

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

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	60
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	93

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	8
------------------	----	---

Total	110	101
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

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 is proposing a PBCS that rewards teachers and principals at differentiated levels, based upon objective data on student performance, and other related measures. This system consists of a three-tier evaluation and reward system which is being developed to replace the state teacher-assessment system which has recently been done away with (Pages 7 through 10). Currently, the LEA utilizes a ladder system which the state developed, and which required all teachers to put in seniority time before being rewarded for good practice (Page 7). The new system will also have built into it, a component that accounts for student achievement, which it formerly did not have, and which weights student - achievement pretty heavily. Objective data of student performance on multiple measures will be utilized to assess school personnel performance, as well as observations, and (in the case of principals) graduation rates and another measure which the principal selects when setting professional goals at the beginning of the year. (Pages 8 through 12)

The applicant proposes a three-tier approach which they feel will be effective in creating a change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers and principals.

Referring to the literature, the applicant proposes a three-tier system which rewards school professionals at varying levels. Tier I (20% of weight in assessment) represents teacher observation measures. Tier II (30%) assesses the degree to which and effectiveness of employee collaboration in reaching school goals. Tier III (50%) assesses school-wide outcomes in student achievement. Schools receive rewards for the latter once they have attained the highest rating possible. The applicant has determined that this approach is most effective because it demands that staff engage in the process of school change, through utilizing data for instructional planning, working collaboratively to establish policy/norms, etc. Rather than developing a top-down or hierarchical system, the applicants developed an inclusive system, where all share in the work of improving student performance, and can be adequately recognized and compensated for the work. (Pages 9 through 13)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant does have costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS during the project period and beyond, and has accepted responsibility to provide performance-based compensation to school-based employees and other persons. The team presents a detailed plan for doing so, including a break-down of how they will apply their increased share of the costs over the life of the grant. For example, in year three they propose to provide \$126,219 of the budget share, and by year five (the final year) their projected share would be \$604,619 (Page 24). The applicant has set a 15% fund-development goal. All funds identified to date are federal funds. The applicant is encouraged to also identify other sources of funding as well (Pages 24 through 25).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant presents a detailed and well-thought out plan for implementing a data-driven system which tracks student achievement, utilizing Galileo (Created by Assessment Technology Incorporated) for creating valid and reliable benchmarks that assess essential standards (i.e. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills [DIBELS], Arizona has developed an Instrument to Measure Standards [AIMS-A, and the Stanford Achievement Test [SAT] [Page 7]). Galileo provides an umbrella for all data collected within the district, and assists in helping the applicant to link the assessment to practice, incentives and to student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant reports that there are a variety of higher level leadership responsibilities to be offered through their PBCS, including teachers who serve as mentors, peer coaches, staff development trainers, to action research leaders, as well as other opportunities. TIF funds will be used to provide stipends related to leadership opportunities. There are criteria which staff must meet, however, to being considered for a leadership position. (Page 8)

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 LEA has decided to utilize an existing staff development committee which consists of one teacher from each school site, the Title I Coordinator, the PBCS (former Career Ladder) Coordinator, a district-level Technology Educator and the Director of Instructional Services. This group meets monthly to coordinate and disseminate staff development information to each school. Additionally, they collect information from teachers, principals and staff at their schools, as well as from district leaders, in order to determine staff development needs across the LEA. Other information is also disseminated from central administration offices. They did not offer a plan for the community at large (Page 18)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant has structured in meaningful roles for teachers, principals and other personnel in the process of creating the PBCS and in influencing the types of activities and incentives will be provided, i.e. the varied leadership opportunities provided internally (Page 8), the Staff Development Committee (18), and teacher peer groups (Page 10).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant has provided a detailed proposal for the development of a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth, and that includes rubrics, charts, and descriptions of all levels of procedures and guidelines. Under this system, academic achievement is heavily weighted through the use of a variety of objective student progress measures that result in there being value-added, and also through regularly scheduled classroom and school observations (two formal observations and a range of informal walk-throughs), utilizing rubrics which detail a range of observable traits. (Pages 8 through 11) School personnel have the opportunity to be rewarded on many levels. The LEA reports that they gave considerable consideration to compensation and reward amounts, and that their structure offers the best of intrinsic and external motivational factors. Evaluation is linked to opportunities for leadership, promotion, and tenure.

