

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 2:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	60
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	109
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

### 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 provides a clear description of a PBCS that includes differentiated levels of incentives, using the TAP model, which includes a rubric observation system. The agency intends to utilize a comprehensive school-wide model focused on four tenets: aggressive career advancement, a rigorous evaluation system that is linked to student achievement, a professional development system, and a compensation system (page 15). The applicant describes a plan to use a value-added model to measure student growth, analyzed by a reputable provider (page 20). The applicant proposes to provide differentiated incentive awards of \$2500 that appear to be substantial enough to affect the behaviors of teachers. The applicant will provide \$10,000 to administrative teams, and recruitment incentives for hard-to staff areas of \$10,000 (page 22). Mentor teachers will be eligible for \$5000 in incentives (page 27). The applicant describes a high quality plan to use the proposed individual value added model as 30% of the total evaluation of teachers and principals, with another 30% from school value added evaluations.

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:**

Fiscal sustainability for the project is clearly described on page 36-38, and includes a strong commitment by the partner schools to fund a percentage of both incentives and personnel costs using non-TIF funds. During years 2,3,4 and 5, the applicant will fund incentives according to the following rate: Year 2, 15%, Year 3, 30%, Year 4, 45% and Year 5, 60% and beyond, 100%. For personnel, the applicant plans the following: Year 2, 10%, Year 3, 25%, Year 4, 33.3% and Year 5, 50%. This support will promote the sustainability of the project after TIF funds have been exhausted.

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 describes the TAP evaluation system, which is reported to be aligned with the state evaluation systems (page 29). The TAP system, in addition to a value added system, provides a comprehensive method of evaluation and professional development. Sustainable features of this model include the use of a training portal to identify and share successful instructional strategies, school based professional development, and feedback combined with observational visits by mentors and coaches. These features will ensure that a strong educator workforce exists in the district, even after the TIF funding ends.

Reader's Score: 0

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

The applicant provides substantial incentives to master teachers and mentors, in an effort to encourage teachers to take on leadership roles. In addition, a \$10,000 bonus will be available to administrative teams who meet the criteria for performance compensation. These incentives appear to be significant enough to modify behavior.

**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 describes a strong communication plan (page 40) that includes presentations to stakeholders regarding TAP and the value added model. There is a plan for providing a web-based portal to share TAP resources, provide webinar trainings as needed and facilitate communication. Additionally, there is a public relations plan that will use media outlets to effectively promote TAP, create publicity to increase funding, and garner support for the program from state-wide stakeholders (page 43). The applicant describes a plan to evaluate the communication plan on page 44, annually using data sources to analyze the community relations plan and make changes accordingly. These evaluative components of the communication plan will strengthen the overall system by improving the implementation process.

**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 provides letters of support for the project from the Governor, the superintendent of public instruction, Battle for Kids and principals from partner schools. The applicant describes the method for communicating with schools interested in participating in the project on pages 12 and 40-42. The process includes an informational presentation regarding details of how the PBCS works, followed by a teacher vote on participation. The applicant states on page 41 that schools listed as partners received an initial presentation about the project and were required to vote with a two thirds majority of their faculty approving participation in the project. These activities demonstrate strong stakeholder involvement and support for the project.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

**General:**

The applicant has a detailed and well thought out plan for implementing the evaluation system. Using the TAP model, the agency intends to utilize a comprehensive school-wide model focused on four tenets: aggressive career advancement, a rigorous evaluation system that is linked to student achievement, a professional development system, and a compensation system (page 15). TAP includes a rubric observation system that is based on clearly defined standards. The applicant describes a plan to use a value added model to measure student growth, analyzed by a reputable provider. These components of the PBCS contribute to a fair evaluation system that is likely to strengthen the educator workforce.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

**General:**

The applicant provides a well described implementation plan that includes a data management system that uses CODE data entry software to track all teacher observations (page 28). The TAP evaluation system is aligned with state evaluation systems, as is the principal evaluation system (page 29). SAS Data Services provides value added growth calculations to schools in this state agency program (page 36). Links to human resource systems and payroll are not identified, however.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for ensuring that teachers and principals

understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

**General:**

The applicant has a detailed comprehensive plan for professional development to help teachers understand measures of effectiveness. This plan includes value added leadership conferences that provide discussions on use of data and value added results (page 35). Principals and teachers participate in these conferences. TAP professional development activities include weekly cluster meetings, individual growth plans and coaching, and state, district, and school level professional development activities. The plan provides evidence for ensuring understanding of the specific measures of the evaluation system.

