

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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	7
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	56
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	90

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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 describes a strong plan for developing a PBCS with significant weight given to student growth, observations by trained certified building administrators at least three times per year, compensated leadership roles such as mentors and coaches, and the use of attitude and behavior measures as part of the evaluation model. The plan to award incentives is well developed, and includes substantial signing bonuses for principals, incentives for mentors, and performance awards for teachers. The applicant provides a description of opportunities for leadership roles, such as mentor teachers, master teachers and demonstration teachers that include stipends (page 31).

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:

1. The applicant provides a budget with projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS. The allocations for the total grant request are broken down in the budget narrative (appendix) and appear to be reasonable for the project.
2. The applicant describes a levy that will provide non-TIF funds to the project. This is not broken down by increasing shares over time, however.
3. The applicant describes a plan for assuming the costs of annual assessment system subscription, which would be covered by TIF funds in years one for pilot testing in year two. TIF funds would cover full costs in year 2, with a percentage (2.5%) in year 3. The district would assume full costs in year 4 (see budget narrative in the appendix).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant proposes a plan using a Professional Growth and Evaluation Program that was piloted in the district and developed by a task force. It is based on Charlotte Danielson's evaluation model that includes online tools so that teachers can access to professional development supports (including video clips) immediately. Professional development will include the use of data, and will include use of both student and staff data to better align and target development opportunities (page 13).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant describes sufficient incentives for taking leadership roles. For example, mentor principals receive \$2,500. Mentor and master teachers also receive incentives.

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 plans to launch a new image campaign based on having our best talent bring in more of the same (page 10). It is not clear how some of the components of the applicant's plan will be communicated to school personnel and the community at-large.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant describes working on a collective bargaining agreement in developing Professional Growth and Evaluation model that was piloted during 2004-2009. A task-force is also mentioned as having worked to develop this model, which serves as the framework for the proposed model. There is a plan to continue negotiations in adopting the proposed model.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account

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

General:

The Charlotte Danielson model that is described by the model appears to adequately provide for an evaluation process that includes an evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching standards. The model includes three observations per year by a trained administrator. Multiple data sources are planned to be included in the model, such as surveys that target teacher and principal attitudes and beliefs, as well as student achievement data, and observation data. The applicant describes a plan for assuming to purchase and develop additional assessments in high school subjects, with the costs for the annual assessment system subscription to be covered by TIF funds in years one for pilot testing in year two. TIF funds would cover full costs in year 2, with a percentage (2.5%) in year 3. The district would assume full costs in year 4.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant's implementation plan is well thought-out, however, it is unclear how the assessment system will be ready in time for use as a valid measure of student achievement, in the content areas where there are currently no assessments available. The applicant's plan for developing a data-management system appears to be sound.

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 describes numerous opportunities for professional development and mentoring in regard to specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness. Since many of the elements of the system have not been determined as yet, it is difficult to note how teachers will be informed about these, in order to understand them. For example, it has not yet been decided if the Colorado Growth Model or a value added model will be implemented, so professional development on this specific measure has not been addressed.

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 provides sufficient opportunities for professional development in most areas. These include online tools and courses, mentorship, and Human Resource consulting. Compensation is differentiated, with numerous supports in place for those who do not qualify. Some areas of professional development are not address, as decisions about these evaluation components have not been made.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides a graphic (page 3) to illustrate 34 high needs schools with 50% or more students eligible for free or reduced lunch, that will be targeted by this project. Three of the schools were identified as the lowest in the state. (page 1). A table illustrating the demographics of these schools is provided in the appendix.

(i) The applicant describes the district's difficulty with principal turnover (20%), and high teacher vacancies (page 7 with a table provided on page 8).

(ii) The high number of teacher vacancies in high need schools is provided as evidence of the need for reform in retaining teachers.

2. The applicant provides a segmented graphic of school performance, with an explanation of the process used to rate schools (located in the appendix). This process is identified as "segmentation".

Weaknesses:

1. Disaggregated data describing the schools to be targeted is lacking.

2. The applicant does not define comparable schools in this section.

3. A comparison to other comparable schools is not included in this section.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

(iii) The applicant provides a clear explanation of how teachers, principals, and

other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS.