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 is presently utilizing Assessment Technology Incorporated (ATI) Galileo for creating valid and reliable benchmarks that assess essential standards. Data generated through this system is utilized by teachers for instructional and program planning, for principals to lead, and for human resource decisions, i.e. promotion, rewards (Pages 7 and 18).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant has not provided a plan for how teachers and principals will be trained in specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness, although the applicant has communicated an understanding of the importance of professional development. They provide a strong theoretical base underlying their model of training, however, they do not provide a detailed plan for implementation, nor which outlines how school personnel will be prepared to engage in professional practices utilizing data management. (Pages 18 through 25)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

- (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
- (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
- (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

The applicant provided a detailed professional development plan, which outlines the involvement of district personnel in planning and professional development training designed to help teachers and school leaders to learn skills and dispositions needed to turn around school failure among students attending high needs schools. The plan discussed the ways in which data, evaluation, and performance pay will be linked. It also addresses those teachers who are deemed to be effective as well as those in need of more critical support. It also outlines a pathway for teachers who want to take on additional responsibilities through school leadership roles, as well as provides training that assists teachers and principals in better understanding and applying measures of effectiveness leading to improved practice and student achievement (Pages 18 through 23).

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides its designation of comparable schools based upon the federal definition, and provides data on its LEA and comparable districts to establish high-need status. Data provided shows a gap in achievement with students in the targeted school trailing behind others, and significant numbers of low income students above 50%, which meets the federal definition for high needs schools. (5 through 6)

The applicant makes a strong case for the need by citing the following factors which make it hard for them to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and principals, and by supporting their claim with concrete data: 1) The LEA has a spending budget requires that they spend a per-pupil amount that is below the national average, 2) Their teacher

salaries are also about \$14,000 less than the national average, 3) Fewer students in Arizona are choosing to pursue the teaching profession, which has resulted in a critical teacher shortage in the state. 4) They are in a rural district cut off from most cities. (Pages 1 and 2).

The applicant included a variety of objective assessments which target key student groups and which are known to yield the most accurate information, rather than the single shot approach of applying the same assessment across many students. DIBELS for example, has been identified by the US DOE and by researchers as being a superior measure of early childhood development, while AIMS, another assessment utilized by the LEA, is commonly used across grades. Each assesses some overlapping domains, as well as different ones. Collectively, they provide a much more comprehensive measure of student growth. (Pages 17 through 18)

Weaknesses:

None listed.

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 is proposing to implement a new PBCS system which builds upon a state-wide teacher assessment and support system which has recently become defunct. The applicant is proposing funds to establish the system within its LEA, while building upon its initial design. The applicant is adding a principal assessment and support component, and is including measures of academic achievement (growth). These two elements were not present in the prior state system (Pages 1 through 18)

The system proposed will be a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals, which differentiates levels of effectiveness, using multiple rating categories, and which takes into account data on student growth as a significant indicator, as determined through use of objective student data and formative (observations twice per year). Specifically there are three tiers of teaching and non-teaching staff involvement, through which school professionals are evaluated and rewarded. Tier One (20%) represents those in the school who work directly with students, and provides the scaffold for observation measures. Tier Two (30%) represents the degree to which professionals can collaborate with one another. Tier III (50%) credits school staff for school-wide outcomes in academic achievement, a value-added feature. There are additional incentives and opportunities for leadership and development built in as well. (Pages 1 through 18)

The project is part of an overall district and statewide reform strategy that has student growth as its centerpiece, and which includes a refined data management system -- ATI Galileo software. This interactive tool links classroom and school data to human resource and academic development functions. School personnel at all levels are participating in developing the PBCS. (Pages 1 through 18)

The applicant provides detailed professional development plan, which links to all other components of the system, and which employs a variety of strategies to help school professionals to increase student achievement. (Pages 18 through 23)

Weaknesses:

None listed.

Reader's Score: 60

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 submitted a detailed management plan, including timelines for completing activities.

The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals in relation to design of project (Pages elthrough e13)

The applicant has identified a significant local funding source through local Override election, as well as has identified other possible sources of funding support. Grant requested (Pages 24 through 25)

Weaknesses:

The management plan submitted by the applicant lacks specificity in many areas. The Project Director and other key personnel are not yet identified. There are no links between the goals, objectives, activities and implementation timelines. (Pages 22 and 23)

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Plan centers around three key areas of data collection: 1) Impact of differentiated levels of compensation for teachers and administrators, 2) professional development effectiveness or impact, and 3) Evaluation of actual unit of measures and data collection instruments. This design allows for a full audit of the system annually. (Pages 26 through 30)

Weaknesses:

Evaluation plans could have been more detailed so as to include information about who would be conducting the evaluation, over what period of time, utilizing what type of research approaches (qualitative or quantitative) and for which aspects of the plan? (Pages 26 through 30).