**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 addresses the need to assist teachers who do not qualify for incentives by providing a professional development plan that allows for reflective practice, using Individual Growth Plans for improving areas of weakness. Weekly cluster meetings encourage sharing best practices, so that the needs of highly effective teachers and less effective teachers, as measured using value added growth and classroom observations, are met (page 34). These activities appear sufficient to meet the needs of struggling teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes 12 districts with 42 high need schools involved in this project. The schools serve at least 50% low income families, with some having a much higher percentage (page 1). The average poverty index is 83.6% for the TIF partner schools, and 69% minority. The applicant provides a table (pages 2-3) that includes a profile of the TIF partner schools's minority status, poverty index, and achievement results on the state assessment.

1. The applicant describes challenges in recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers on page 5, and states that the low number of college graduates and high number of vacancies is part of the problem. High teacher turn over (average of 17.5%) represents a waste of limited school resources. Lack of competitive salaries that are comparable to surrounding states, and a lack of leadership in the form of superintendents and principals is also noted in a chart on page 8.

2. The applicant provides a table (pages 2-3) that includes a profile of the TIF partner schools's minority status, poverty index, and achievement results on the state assessment. Low student achievement is described on page 1. Low academic achievement is also described in regard to schools that are part of the Juvenile Justice System.

3. The applicant describes comparable schools in terms of schools matched on demographic and size (page 2).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

### Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

1) The applicant is a state agency that is working with 12 high-need districts with a goal of improving student achievement and teacher effectiveness.

(i) Using the Tap model, the agency intends to utilize a comprehensive school-wide model focused on four tenets: aggressive career advancement, a rigorous evaluation system that is linked to student achievement, a professional development system, and a compensation system (page 15). TAP includes a rubric observation system that is based on clearly defined standards. The applicant describes a plan to use a value-added model to measure student growth, analyzed by a reputable provider (page 20).

(ii) The applicant proposes to provide incentive awards of \$2500 to affect the behaviors of teachers, provide \$10,000 to administrative teams, and provide recruitment incentives for hard-to staff areas of \$10,000 (page 22). Mentor teachers will be eligible for \$5000 in incentives (page 27).

(iii) The applicant clearly describes the method for determining teacher effectiveness using the TAP system and a value added model to link student achievement data with evaluation data on pages 27-31.

2) The applicant provides letters of support for the project from the Governor, the superintendent of public instruction, Battle for kids and principals from partner schools. The applicant describes the method for communicating with schools interested in

participating in the project on pages 12 and 40-42. The process includes an informational presentation regarding details of how the PBCS works, followed by a teacher vote on participation.

3) The applicant describes a plan to implement a PBCS that includes rigorous and transparent methods of evaluation through the TAP program, a value added model that links student achievement to evaluation data and compensation systems, and a professional development model to support teachers and leaders in the partner schools (pages 15-17 and 25-26). The model includes teacher observations four times per year by trained evaluators (page 28).

4) The applicant describes a data management system that uses CODE data entry software to track all teacher observations (page 28). The TAP evaluation system is aligned with state evaluation systems, as is the principal evaluation system (page 29). SAS Data Services provides value added growth calculations to schools in this state agency program (page 36).