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the districts's plans for a PBCS that targets high need schools.

(i) The applicant provides a project that will focus on the following goals: recruit, mentor, support, evaluate & assess, and recognize/reward and retain.

The applicant proposes a planning year to develop and use in its PBCS that determine the effectiveness of a school's teachers, principals (page 9)

(ii) The applicant proposes to use 50% of TIF funds to support teachers and principals in addition to the districts's contributions (pg 10). Recruitment plans for new principals include a one time \$10,000 signing incentive (page 11), with \$2500 in incentives for mentor principals (page 12).

(iii) The applicant provides a plan for of how teachers and principals will be determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS on page 13, and includes the use of Charlotte Danielson's evaluation model, student achievement data, and teacher feedback on professional development (page 14).

2. The applicant describes teacher and principal support and involvement in the development of the PBCS and provides letters of support from the superintendent, the principals's coalition, and a senator. The applicant provides an MOU between the state agency and the district's education association. The applicant describes plans to include stakeholders in the development of the PBCS during the planning year. The applicant describes a collective bargaining agreement that involved a pilot program for professional growth and evaluation. A Professional Growth and Evaluation task force is mentioned on page 18.

3. The applicant describes plans for developing a fair and transparent evaluation system based on a system that was piloted between 2004 and 2009. The evaluation system includes 3 formal observations conducted by a trained certified building supervisor. The inclusion of student achievement data in the evaluation system is described on page 21 and includes the use of student growth percentiles and student growth objectives. There is a plan to develop assessments in areas that do not currently have any common tests to gauge progress with. When assessments are available, the Colorado Growth Model or a Value Added model will be used to measure student growth (pg 22).

4. The applicant addresses the need for a technology infrastructure to support student academic data system the payroll system, and the staff evaluation system (page 33), and describes a plan for developing this (pages 33-35).

5. The applicant describes a variety of high quality professional development activities on pages 13-16. These include professional development courses with video clips of master teachers, common shared learning time among teachers, training in classroom management, differentiation and collaborative, etc.

Weaknesses:

Some of the tasks described in the project design appear to require more time than the project period. For example, the applicant's plans for developing valid assessments may require more time than the project period, if item development, field testing, and piloting testing are done before the assessments can be implemented in those areas where assessments are not in place.

Reader's Score: 56

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:

1. The applicant provides an organizational chart to illustrate the management plan on page 36. A timeline of project activities, with milestones and outcomes is provided on page 42. There is a description of a solid management plan on pages 36-42, followed by a description of highly qualified key personnel.
2. The project's key personnel and the role they will play in the project are described (pages 43-48). The team includes the superintendent, executive director of human resources (to be hired), the chief academic officer, the director of finance, the director of research and evaluation and other key members.
3. The applicant describes a source for funding the project in part through a levy that will contribute to sustaining the TIF work and expanding it to all schools in the district (page 49). The applicant describes a plan for assuming the costs of annual assessment system subscription, which would be covered by TIF funds in years one for pilot testing in year two. TIF funds would cover full costs in year 2, with a percentage (2.5%) in year 3. The district would assume full costs in year 4.
4. The grant amount requested and project costs appear to be sufficient to attain project goals and are reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

Weaknesses:

- 2). There is no description of the project director. Costs for a project director are not provided.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant mentions an evaluator who will consult with relevant planning teams in year 1, and provide guidance on the development of protocols and instruments to obtain consistently reliable and accurate outcome data throughout the implementation years (2-3) (page 51).
2. The evaluation plan includes the use of quantitative and qualitative data including student achievement data, data on attitudes and behaviors of principals and teachers, and recruitment and retention data.
3. The evaluation procedures include providing feedback through an annual progress report (page 54), that includes recommendations for sustaining operations.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear description of how stakeholders will access the project evaluation report or have input on it.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to use the Colorado Growth Model or a value added measure, as described on page 53. An annual evaluation progress report on performance measures will be submitted to inform project implementation and continuous improvement. At the end of 5, the evaluator will present a report that includes recommendations for sustaining operations.