Reader's Score: 3

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a plan for implementing a value-added model in which teachers and principals have an opportunity to benefit from a differentiated reward system based upon multiple measures of student growth, and in which they utilize qualitative data collection methods (i.e. observations and unstructured interviews or discussions).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided a basic implementation plan, however, is not detailed enough. For example they state the importance of educating personnel on all levels, and talk about how the training should look, but, they do not provide a timeline for this training. The plan, however, is implementable. (Pages 8 through 10)

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need Schools. (Up to 5 points):**

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an

explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

Strengths:

The applicant has presented criteria to verify that they will be serving a high need school (95% of student qualifying for free or reduced lunch. The federal standard is 50%. They also made a convincing case for high teacher turn-over and difficulties in recruiting teachers. They also talked about how rewards could serve as important incentives to attract and keep staff, including those in hard to staff subject areas. (Pages 1 and 2 and 7 and 9). A more detailed plan for teacher and principal recruitment is needed to flesh out their plans, however, the plan can be implemented effectively. (Pages 1 through 2 and 7 and 9)

Both teacher and principal effectiveness will be defined with a teacher and principal effectiveness framework which incorporates national standards and is adapted to local conditions. (Page 9)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses listed.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

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	8
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	82

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	8
------------------	----	---

Total	110	90
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

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:

Priority 1 was met.

The proposal contains elements of financial compensation with weighted parts for student achievement, peer group goals, leadership responsibilities, performance evaluators, professional growth and whole school student growth. This encompasses individual, defined group, and whole school sections, however the responsibilities of the leadership opportunities are unclear. More information is needed to indicate as to how they will positively impact student achievement or the effectiveness of other teachers in the school (e.g. peer coaches, mentors) (p.8). As stated in the application leadership could mean attendance at events, or more significant and responsible positions.

Principals have two components in their differentiated compensation pay (p.13). The end result of a personal goal will impact student achievement. The principal's role as instructional leader of a site indicates the possibility of considerable influence over his teachers resulting in increased achievement for students. It is unclear if the principal's personal goal is significantly different from the mentoring goal which also warrants bonus pay. Additional strategies in developing the personal goal with the

expectation that it will result in a positive increase in student achievement is needed.

The measure of student achievement is documented by a series of standardized tests given at two points in the school year. Student growth will be measured by Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBELS), Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) 10, and AIMS-A, the alternate to AIMS.

The observation element is satisfied. Teachers and principals would be observed at least twice a year by principals who were given training in observations. Principals would be observed by Superintendents who were given training by the state (p.7).

Higher level leadership responsibilities are offered as peer coaches, mentors, staff developers, and action researchers (p.8).

The applicant has provided a tiered system of differentiated incentive rewards (p14-16). The proposed system is based on student growth, peer goals, and whole school improvement.

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:

Safford has demonstrated they will provide increasing amounts from non-TIF funds towards PBCS over a five year period. Although their non-TIF contribution begins in year 3 they demonstrate that an increasing share will progress from there and they will assume responsibility for the continuance for the PBCS funding beyond the 5 year time frame of the project. The non-TIF share is proposed as follows: Year 3 - 25%, year 4 - 50%, year 5 - 75%, year 6 - 100%. The non-TIF contribution will be \$126,219 in year 3, \$363,764 in year 4, and \$604,619 in year 5.

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:

There is a convincing professional development plan in place. The proposal designates the Effective Teachers and Principals Program (ETAPP), data tracking (ATI Galileo) as well as standardized tests to validate and measure student growth. They provide evidence of an integrated strategy for strengthening the workforce (using sign-on bonuses of \$500 to \$1000) and a robust PBCS (up to \$10,000 for teachers and principals) to entice, recruit and retain teachers (p.17). They will continue to use the hiring process in place to determine effectiveness of candidates. This includes a committee of teachers and principals, interviews, demonstration lessons, background checks and lesson modeling.

They also are committed to professional development for all teachers in using the data system to improve instruction. The staff development committee has adequate representatives from school sites, as well as the Title 1 coordinator, ETAPP coordinator, Technology Educator, and the Director of Instructional Services. They meet monthly to coordinate and disseminate information. Needs are determined and student achievement data reviewed. Plans are developed and a peer coaching model is being added. Student data will be tracked and monitored to determine if professional development efforts were successful. These measures will indicate effectiveness in decisions related to retention and tenure.