5) The applicant describes incorporating high quality professional development activities through the TAP system on pages 33-36. These include feedback from observational visits, cluster meetings, individual growth plans, and leadership team conferences. These activities are directly linked to data on teacher effectiveness.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**Reader's Score: 60**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

1. The applicant describes the management plan on pages 46-54 and includes a graphic of the management structure that details the components of the plan (pg 47). The plan includes a timeline with quarterly benchmarks for project activities. The plan as described appears to be adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

2. The applicant describes the qualifications of key personnel, including the project director and principal investigator, who appear to be highly qualified. Resumes are included in the appendix. The required qualifications for key personnel are also described and appear appropriate for carrying out the responsibilities of the project effectively.

3. Fiscal sustainability for the project is described on pages 36-38, and includes a commitment by the partner schools to fund a percentage of incentives using non-TIF funds in years 2,3,4 and 5, as well as personnel.

4. The requested amount of the project costs appears to be sufficient to attain project goals.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

1. The applicant describes an evaluation plan based on measurable goals and objectives (pages 57-61), with a process for reporting on performance to improve student achievement and guide project goals (page 61).

2. The external evaluator will use quantitative and qualitative data such as data used in the value added model (state assessment data) and data from the attitudes and beliefs survey results. Data from the Teacher Efficacy scale will also be used, as well as teacher evaluation data from the TAP Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities Standards.

3. The external evaluator will select 40 comparable schools matching on Poverty Index, Absolute Rating, and Growth Rating (page 54).

4. Interim and final evaluation reports will be provided to the project director.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how stakeholders will access the evaluation reports. A feedback loop is missing for reviewing annual evaluation reports that includes teachers and administrators.

**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 describes a plan to use the proposed individual value added model as 30% of the total evaluation of teachers and principals, with another 30% from school value added evaluations. The applicant describes a communication plan that includes a description of the value added model (pages 42-43). A training plan to explain the model is also described.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes working closely with the Center for Educational Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement in identifying, attracting, placing and retaining well qualified teachers. The applicant also describes a formula identifying effective teacher applicants using a score of effective teaching (page 67). Scores derived from this formula help principals identify the most effective candidates for teaching positions (page 67). These features appear to be advantageous for making human resources decisions.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 2:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 6:24 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	58
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	97

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	107
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

Priority No. 1 is addressed by the applicant through the utilization of past successful TIF implementation experience with PBCS at the state level to outline an expansion proposal that is responsive to the needs of the high-need schools and districts in need of a school reform initiative. The level of compensation is robust to promote change in teacher and principals behaviors as reported by the applicant.

Applicant demonstrated a clear understanding of the core components of PBCS as outlined in TIF. The comprehensive description of the required components and how the applicant will meet them was evidenced through a strategic plan of action that will carry a significant weight to student growth based on multiple sources of data.

Application included 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. A

system for determining student growth that is valid and reliable has been identified to support the initiative.

The applicant demonstrated thoughtful differentiated effectiveness incentive payments based on a data-management system that integrates personnel, payroll, and student achievement in accordance with PBCS model requirements.

The applicant's proposed PBCS plan provides a comprehensive value-added approach that provides for compensation based on the success of student learning as a shared responsibility by teachers and administrators.

The degree of compensation is significant to promote a change in positive student learning and leadership approach at the classroom and district, levels.

**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:**

Reviewer Comment Priority 2:

Priority No. 2 is fulfilled with a description of the applicant's familiarity with the PBCS application process and its key components. The applicant was successful in outlining a budget for the duration of the grant and outlining the sources of funding that will support sustainability beyond the duration of the grant. As a state agency, the applicant demonstrated flexibility and resourcefulness in the allocation and reallocation of other state and federal fiscal resources to support this initiative beyond the duration of the grant that has built into it the gradual increase of its share for the compensation requirement under the grant. The state agency's comprehensive application reflects a view that PBCS is a school reform initiative that will bring about systemic change at the school, district, and state levels.

**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:**

Priority No. 3 was fulfilled by applicant by outlining plans to align proposed PBCS as a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce. This includes the strategic establishment of key teacher leadership positions along with the development of assistant principals as part of a succession model. Teachers as leaders will result in sustained school and district capacity to oversee the important work of teachers as a key factor in improving student learning and data-driven decision making. Master teachers will assume instructional leadership responsibilities as an additional support to principals. The concept of a leadership team is outlined, further affording staff members with an opportunity to contribute to the solution in a more defined and expanded leadership role.