Weaknesses:

Since the applicant is unclear as to which type of value added model it will use, it is uncertain how this model will be explained to teachers.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes a strong plan to serve high-need students through a PBCS that includes incentives for recruitment of highly qualified teachers and principals who will fill vacancies in high need areas. The district plans to launch a new image campaign to bring in new talent, and bring on additional staff members to increase recruiting capacity (page 10). The district plans to contract with an outside recruiting firm to help attract high performing school leaders (page 11). The district will help seasoned teachers understand retirement options and provide transition opportunities as coaches, mentors, community builders, and district interviewers.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how staff will be informed of which schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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	18
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	80

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	88
--------------	------------	-----------

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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's understanding of the critical role assigning significant weight to student growth based on objective data on student performance is demonstrated via an inquiry process into the most effective model to use in the district. The use of district standards to demonstrate growth will be supported by the tentative selection of either Colorado's Growth Model or Value-added Model (VAM). A clearly defined observation-based assessment of teacher and principal performance will be carried out by a team of educators who will be trained in using objective evidence-based rubrics that are aligned with professional teaching standards.

An expanded mentoring program for teachers and principals reflects the applicant's commitment to cultivating teachers and leaders and to supporting principals whose leadership roles will serve as evidence of the district's commitment to the implementation of a comprehensive data-driven system that expects and rewards student growth. Differentiated effectiveness incentives for teachers are defined based on the district's teacher evaluation tool. The tool defines a proficient as a level of performance

expected from a novice teacher after four years of service; however, a score at the â innovativeâ level, along with consistent high student performance, are required to be eligible for multiple career ladder opportunities. High-performing principals can be rewarded with a substantial monetary bonus.

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 outlined a budget for the duration of the grant and outlined fiscal resources that will be built over a five-year period to support sustainability beyond the duration of the grant. Projected costs revealed commitment to a monetary compensation system that seeks to integrate multiple sources of funding, both internal and external.

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 developed a plan to recognize the contributions of teachers to the enhancement of student learning and achievement through multiple strategies that foster shared responsibility and leadership. The proposed PBCS includes substantial monetary compensation and career ladder opportunities for teachers. An array of teacher leader positions include on-site demonstration teacher, on-site mentor, on-site master teacher are anticipated at each of the schools based a data-driven decision making process.

Mentoring as a differentiated effective strategy will be expanded from one year to three years. Principals will engage in mentoring of colleagues. Professional development strategies to nurture principal leadership development will continue to be refined.

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 developed a plan to recognize the contributions of teachers to the enhancement of student learning and achievement through multiple strategies that foster shared responsibility and leadership. The proposed PBCS includes substantial monetary compensation and career ladder opportunities for teachers. An array of teacher leader positions include on-site demonstration teacher, on-site mentor, on-site master teacher are anticipated at each of the schools based a data-driven decision making process.

Mentoring as a differentiated effective strategy will be expanded from one year to three years. Principals will engage in mentoring of colleagues. Professional development strategies to nurture principal leadership development will continue to be refined.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. **Core Element 1:**

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

General:

Core Element No. 1 reflects strategic thinking and planning and it effectively communicates to teachers, administrators, other personnel, and the community at-large the commitment to the core principles of PBCS. The comprehensive plan of action that embraces current practices and innovations as building blocks to genuine capacity to implement an innovative and effective education reform initiative that will become institutionalized over time with research-based practices as daily common practices at the classroom, school, and district levels.

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:

Core Element No. 2 reflects that the applicant recognizes the critical role all stakeholders play in the successful implementation of this education reform initiative. The application references the future design of a detailed stakeholder outreach and engagement strategy in the first six months of the planning year. A broad group of external and internal stakeholders will be targeted to emphasize transparency and accessibility. Making a connection between performance data and accountability for student achievement will be an effective strategy that helps stakeholders understand the rationale for the implementation of PBCS as a data-driven system that fosters high levels of teaching and learning.