This professional development plan should serve the district well in its goal to positively impact student achievement. A challenge will be finding a qualified ETAPP Coordinator since the designated person had recently resigned. The proposal indicates they will search for a qualified candidate.

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:

Higher level leadership positions are available and include peer coaches, mentors, staff development trainers, and action researchers. These positions command an extra \$3000 in compensation. Before being considered for leadership positions candidates, (both teachers and principals) must satisfy ETAPP leadership criteria (p.16).

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 proposal outlines a communication plan that would inform the community, staff, and other personnel about the components of the PBCS. An initial meeting attended by principals and teachers to explain the TIF grant and its components was held in April and May. earlier this year. Questions and answers were provided. Additional informational meetings are planned on all six campuses for the future and will include parents (p.20).

A comprehensive communication plan is essential for the success of the program and the proposal outlines a good one.

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 letters of support from the chairs of the previous differentiated compensation committee, all six principals and the members of the Board of Education show evidence of strong support for the PBCS. They also show clear understanding of the program as well as the prospective goals (p.e0, e1. e2).

Safford has a staff development committee currently in place that is made up of one teacher from each school site, the Title 1 coordinator, the ETAPP Coordinator, Technology Coordinator and the Director of Instructional Services. They meet monthly to assess needs. They use a needs assessment survey that principals and teachers complete online. They also review student achievement data. They use this information to generate and address areas of concern (p.18) and plan staff development activities.

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 proposal presents an evaluation system that includes differentiated rating categories, uses student growth and performance evaluations, provides leadership possibilities, measures student achievement data, and offers vibrant professional growth factors. The teacher evaluation instrument has multiple rating categories and is fair and transparent. It was designed by a team of teachers and administrators and was field tested and revised (p.21). Formal observations will be performed a minimum of twice a year with walk throughs occurring throughout the year. Inter-rater reliability is assured by ongoing workshops for principals. All principals have received Arizona Department of Ed training. The evaluation instrument is aligned with professional teaching standards (p. 21).

Additions to the evaluation system will be forthcoming as it presently lacks a student achievement component. This is essential. The Arizona Department of Education is issuing new guidelines for this and it will be incorporated into both the teacher and principal evaluation instruments.

Additional evidence includes formative and benchmark assessments, peer coaching reports and mentor logs, staff development sessions, leadership activities, and walk throughs (p. 21).

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 ATI Galileo data management system holds all student data and 2 years of district and state benchmark assessments (p.22). Additional testing data will be added as it becomes available. The benchmarks in ATI Galileo are updated quarterly. All teachers may access their students' data. The system is able to link student achievement data with teacher/principal information and the human resources system.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

There is a comprehensive professional development plan in place. Principals who have been trained and already involved in tracking and analyzing data will be responsible for educating their staff and thorough training sessions are planned (p.22). The ETAPP coordinator will review requirements of ETAPP with all participating principals and teachers. The training will be supplemented by a written document placed online stating compensation requirements. Notebooks will also be issued to all participating teachers and principals.

Effectiveness will include documentation using principal and teacher effectiveness results, individual student data from district and state benchmarks, and performance based assessments (p.22)

The proposed professional development will enable teachers and principals to use the data to improve practices. The professional development plan is based on the National Staff Development Council Standards (p.20). These include context standards (learning communities and support through skillful leadership), content standards that set high academic achievement expectations, and developing effective and qualified teaching staff, and process standards which are made up of research data and drive decision making.

Staff development opportunities will include Robert Marzano's nine research based instructional strategies (p.19), utilizing assessment data and curriculum design (Wiggins and McTighe), and nine best practices presented by the State Resource Center. These ensure that professional development leads to positive effects on student achievement (p. 19).

Data is used to guide instruction and drives this professional development plan.

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:

There is a comprehensive professional development plan in place. Principals who have been trained and already involved in tracking and analyzing data will be responsible for educating their staff and thorough training sessions are planned. The use of data to guide instruction is essential and this professional development plan addresses it well.

Professional development is based on National Staff Development Council standards (p.20). The plan consists of context standards (learning communities, and support provided through skillful leadership), process standards (research based and data driven decision making, and evaluating learning strategies), and content standards consisting of high academic achievement and the development of highly effective teachers and staff members.

Staff development opportunities are driven by teacher and student needs (p.29). The

district has a staff development committee and it is made up of teachers, coordinators and directors who meet on a monthly basis to coordinate and disseminate staff development information to each site (p.18). The committee compiles data to determine staff development needs. A needs assessment survey is completed online by teachers and principals. Student achievement data from AIMS and SAT 10 are reviewed and using this data a plan is generated to address areas of concern that have been identified. The Puget Sound Peer coaching model will be added to enhance standards based instruction by offering students technology rich learning experiences (p.18). This provides a model that has theory, practice, feedback, and coaching based on research findings.