**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:**

Applicant outlined the role and responsibilities teachers will have in new positions to be created, which carry monetary compensation. A fixed amount has been assigned for serving in various roles, particularly teachers in a position of master teacher and principals as principal mentors. The applicant outlined that teachers are sharing some responsibilities with the principal and some responsibilities are being fulfilled in addition to fulfilling classroom duties.

**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

A comprehensive plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its PBCS is outlined. Effective communication is regarded as a key component of the systemic reform initiative. The successful implementation of the grant can be enhanced via reporting periods that are not limited to annual reports. The magnitude of the grant is such that it warrants regular reporting internally and externally to meet grant requirements.

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

Support has been generated via an invitation to apply and the state agency's willingness to support the implementation of this systemic initiative designed to bring about change in student, school, district, and state levels. Letters of support are evidence of the enthusiasm and support for this initiative.

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:

Instructionally Focused Accountability is represented by fair evaluations based on clearly defined and research-based standards. A rubric-based observation system will allow the process to be a professional growth opportunity, rather than a compliance effort. A research-based framework supported by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) will lead the work of the PBCS model that is being expanded to districts and schools identified by the state department to be in need of education reform.

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

A data management model that complies with grant requirements has been in place as part of the state agency's implementation of PBCS Initiative. The applicant will replicate the use of this system in expanded districts and schools. The current system allows for real time data to be analyzed by school personnel, as charts and graphs can be produced instantly or immediately following a classroom observation. Ground work needs to be done to complete the expansion phase.

**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 professional development activities to be led by NIET. Ongoing professional development will afford teachers with onsite growth opportunities focused on the needs of their students to enhance their overall effectiveness in the content area they teach. Professional development opportunities for administrators are at the core of the initiative that promotes dependence and interdependence at the school, district, and regional levels.

Principals, teachers, mentors, and master teachers are key players in this reform effort and must be fully equipped with the necessary professional tools to facilitate their work as instructional leaders.

**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 will replicate the existing TAP model that has generated positive student outcomes, as reflected throughout the application.

All staff will be eligible to participate in the differentiated compensation system. Teachers of subjects not tested will incorporate the curricular initiatives in support of anticipated school-wide success.

Professional development is an area that will continue to evolve throughout the duration of the grant. Professional development opportunities are job embedded and create opportunities for mentors, master teachers, and administrators to become actively involved in a collaborative inquiry-based process. Regional master teachers will lead training to further support stakeholders' understanding of the key role they play in the successful implementation of PBCS. Building capacity at the classroom, school, district, and state is at the core of the proposed reform.

The effectiveness of the professional development plan will be monitored via the ongoing and focused professional development evaluation, interaction between mentors, master teachers, administrators, and regional staff members.

**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, recruitment and retention data related to hard to staff subjects (science, mathematics, special education), and past positive experience to convey a sense of urgency in the need to improve the learning of all students across high-needs districts and schools. Furthermore, applicant is relying on lessons learned as an experienced state agency that has led the implementation of a PBCS.

**Weaknesses:**

The application did not reflect a comprehensive comparability analysis as part of the statement of need.

Reader's Score: 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The application reflected strategic, comprehensive and thoughtful planning of a coherent system that is guided by the application's core principles: attract and retain high quality teachers and principals, enhance leadership and career advancement opportunities among teachers at the local and state levels, enhance and sustain student achievement for all students, and sustain a high-quality professional and data management system to drive the decision making process at the student, classroom, school, district, and state levels.

The proposed plan has been designed with a solid compensation system for both teachers and administrators to build and expand leadership roles. A focused communication plan outlines the mechanism to be used in maintaining regular communication with all stakeholders.

A clear and transparent system is in place to conduct evaluations that are supported by research-based national teaching standards. Observations are conducted by a team of trained evaluators who possess expertise in the instructional delivery process.