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:

Core Element No. 3 is addressed via an evaluation system that includes members of the leadership team as evaluators following extensive required training. The applicant has implemented a Professional Growth and Evaluation Pilot Program that was overwhelmingly supported by teachers and union leaders to develop professional practice standards to guide a sound and equitable teacher evaluation system. A detailed evaluation of principals is included with reference to professional development opportunities for principals in need of support. A collaborative and inquiry-based approach to principal leadership development is offered.

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:

Core Element 4 is addressed through the acknowledgement that the existing integrated data-management system to support the implementation of PBCS Initiative needs to be strengthened. The applicant is aware of the technical requirements needed to capture multiple data (academic, personnel staff, and payroll) via this system that utilizes

growth measures to ascertain student academic success, leadership development, and institutionalization of research-based practices daily practices in every classroom and school.

To support the integration of a highly effective data-management system that supports the implementation of the grant, and to build technical capacity, the applicant plans to identify a system that integrates: 1) Student Information System, 2) Employee Performance Evaluation System, 3) Business Resource System, and 4) Academic Warehouse.

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:

Core Element No. 5 is addressed via a comprehensive plan that outlines a new approach to professional development which incorporates both student and staff performance data to better align and target professional development needs of teachers and principals as instructional leaders and reflective practitioners. The applicant outlines a target goal for professional development program for teachers that will be embedded as part of a four-tier evaluation research-based model, authored by Charlotte Danielson and titled, "A Framework for Teaching."

A data-driven professional development for principals should mirror that of teachers, with emphasis on the development of the principal as an instructional leader and researcher.

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 high-quality professional development program outlined includes required and creative approaches for teacher development and principals that is data-driven, aligned to professional practice standards, and which promotes collaboration, inquiry, and reflection.

Components of the PBCS include teachers as recipients of differentiated compensation and professional development to improve their own effectiveness as instructional leaders who share accountability for improved student learning and instructional practices at the classroom and school levels. The importance, significance, and impact the implementation of the proposed PBCS will have on student learning will be communicated with all stakeholders through multiple vehicles following a careful and strategic planning year. The external evaluator will play a key role in the ongoing and comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed professional development plan in transforming the instructional delivery and leadership development process at the classroom, school, and district levels. Principals as recipients of differentiated compensation and professional development must become the focus of a more detailed plan to meet their diverse needs that are supported by data and performance outcomes.

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:

Applicant utilized demographic data to convey a sense of urgency in the need to improve the learning of all students across high-need schools. Data on the recruitment and retention of teachers and principals reflect a severe need and discrepancy across the high-need and high-performing schools. The shortage of teachers in hard-to-staff areas and in general is viewed by the applicant as an opportunity to attract, mentor, support, evaluate, and recognize effective teachers to assume and share leadership responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

Comparability is limited to the segmented district population defined as the district's two lowest performing boundaries areas. The applicant describes the segmentation as a strategy to monitor school progress toward meeting district-wide goals. Student performance can be compared with that of like-populations in the district or across the state.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Project Design**1.(B): Project design (60 points)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The application reflected strategic, comprehensive and thoughtful planning of a coherent system that will be guided by research and best practices. The district is committed to supporting the development of a stronger educator work force ready to assume expanded responsibilities as teachers and principals in a mentor role and other teacher-support positions. The performance-based compensation model, once established, will be implemented as a highly effective strategy that guarantees a viable educational program for all students in the district.

The district is committed to promoting shared accountability and responsibility for meaningful and sustained learning by all students through the design and implementation of a teacher and principal evaluation system that will include student growth expectations and which will reward high-performing teachers and principals. As the model is rolled out, differentiated support will be provided as part of a professional system that establishes a link between student achievement and staff performance.

An integrated data-management system is at the core of the work of the implementation team as a priority during the planning year.

Over the next five years, the applicant will roll out a new master teacher and principal evaluation system that includes student growth expectations and which will offer recognition and reward high performers.

A new professional development system that uses both student and staff performance data to better align and target professional development will be designed and implemented.