The applicant notes that professional development is a continuous process. There will be regular assessments to determine if student achievement is impacted due to improvements in teacher and leadership practice.

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 presented convincing data that due to location (rural), lack of financial resources, and lack of adequate employment opportunities for spouses, that this is a hard to staff area both in terms of recruitment and retention. Due to the lack of adequate personnel it has been noted that mandatory special education needs are possibly not being met.

They also presented data on a comparable district, Thatcher, to whom they are losing high achieving students. The two districts have similar demographics. Thatcher schools outperform Safford's on Arizona Learns Achievement Profiles and are higher rated. The applicant has stated that it is believed that children will get more personal attention at Thatcher.

Weaknesses:

The comparable data presented did not give specific information to support the applicant's declaration that performance was significantly lower in Safford's schools (p5).

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 Safford proposal has many essential elements necessary for a successful PBCS.

There are effective measures in place to use student growth factors to determine teacher and principal effectiveness. Student achievement is tracked through formative, benchmark, criterion referenced and norm referenced assessments. These will be administered quarterly (p. 7). Student growth will be measured by a series of standardized tests given at two points in the school year. Those tests are DIBELS,

Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) 10, and AIMS-A, the alternative to AIMS.

Performance awards are clearly delineated and differentiated by degrees of student success. These differentiated awards have been successfully communicated and understood by the stakeholders as evidenced by the letters of support. The performance awards are of sufficient size to attract and retain teachers in high needs schools. There is a comprehensive communication plan to ensure that principals and other stakeholders understand how to use the data generated to improve student performance. The measures proposed are valid and reliable and understood and supported by the stakeholders. There are provisions to amend the teacher and principal evaluation system as more information becomes available from the Arizona Department of Education.

Additionally there is a data management system that coordinates all data from students and links it to teacher and principal data. Training in the use of the data system is ongoing and future professional development is outlined and based on needs determined by the professional development committee.

The proposal enjoys a considerable amount of support from staff as evidenced by letters of support and participation on committees.

The evaluation system is multi-tiered and includes fair, rigorous and transparent criteria. Formal observations will be performed a minimum of twice a year. Opportunities to take on additional leadership responsibilities will be available to personnel who meet certain requirements.

The professional development plan is comprehensive. It is based on National Staff Development Council standards (p.20). There is a district staff development committee made up of representatives of teachers, coordinators, and directors who meet on a monthly basis to coordinate and disseminate staff development information to each site. The district staff development committee gathers data from the sites to determine needs. Needs assessment surveys are available online and completed by teachers and principals. Student achievement data from AIMS and SAT 10 are reviewed and using this data a plan is generated to address areas of concern that have been identified. A coaching model will be added to the program.

Weaknesses:

A challenge for the district will be recruiting a qualified ETAPP coordinator.

Additionally delineation of the leadership responsibilities would be helpful. It is unclear what responsibilities each position would have. Mentors and other leadership positions can have a powerful impact on student achievement by supporting teachers and assisting them in using best practices and techniques that target their particular needs.

A principal can also be a powerful influence on teachers and consequently on students and their achievement. For this reason, considerable thought should be exercised in developing a principal's personal goals.

Although there are letters of support from principals, there is no evidence of support from Superintendents.

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:

This proposal is likely to achieve its goals within the timeframe presented. The budget supports the work to be done and there is a clear outline of responsibilities supported by valid and reliable instruments, both evaluative and data management.

The proposal delineates where the non-TIF funds will be coming from and proposed an increasing amount of responsibility for the program in ongoing years (p.24). This type of thoughtful planning seems to indicate that the program has resources to continue beyond the dates of the original funding. The grant amounts requested and the budget are reasonable to attain their goals.

Evidence of support for this project is presented in the form of letters of support from the governing board members (p. e2), administrators of the schools, and the chairs of the career ladder (the former PBCS plan) advisory committee (e0).

Weaknesses:

Recruiting a qualified project director will be a challenge due to the rural location and lack of spousal employment opportunities.