The proposed plan targets all stakeholders as active participants in the design and adjustment of the action plan as warranted based on data analysis.

**Weaknesses:**

The external evaluation system is a key component of the grant that will support the successful implementation of the proposed plan, but did not include an ongoing progress reporting system to all stakeholders.

**Reader's Score: 58**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrated experience with school reform initiatives and management of grants that have at their core the improvement of student learning, impacting the instructional delivery process, and influencing a leadership shift in instructional leaders.

Project management is being addressed strategically to better position itself to effectively develop and implement a high-scale education initiative that will impact students, teachers, administrators, and community at-large.

The management plan is comprehensive and targeted to achieve set objectives and with the financial support from multiple internal and external sources. Personnel responsible for the implementation of the project reflect the needed academic background and practical experience to collaborate with stakeholders and external experts throughout the grant period.

The requested amount reflects actual estimations based on past experience with the implementation of a PBCS model. As a state agency, the applicant demonstrated flexibility and resourcefulness in the allocation and reallocation of other state and federal fiscal resources to support this initiative beyond the duration of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness were identified.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant developed a plan that outlined activities that are consistent with the application requirements. The research-based practices that serve as the pillars of the project defined rigorous measurable performance objectives for building instructional leadership capacity as a shared responsibility between teachers and principals, higher teacher and principal retention, collaborative decision making, and overall improvement in student learning.

The proposed plan outlines a vast array of qualitative and quantitative data to be collected, and analyzed to produce reports that validate the progress made toward the attainment of set goals. The external evaluator will play a significant role in the design of the evaluation plan that takes into account all objectives of the proposal.

The value-added analysis model uses statistical methodology that documents the rate of progress, district, schools, grade, student levels, and is based on individual student achievement data.

The evaluation plan incorporates a plan that collects data from a variety of sources, including the project director as a main source of evaluative data. Professional development evaluation feedback, analysis of the evaluation system at the school and district level, magnitude of compensation, hiring and retention patterns, and overall student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified

**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:**

Applicant demonstrated a deep understanding of and the impact that a value-added analysis system has on the success of the students across schools and districts. It recognizes that existing PBCS model has been quite effective in promoting systemic change. and relies on this experience to implement an expansion initiative.

Replicating existing PBCS implementation will forge ahead schools and districts to think differently about the teaching and learning process and influencing positive learning and leadership development.

The applicant's experience with TAP as an effective data-driven state-approved school-turnaround model will allow for the successful implementation of PBCS with a value-added component. Significant weight will be assigned to student growth with 60 % of teacher

compensation to be linked to student achievement. Multiple teacher observations and evaluations will comprise the remaining 40 %. Principals' compensation is determined based on school-wide gains in student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant addressed the challenging recruiting areas through monetary incentives and through a redefinition of school reform through PBCS. The application reflects focus in serving high-need students, recruiting and retaining effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas such as science, mathematics, and special education. The applicant fulfilled this requirement by to implement an effective and comprehensive communication system that includes all stakeholders.

The proposed plan is substantiated by a state-wide survey completed in 2005 on working conditions revealed that leadership, the work environment, the opportunity for continuous improvement, career advancement opportunities, and the ability to interact and work with professional colleagues draw teachers to work in tough-to-staff schools. Without a substantial and effective differentiated compensation model and reform, the limited pool of quality teachers will be faced with a decision to seek employment in areas outside the identified high-need schools and hard-to-staff subjects.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/29/10 6:24 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 9:52 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

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

**Points Possible    Points Scored**

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 1

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

##### Absolute Priority 2

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

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

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

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

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

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

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Core Element 1

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

##### Core Element 2

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

##### Core Element 3

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

##### Core Element 4

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

##### Core Element 5

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

##### High Quality Professional Development

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

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

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	59
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	98

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	108
--------------	-----	-----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Panel - 15: 84.385A

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

**Applicant:** South Carolina Department of Education -- Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, Educator Quality and Leadership (S385A100134)

### 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 proposal by the SCDOE clearly meets the requirements of a PBCS which provides incentives for teacher and principal performance based on student achievement data. The plan includes an exceptional value-added approach that provides for differentiated compensation based on student, teacher and school success. The proposal is an extension of the existing SC TAP initiative. Significant weight is given to student growth, with 60% of the teacher compensation package based on student achievement. The remaining 40% is awarded through extensive teacher observations and evaluations that occur a minimum of 4 times a year. Principals are held accountable also based on whole school student achievement. The levels of compensation are substantial, and have been determined to be an effective amount to induce change, as is evident in the past successes of SC TAP schools.

