarily funded through TIF grant funds for the four schools participating middle schools. During years four and five, necessary professional development resources will be provided out of district funds. In addition, the district will provide 50% of the salary in year four and 75% in year five for the senior application specialist. The district will begin to fund the incentive payments in years four and five at a rate of 25% in year four and 50% in year five with 100% funding upon the ending of the grant funds out of district operating funds (pp. 4-36, 4-37).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The proposed PBCS teacher and principal evaluation system will utilize multiple sources of data and will be used to inform professional development. No mention has been made as to how the data will be used for tenure and promotion decisions.

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:

Teacher and principals will be compensated for additional leadership roles and activities with an incentive of at \$2,000.00 annually (p. 4-19). However, such compensation will not be based on an evaluation of levels of effectiveness within these roles.

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 included that the program will develop a communication plan during the planning period. The Office of Strategic Communications will develop this plan. The emergent plan consists of surveying internal stakeholders, branding and key messaging, and collaborating with a local television station.

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 explains that the district is working with region administrators, principals, and the local classroom teachers association (PCTA) to gain their support in the development and implementation of the PBCS. These stakeholders are meeting with the TIF project team and have provided letters of support for the implementation of the PBCS in the targeted schools (p. 4-13).

In addition, commitment from the principals of several participating schools, and

district offices has been ascertained in writing. The communication plan is to include means for informing educators of the program components and professional development will be offered to teachers and principals to apprise them of the educator effectiveness evaluation system.

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 purports to utilize the existing state assessment system for mathematics and reading to assess student growth as it pertains to evaluation educator effectiveness. The applicant explains in detail how the results for the state assessment have been proven to be valid and reliable.

The appraisal observation tool is designed in accordance with the state education commission's competencies for teachers (Appendix C., p c-5) and is scheduled to occur by administrator and peer review twice a year (p. 4-13). The applicant explains that the appraisal instrument for principals will be developed in the future.

The observation appraisal (evaluation) protocol for educator effectiveness is being revised and consists of clear performance domains, indicators, and descriptors for levels of effectiveness in each domain.

The intensive training for both the teacher and administrator appraisal instruments will provide a strong foundation for ensuring inter-rater reliability (p. 4-27).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant asserts that the program will use the one year planning period for collaborations between the TIF project director, the departments of Research & Accountability, Human Resources, Strategic Communications, MIS, and the Pinellas Classroom Teachers Association. These collaborations will serve the purpose of developing and building a transparent value-added model which will be used in combination with the performance appraisal instrument to develop appropriate effectiveness scales for teachers and administrators (p. 4-18).

The proposed data management system will store and organize student achievement data, human resources information (including certification records and appraisal information), and payroll reporting systems will be integrated (p. 4-25).

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:

All teachers and administrators from the participating schools receive training on the new teacher appraisal process. In addition, principals and assistant principals are scheduled to receive training on the on the administrator performance. This training is slated to include instruction for understanding the instrument and interpreting the data collected from the instrument for the purposes of improving administrator effectiveness (p 4-27).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive

differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

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

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

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

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

General:

1. The applicant does not clearly explain how the needs of a school will be identified and how such data will inform professional development for that school.

2. A teacher's performance appraisal data will identify a target for improvement. Teacher inquiry may be used as an action plan to address the targeted goal in the Individual Professional Development Plan. (p. 4-29)

3. Professional development structure and support for teachers at these high need schools includes inquiry-embedded professional learning at the school, facilitated by teacher leaders as mentors and coaches. Professional development structure and support for principals at these high need schools includes an inquiry-oriented community of practice and mentor support (4-28).

4. All teachers and administrators from the participating schools receive training on the new teacher appraisal process. In addition, principals and assistant principals are scheduled to receive training on the administrator performance. This training is slated to include instruction for understanding the instrument and interpreting the data collected from the instrument for the purposes of improving administrator effectiveness (p 4-27).

5. The applicant does not address how professional development activities will be assessed to determine their efficacy to improve educator performance and student achievement..

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 minimum 50% level for free and reduced meals among students is met to classify the schools as high needs (p. 4-1).

The applicant has expressed difficulty hiring certified teachers for the participating schools.

The applicant has identified the state accountability letter grades of the participating schools as an indicator of need, by comparing these with higher performing schools in the state with comparable student population demographics (including size, and socio-economic status).

In addition, the applicant has identified mathematics, reading, science and exceptional student content/classrooms as high needs given the 30% or more new teachers assigned to participating schools.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has developed an evaluation system to determine educator effectiveness. The system includes an added value system of student growth utilizing state data from standardized tests in reading and mathematics and teacher observation along with other data sources. The applicant relies on state research on the validity and reliability research on test data. The current target of the educator effectiveness evaluation weighs student achievement at 30% and plans to increase this percentage over the life of the grant (p.4-22).