There is a minimal management plan proposed and more specificity for performance objectives, responsible personnel and timelines are needed (p.26-30). Greater explanation is needed to delineate who is responsible for what and in what timeframe activities would be performed.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal sets clear definitive goals for student achievement that are measurable and will indicate teacher and principal effectiveness. These performance objectives will determine teacher and principal effectiveness jointly with observations. Financial incentives will also help recruit and retain teachers in this difficult to staff area. Data will be continuously monitored and professional development will be developed to fit the needs of the district. Evaluative measures are in place and evolving to guide instruction and professional development. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be obtained and used to provide the most effective support for the project participants.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear who is involved in collecting data and who evaluates data (p.26-30). More specificity of these tasks is needed with a desired timeframe.

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 Safford proposal clearly links differentiated student achievement to teacher performance pay. It has communicated the criteria to its stakeholders and has a specific data system to manage the information both on the student side as well as the teacher and principal side. They have already held an information session on the program as well as provided for ongoing professional development to assist teachers in using the data collected to improve instruction.

Weaknesses:

More detail in the value-added model is needed to delineate the personnel who will complete tasks and the method by which the quality will be judged (p.26-30).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need**

Schools. (Up to 5 points):

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

Strengths:

The Safford proposal addresses each of the criteria for this competitive priority. They are a high needs district and serve high needs students. They are designing this proposal to retain effective, hard to staff areas and designed a system to determine if future teachers will be effective. The incentives provided will attract teachers and enable them to retain personnel. They have determined that background checks, demonstration lessons, interviews and other means are adequate means to rate teachers' possible effectiveness for hire.

The district provides a communication system for students and teachers whereby information is passed on about the schools, teachers, and programs. The communication system consists of briefing meetings where information is disseminated and input is received. These meetings will continue throughout the program at the sites to provide further elaboration on the program.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

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	8
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	15
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
Sub Total	100	70

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	77
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Safford Unified School District #1 -- , (S385A100103)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant has provided a differentiated model of performance incentives for the teachers and school leaders within this project design. Teachers are evaluated on student growth, peer goal setting, and whole school student achievement. Teachers will be observed and evaluated two times each year as a part of the assessment process in determining teacher's performance in meeting the incentive standards that have been established. Principals are evaluated on the basis of district assessment benchmarks scores one time per year. Within this framework teachers will also be compensated according to student achievement of their own students. The applicant has based their evaluation of teachers on student growth and assessments that are valid and reliable. However, the assessments are limited in several ways. Some of the assessments are limited by the age of the students who can be assessed with the tools and some of the assessments are only annual measures of student growth. The applicant has outlined a structured and fair evaluation process for teachers and school leaders. The performance incentives offered are as follows within the framework of the grant: individual teachers - \$500-\$2,500, Principals - \$1,500-\$4,500 Whole school - \$500-\$1,000. The level and differentiation of the awards would be a likely high enough amount to create change and

improve student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has outlined the use of district funds and state override funds to support and sustain their performance initiative beyond the initial cycle of the grant. The applicant has provided a comprehensive budget for the purposes of the project. The budget that is presented represents projections for each year of the grant and includes itemized elements for personnel and performance incentives. The budget does not provide line items for professional development, assessment, and evaluation processes.

The applicant has a plan designed to progressively add district support for the performance incentive plan over the course of the project implementation. The support will come from district title grants and from a state override funding program designed to be used to attract teachers to their school systems. Their progressive amounts of non-federal support includes: Year 3 - \$126,219, Year 4 - \$363,764, Year 5 - \$604,619 for a total of \$1,094,602.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant has proposed a coherent and integrated strategy for the project design that they are proposing. The impetus for the project design has come from a current "Career Ladder" incentive program for teachers in the school district. The district is planning a strategic revision of this program and has used this as the foundation for their performance based compensation system project design. The applicant has outlined a project design that includes the collection and use of data, evaluation processes and procedures, processes and procedures for the retention of teachers. They will accomplish the implementation of these elements through the use of staff development committees, peer coaching models, the use of the National Staff Development Council Standards for professional development, and professional development workshops on data and it's usage.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant has indicated that teachers will have the opportunity to take on additional responsibilities within the framework of the grant and they have established the criteria by which the staff and school leaders will need to complete in order to take on the added leadership responsibilities. However, the applicant does not provided details on the level of stipends that will be awarded for staff and school leaders who do assume additional leadership responsibilities.