Applicant demonstrated a deep understanding of the core principles behind PBCS through the proposed plan of action that is to be actualized during the second year of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The involvement and support of teachers, principals, and union representatives was not referenced in a detailed manner. Letters of support included are from principals' association, state superintendent of public instruction, and United States Senator.

Since an evaluation tool for teachers and principals has not been finalized and considering the magnitude of the project to be implemented as a turn-around reform model with a redefinition of roles and responsibilities, the overall project may face delays.

Principals as recipients of differentiated compensation will require the necessary teacher evaluation tools to perform all responsibilities in accordance with the requirements of the grant. The focus of a more detailed professional development plan to meet their diverse needs should be a top priority. As a result, the size of the awards to be offered to teachers and principals is yet to be determined.

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:

Budget reflects the integration of multiple sources of funding and the use of non-grant funds to augment the project and to create fiscal sustainability beyond the grant period.

The application described a management system that includes a collaborative approach that brings together all facets of internal and external resources: central office administration, teachers as leaders, consultants, and the community at-large. A high-quality team as outlined in personnel qualification descriptions will be assembled to carry out the proposed plan. This includes the hiring of a Communications Director who will lead the marketing and focused attention to the project based on its successful track. A project director and coordinator will lead the project in accordance with the proposed goals and timelines.

The requested amount to carry out the project are assessed to be sufficient, as demonstrated by the budget submission.

Weaknesses:

Key elements of the plan that will serve as the foundation for the successful implementation of the initiative will not be in place until after the first year. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain from the application how the specific components of the grant will be finalized and implemented.

The management plan is regarded as a critical element that the applicant will further establish as a top priority for the implementation team to follow.

The cost of the project will be balanced between local and grant funds; however, the proposal stipulates that local funding is contingent upon the community's approval through tax levy, which traditionally has received community support. The proposal did not outline an alternate source of funding for the project if the tax levy is not approved.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

An external evaluator will lead a comprehensive internal and external evaluation designed to guide the initiative and necessary adjustments throughout the duration of the grant.

Outcome monitoring will be conducted through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods in years 2-5. To maintain a continuous measure and report outcome indicators as well as to inform the outcomes evaluation at the conclusion of year 5. Relevant and multiple sources may include, but are not limited to informal and formal standardized student achievement data, evaluation of teachers and principals, exit interviews, self-reported principal and teacher attitudes, beliefs and behaviors related to career satisfaction, professional development, and instructional practices. Data will be analyzed and reported using descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and means for attitudinal items. Longitudinal analysis will be conducted as appropriate.

Weaknesses:

The first year as the planning year will be critical in solidifying the plan of action. Annual reporting to stakeholders needs to be reflected as a key activity that informs and engages all stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrated an understanding of a value-added model and its impact on student achievement and teachers' and principals' behaviors.

Professional development plan will address the need to promote faculty, staff, and school community understanding the principles behind a value-added model. The district proposed a planning year to evaluate research-based models and to develop evaluation tools.

A team of educators led by the project evaluator will convene during the first year of the grant to formulate a decision regarding the value-added model to be used to meet grant requirements. Two research-based models have been selected for stakeholders' examination and selection.

Weaknesses:

Two distinct and reliable models are being considered and the selection process will be completed as part of the first year or planning year. The selection process will take place during the first year with an evaluation of the five-year project as a requirement.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant addresses the challenging recruiting areas through a better public relations campaign and hiring bonuses. Recruiting and retaining challenges will be addressed via a research-based approach that recognizes teachers and principals as partners in the providing an optimal learning environment for all students, including those hard-to-staff subjects.

Retention of high quality teachers will reflect an eclectic approach that combines rewarding existing talent and expediting attrition. A plan to be developed in the first year of implementation is likely to provide the needed infrastructure to cultivate high-quality teachers in every classroom and consistent leadership in the classroom, school, and district.

A multi-faceted approach to improving the teaching workforce through an improved interviewing and hiring system will be designed and implemented. External resources will be tapped to enhance the principal hiring process. This will include an expert in the identification of highly effective principals who can be attracted to join the applicant's school system.