The applicant provides research based data to justify these monetary levels as sufficient for leveraging a change in educators behavior, a reference to research on the benefits of financial incentives on performance (i.e., Figlio & Kenny, 2007) is cited (p. 4-3).

The applicant plans to expand on established professional development activities (e.g., STEM and teacher inquiry professional development) which are intended to meet a district need for hard-to-staff subjects.

The applicant recognized that once developed, the data integration will be critical for the PBCS to implement a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness (p. 4-24). Such integration will consist of a data management system in which student achievement data, human resources information (including certification records and appraisal information), and payroll reporting systems will be integrated (p. 4-25); thereby meeting one the requirements of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not provided evidence to substantiate the quality of the research based professional development to be provided to teachers. Nor has the applicant substantiated how inter-rater reliability may be achieved on the observation (appraisal) protocols.

The distinction between administrative and peer review is not clearly articulated.

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 has presented written support for the grant by principals of the participating schools, district office personnel, and the classroom teacher association.

The program experience and qualifications of the program director are commensurate with the written job description. In addition, clear criteria for the selection of key program personnel have been devised. For example, a job description and hiring criteria for the mentor teachers (appendix, p. 61)

The applicant has constructed clear objectives and timeline and has allocated key program personnel to activities.

The applicant reports Title I and district funds will be utilized to support program professional development (p. 4-37). The level of such funding has not been made clearly apparent. The district is committed to implementing the PBCS in the district. The initial three years of the project will be primarily funded through TIF grant funds for the four schools participating middle schools. During years four and five, necessary professional development resources will be provided out of district funds. In addition, the district will provide 50% of the salary in year four and 75% in year five for the senior application specialist. The district will begin to fund the incentive payments in years four and five at a rate of 25% in year four and 50% in year five with 100% funding upon the ending of the grant funds out of district operating funds (pp. 4-36, 4-37).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

- (1) Includes the use of strong and measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other

personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel;

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

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

Strengths:

The local evaluation is designed around the goals of the program and is integrated into the implementation schedule. It is anticipated that the program will develop both activities to assess both the processes for program implementation as well as the outcomes of program goals and objectives (p. 4-39).

The plan for evaluation included expectations for formative and summative assessments and feedback loops.

Weaknesses:

The extent to which the program evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative measures has not been fully addressed.

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 has identified a value added model, utilizing state standardized content area (reading and mathematics) assessment along with other measures to determine growth in student learning. For example the applicant plans to utilize the established the level of student growth (over the course of one year) as determined by the state:

Improve achievement levels from 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, or 4-5; or

Maintain with the relatively high levels of 3, 4, or 5; or

Demonstrate more than year's growth within achievement levels 1 or 2 (does not include retained students). Individual student annual learning gains will be attached to individual students and students will be attached to specific school personnel linked

through school-based master course schedules in order to obtain an overall student growth score for instructional personnel. Class-wide or school-wide reading or math standardized test data will be used in measuring student growth for other instructional personnel, such as reading coaches, media specialists, and guidance counselors who have direct contact with students but are not assigned specific students linked to course data as the exclusive measure of student performance for these personnel (pp. 4-17,4-18).

The added-value measure to be used is clearly defined and will be drawn from standardized test data. In content areas where testing does not occur, common assessments will be developed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The program is targeted to schools in which the required threshold for the percentages of students receiving free and reduced meals is met. In addition, the applicant has following identified the following content areas as hard-to-staff in these schools: reading, math, science, and exceptional student education (p. 4-3).

The applicant reports that the district employs existing procedures for ascertaining a level of quality of applicant educators which include a review of references, employment history and previous evaluations. In addition, plans are in place for the Human Recourse Department to identity screening tools during the planning year of the grant to determine the effectiveness of applicants (p 4-4).

The program has conceptualized performance based incentives as the primary strategy for recruiting and retaining teachers (p. 4-3). As such the applicant has identified specific goals and objectives for retaining teachers by reducing the current transfer rates. Their objectives and targets are as follows: Obj.11: To decrease the percentage of teachers transferring in hard-to-staff subjects in high need schools to 10% by the end of year five. (Benchmarks: 2012 at 30%, 2013 at 20%, 2014 at 15%, 2015 at 10%); and Obj.12:

To decrease the number of teacher transfer requests in high need schools by 50% by the end of year five. (Benchmarks: 2012 â avg. 30 requests; 2013 â avg. 27 requests; 2014 â avg. 23 requests; 2015 â avg. 17 requests) (p. 4-8).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 11:00 AM