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 not described a comprehensive plan for communicating with teachers and administrators about the performance based incentive system. Their management plan lacked descriptions of how information would be shared about the project. Their plan also lacked evidence of support from teachers for the project design and its implementation.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

- 1.Core Element 2:**

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

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

General:

The applicant has support from the the district principals and the school board members in their efforts to design and implement the grant (letters of support). However, the only support provided from the teachers was a statement from a teacher advisory committee. No support was provided from the district superintendent.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1.Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant has outlined the use of a structured evaluation system with which it will judge the performance of its teachers and school leaders. The evaluation plan offers multiple observations of teachers and multiple methods that will be used to determine the effective performance of teachers and school leaders. However, their evaluation plan lacks definition of effectiveness standards and on which they would base their judgment of teacher and school leader effectiveness. The applicant has indicated that they will provide ongoing training for their school leaders in evaluation processes so that they will be able to maintain inter-rater reliability between observations of different teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1.Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant has a data management tool in place to use for student data. However, the applicant does not provide details about how this data management system will be linked with payroll and human services departments which will be critical elements in tracking the performance and the recognition of staff who have earned performance

incentives.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant has not presented a comprehensive professional development plan. They have described research based models that they would like to reference in their trainings on effective instruction. However, the applicant has not described the details about the frequency of the professional development that will be offered, how they will communicate the measures of instructional effectiveness that are critical to the performance evaluations, or how staff and school leaders will be trained in the use of data and its application to the improvement of student achievement.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

General:

The applicant presented a limited description of the professional development that would be offered within the project design. Their description lacked information about the frequency of professional development sessions, descriptions of the identified training targets, and descriptions about who would be delivering the professional development sessions. the process of identifying the professional development topics, and the methods by which professional development would be linked with the performance standards within the framework of the grant application. The applicant does not describe differentiation of professional development that will be offered for those who achieve and do not achieve performance standards. They only indicate that staff development will be provided. Finally, the applicant indicates that they will track student achievement based on teacher professional development, but they do not provide details on how this would occur. Finally, the applicant does not describe any processes that will be used in the assessment of the professional development efforts used in the project implementation.

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:

STRENGTHS:

Page # 6 The applicant has defined comparable schools for use in their grant application demonstration of need. They have indicated that comparable schools are schools in rural areas with similar demographics. They have elected to compare their school with a neighboring district. The neighboring district has outperformed the Safford School District.

Page # 3 The applicant has demonstrated (with documented support) that the schools within their school district are high need schools. Five of the six schools targeted within the grant proposal are above the 50 percent free and reduced levels that would indicate high need.

Page # 1-5 The applicant has referenced that the recruitment and retention of teachers

has been a challenge for the district. They have identified demographic, lack of trained local staff, and low salaries as the primary hurdles to staffing hard to fill vacancies. They have indicated that they have a turnover rate of 15 percent each year in their teaching staff.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 4 The applicant has presented mixed academic information. The academic information that has been presented only represents student performance on reading comprehension and math skills. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Arizona Indicators of Meeting Standards (AIMS) scores are limited measures for making decisions on student achievement because of their once a year assesment window or their limited age group testing. The scores indicate that an estimated 25% of the students are at risk, but that statistic also indicates that 75 percent of the students are achieving success. Hence, the applicant has weakend their argument for the need for improved academic success.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS:

Page # Appendix The applicant has provided leadership criteria forms (rubrics) that will be used by teachers and principals in evaluating their readiness for adding additional leadership responsibilities and subsequent stipends.

Page # 7-8 The applicant has based their project design on current strategies that are in place in the school district. They currently have a performance based incentive program in place for their teachers (Career Ladder). Their plan is to build on the experiences from implementing this model to design a new performance based model. Their new model will also reflect future mandated legislative changes that will eventually tie teacher and school leader performance to student achievement.

Page #9-17 The applicant has outlined a framework for performance incentives for teachers and school leaders. Their plan is tiered to include student achievement, peer group goal setting, and whole school performance as indicators of effectiveness. Their tiered approaches offer tiered monetary incentives in each of the above categories. The incentive amounts that have been outlined are appropriate for the project design and should serve as an incentive for teachers.

Page #8-13 The applicant has described the evaluation system that will be in place for teachers and school leaders. They have indicated the assessments that will be used to judge student growth, a description of the evaluation processes and how often they are assessed

Page #18 The applicant has identified a data management tool (ATI Galileo) that will be used within the project to track the performance of students and to provide data for teachers and school leaders.

Page #19 The applicant has presented a project design that will build teacher capacity to improve student achievement. They will accomplish this goal through a differentiated professional development plan within the project design that will be created from the feedback from teachers on their specific teacher development needs.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page #9-17 The applicant has determined what teachers and school leaders need to do to achieve performance incentives, but has not defined what effectiveness means for teachers

and school leaders. They have not defined the qualities that teachers and school leaders need to possess that will lead to the achievement of the performance incentives.