Weaknesses:

Science, mathematics, and special education were listed as hard-to-staff subject areas. A detailed plan of action to effectively address this required process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the subjects were identified as hard-to-staff was limited to the identification of the subjects.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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	7
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	17
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	79

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	86
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Seattle Public Schools -- Strategic Planning and Alliances, (S385A100135)

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 Seattle Public Schools (SPS) proposal includes a planning year to assist in the roll out of the proposal. This involves the creation of new teacher and principal evaluations which focus on student growth expectations. Appropriately, the evaluation tools are being created in cooperation with the local teacher union. A pilot program of the tool has already been tested. These new tools will specifically include recognition and rewards for high performing teachers and principals. Teacher evaluations will be conducted a minimum of 3 times a year for novice teachers, and twice a year for veteran teachers. These evaluations give significant weight to Student Growth Objectives identified by the district. A new principals' evaluation tool is planned to be developed in cooperation with the principals' union. The tool will include a whole school student growth measure as a substantial part of the evaluation. Principals may earn up to \$10,000 annually in bonuses for whole school student achievement. Teachers can earn \$2500 for working in low performing schools. The value of the incentives was justified through extensive national research.

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:

SPS has clearly delineated the costs of the project through the five year period. Costs are heavier in the first three years due to the purchasing of needed technology infrastructures as well as developmental costs of the project. Specific dollar amounts for principal incentives have been identified, but teacher incentive funds are unclear.

SPS acknowledges that the district is dependent on an approved levy this fall in order to sustain the proposed TIF project. Without taxpayer support of the levy, local funding is lacking, and SPS does not indicate how the project could be funded locally.

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:

Extensive use of data is evident in the evaluation of teachers and principals, especially related to student growth. Professional Development in the plan is tiered based on a teacher's level of performance. PD is directly tied to teacher needs related to improving student performance. The new evaluation tool uses a grid type model highly focused on student growth that will assist the district in making retention and tenure decisions.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant has clearly made an honest attempt to include key stakeholders in the development of the new PBCS plan. Details for the incentives of principals are well-defined. Unfortunately the applicant's defense of how the plan will provide teachers incentives to take on additional roles is vague.

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 PBCS plan for SPS is currently being developed in conjunction with both the teachers' union as well as the principals' union. The new evaluation tool for teachers has the documented support of the union in the pilot project. The Communications and Family Engagement Department will play a vital role in disseminating information to the various stakeholders. Specifically how the details of the PBCS will be communicated to key stakeholders needs to be more clearly defined in the proposal.

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 SPS has done extensive work to insure key stakeholder groups have been involved in the process. The teachers' union was directly involved in the creation of the new pilot teacher evaluation tool. The union is currently in support of the new tool, as indicated through support letters. The district also intends to include the principals' union specifically as they develop the new assessment tool for administrators. The teachers and principals in the buildings identified in the project have demonstrated support for the project as well.

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 new evaluation tool has a specific focus on student growth. It is two-tiered in this area, with weight being given to both student growth in subgroup populations, as well as student growth percentiles which focus on the entire class. Reasonably planned teacher evaluations will be conducted a minimum of 3 times a year for novice teachers, and twice a year for veteran teachers. Clear and specific goals using objective evidence for teacher growth over a four year period is outlined. The special training evaluators of principals would receive is undocumented. The proposal also lacks a discussion related to the inter-rater reliability of the evaluations.

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:

SPS has a clearly defined plan for the implementation of a data management system. The system would specifically incorporate teacher evaluations, professional development and student achievement together to help reduce ambiguity in the evaluation of staff and distribution of incentives. The proposal lacks a description of how the student achievement will link to the payroll 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:

Professional development for teachers is clearly defined and linked to their level of need. It is tiered based on the previous year's performance in the evaluation cycle. The use of data is clearly defined in determining PD needs of teachers. The Professional

development needs of principals are lacking with the exception of providing mentors for new and struggling administrators.