Page# Appendix The applicant has not demonstrated that their project design has the complete support of teachers and school administrators from their school district. Their letters of support have come from building principals, a school advisory committee, and school board members. The applicant is lacking evidence of support from the district superintendent.

Page # 8-13 The applicant's description of their evaluation system mentions descriptors that would be used to gauge the effectiveness of teachers, but they do not provide details of these descriptors or how they will be used in the scoring of the evaluation for teachers and for school leaders.

Page #18 The applicant has not clearly described how their data management system will be correlated with the human resources and finance departments of the school district in order to directly link student achievement with the performance incentives that teachers and school leaders will be earning.

Page #19 The applicant presented a limited description of the professional development that would be offered within the project design. Their description lacked information about the frequency of the professional development, descriptions of the processes for identifying presenters and trainers, details about the processes for the development of professional development topics, and details about linking professional development with the performance standards within the framework of the grant application.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS:

Page # Appendix The applicant has provided a comprehensive budget for the purposes of the project. The budget that is presented represents projections for each year of the grant and includes itemized elements for personnel and performance incentives.

Page # 24 The applicant has a plan designed to progressively add district support for the performance incentive plan over the course of the project implementation. The support will come from district title grants and from a state override funding program designed to be used to attract teachers to their school systems. Their progressive amounts of non-federal support includes: Year 3 - \$126,219, Year 4 - \$363,764, Year 5 - \$604,619

for a total of \$1,094,602.

Page #24-26 The applicant has presented a management plan that has included timelines for the completion of activities. For example, they have listed the dates of completion in a month by month framework.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page # Appendix The budget does not provide line items for professional development, assessment, and evaluation processes.

Page # 24-25 The applicant provides only minimal description of their proposed management plan. The management plan lacks information on who will provide leadership, the qualifications of the individuals who will provide management and leadership, processes for managing the grant in multiple buildings, a structured management plan that would link goals, objectives, activities, implementation timelines, and milestones. Their lack of detail presented in this section will be a limiting factor in their ability to actively manage and implement the project as it is designed.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

STRENGTHS:

Page # 26-30 The applicant has presented a framework for the evaluation of their project. It includes priorities and evaluation measures.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 26-30 The applicant has not outlined a comprehensive evaluation plan. The plan lacks details about who will be involved in the evaluation process, who will collect data, and how data will be analyzed and reported.

Page # 26-30 The applicant has not outlined the performance objectives that they intend to apply within the scope of their evaluation efforts.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS:

Page #9-17 The applicant has outlined the use of a value added process to evaluate the performance of their teachers and school leaders. Their process will include using student achievement data, peer group goal setting, and whole school achievement data for both teachers and school leaders.

Page #18 The applicant has identified the use of a staff development committee to provide leadership on professional development activities within the district and to disseminate information about data, evaluation, and the performance incentive grant project. The committee meets monthly in the district and is composed of a teacher from each school, title coordinators, the performance incentive grant coordinator, the technology director, and the director of instructional services. This group will be responsible for disseminating information to the teachers and administrators about the value-added growth model that will be a part of this project design.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 26-30 The applicant has not provided details about the collection and analysis of data within this project design. They do not provide details on personnel to complete this task and the methods by which they will ensure that the quality of the data being collected is appropriate to meet their evaluation needs.

Page #7-8 The applicant had indicated that they will use assessment measures (Arizona Indicators of Meeting Standards, Arizona Indicators of Meeting Standards-A) as tools to measure the effectiveness of teacher and school leader performance. However, the assessments that the district has selected are not value added approaches that will measure growth. The assessments are annual assessments that offer limited capability to demonstrate growth from year to year.

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:

STRENGTHS:

Page # 1-5 The applicant has demonstrated that the targeted schools within their project design are high need schools. All of the six targeted schools have free and reduced lunch counts above the fifty percent free and reduced lunch count.

Page # 1-5 The applicant has demonstrated that they have difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers in many of their high need schools. They have provided evidence that in an average year that they must replace fifteen percent of their teaching staff and that they have difficulty filling special education, kindergarten, and music vacancies.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

Page # 26-30 The applicant has not described how they will effectively communicate with teachers and school leaders about filling vacancies in difficult to staff schools and subject areas.

Page # 7-19 The applicant has not described a process whereby they will be able to determine the effectiveness of teachers to fill positions in high need schools. They do not describe how this would apply to the recruitment of teachers and or the retention of teachers to these high need schools.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:00 PM