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:

SPS has a well-documented professional development plan for teachers based on the level of teacher need related to student achievement data. The plan focuses on student growth data as a foundation for determining need. Teachers at all levels of proficiency are provided opportunities to grow and improve their craft based on this data. PD is tailored to the individual teacher and principal. Principals are also provided professional development opportunities, but these are less well-defined in the proposal. The proposal is lacking a definite description of how the professional development provided will be evaluated for effectiveness.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The project clearly details the schools in the proposal as high need. Three of the schools identified for implementation in the project have been labeled as the state's lowest performing schools (p. 1). 13% of the students receive special education services (p. 3). 40% of the student population receives free or reduced lunch (p. 3). These schools have a disproportionate turnover rate (almost 2 times; p. 7) of teachers as those not defined as high risk. Scores for students in these schools are often below 50% proficiency.

Weaknesses:

Comparable schools are not clearly defined. The proposal does not adequately compare the scores of the project schools to other schools in the district. There is also insufficient information regarding how the proposal will attract and retain effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff subject areas.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to

affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

A planning year to assist in the roll out of the proposal is included (p. 9). This includes the finalization of the new teacher evaluation tool as well as the development of the principal evaluation tool which both focus on student growth expectations (p. 9). The evaluation tools are being created in cooperation with the local teacher union (p. 6). A pilot program of the tool is currently being tested. These new tools will include recognition and rewards for high performers. Teacher evaluations will be conducted a minimum of 3 times a year for novice teachers, and twice a year for veteran teachers. These evaluations give significant weight to Student Growth Objectives identified by the district. The teacher evaluation tool also differentiates levels of success, and prescribes professional development based on these ratings (p. 13). A new principals' evaluation tool is planned to be developed in cooperation with the principals' union. The tool will include a whole school student growth measure as a substantial part of the evaluation. Principals may earn up to \$10,000 annually in bonuses for whole school student achievement (p. 11). Teachers can earn \$2500 for working in low performing schools (p. 12). Significant time and resources are being dedicated to acquiring and implementing a new data management system that will link student achievement, teacher evaluations and professional development (p. 33-35).

Weaknesses:

The methodology to determine principal or teacher effectiveness is not well-defined, even considering the planning year. Since the principal tool is still in the development stages, the objectives have not been framed and are not clearly defined. This is a concern considering the high turnover rate of administrators in the district. The proposal also lacks clearly defined professional development for the principals as well. In addition, the link between principal achievement and the new data management system needs greater clarity.

Reader's Score: 50

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The details of the management plan seem to be well-developed with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of personnel with timelines for tasks included (p. 42). Key personnel including the project director have the needed qualifications to successfully implement the plan (p. 43-47). The amount of the grant request is sufficient in conjunction with LEA funding to support the project.

Weaknesses:

A large part of the LEA portion of the funding for this project is dependent upon a local tax levy this fall. Failure for this levy to pass will result in the LEA being unable to identify other revenue streams to fund the project (p. 49). A viable alternative plan is needed if the levy is not successful.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

The evaluation of the plan is thorough with outcomes that include measureable objectives (p. 54). It has identified benchmarks that will be evaluated throughout the project implementation. There is extensive use of both quantitative and qualitative data (p. 52). The performance measures are directly linked to student achievement with specific, measurable goals. An outside evaluator will be hired to assist in the process (p. 50).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

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

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

Strengths:

The plan calls for the use of value-added measures for calculating levels of compensation (p. 20). Teachers are scored on a gridded rubric which focuses both on student growth as well as student percentile ranking (p. 24). Opportunities for using the data to improve classroom performance are available through various levels of professional development (p. 12).

Weaknesses:

The communication plan for disseminating the information to principals and teachers is not adequately defined.

Reader's Score: 4

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

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal

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

Strengths:

The SPS district plans to launch a new image campaign to attract the best teachers (p. 10). A new more involved mentoring program has been designed to assist new teachers. Incentives are being provided to assist in the retention of both teachers and principals (p. 11). Incentives for teachers to work in high-needs schools are substantial (p. 3).

Weaknesses:

There is no mention how the hard to staff subjects and subjects will be clearly communicated to schools. Greater explanation is also needed related to how the plan will retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. The proposal also does not delineate how it will determine if a teacher filling a hard-to-staff vacancy is effective or likely to be effective.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:17 PM