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 SC TAP proposal has a significant and well-structured plan to ensure sustainability throughout the project period and beyond. All participating school districts were required to sign a MOU indicating their commitment to the project in terms of funding, and have agreed to increase the level of local contributions each year on a sliding scale. All schools in the project must sign a MOU indicating their commitment to implement the PBCS through SC TAP for at least the length of the grant period.

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 SC TAP plan intends to use data extensively in determining student achievement as well as teacher and principal bonuses and incentives. Ongoing professional development is directly tied to student needs and improving teacher instruction. Timely use of data will be a key component of determining professional development needs of all staff. Incentives through the PBCS are intended to attract and retain teachers in these high-need schools. LEAs involved in the project have aligned with the state program as part of the inclusion in the project.

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 provides substantial incentives for both teachers and principals to take additional leadership roles. Teachers are encouraged to seek more leadership roles in TAP schools through an expanded career ladder. They may choose to be career teachers, mentors, or master teachers, all of which come with added responsibilities along with additional pay. Teachers must earn and be selected for such leadership positions. The plan also calls for increased incentives for effective principals to remain in the schools rather than seeking promotions to central office.

**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:**

An extensive communication plan was presented in the proposal. This is based on the communication plan already in place for the SC TAP schools. In addition, a thorough plan was presented demonstrating how each school was selected for inclusion in the project. Multiple site visits were made to prospective schools, and stakeholders were invited to visit current TAP schools as well. A dedicated website has been developed to answer FAQs of teachers, principals and parents alike. Regular meetings are scheduled throughout the implementation of the plan, and all minutes are communicated to stakeholders as well.

**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 sought extensive support from key stakeholders. Prior to selecting schools for inclusion in the project, the state DOE sent out a letter of interest to all districts. LEAs considering the project were invited to formally apply. Based on interest and the level of school need, potential sites were selected. Members of the SC TAP Leadership team then met with principals and superintendents to better explain the process and the PBCS. Site visits with School Leadership Teams were then arranged with each perspective school. Upon approval from this group, a series of informational sessions were planned with the entire faculty. After this faculty were allowed to vote on whether or not to proceed. Selected schools had to have 2/3 of the staff in favor of the proposal to proceed.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

**General:**

A clear, transparent and fair evaluation system is in place for the SC TAP project. The teacher evaluation tool is based on accepted national standards with a high focus on student achievement. The principal evaluation integrates the state mandated administrator evaluation tool into the program and includes significant weight related to whole school student achievement. Classroom observations are conducted a minimum of 4 times a year by trained and certified evaluators who must recertify each year. These observations are conducted by a variety of evaluators including the principal, master teachers and regional evaluators to allow for inter-rater reliability.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

**General:**

The SC TAP proposal has a well-established data management system that is already in place. This high quality system is currently being used at existing TAP schools throughout the state with success. All teacher evaluations are loaded into the CODE system which links students directly to specific teachers and schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

**General:**

The applicant has a highly effective plan for insuring stakeholders understand the specific measures of the PBCS. All teachers in SC TAP schools are divided into professional development cluster teams based on either their subject area or grade level. Value-added data based on student achievement are regularly disseminated to Leadership Teams at the school for review and in determining professional development needs. The master teachers then share student achievement results with teachers and personally design professional development activities to meet their specific instructional needs.

**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 SC TAP PBCS is based on a value-added model with a high focus on student growth. All student growth data is reviewed regularly by the school Leadership Teams, then shared with individual staff members through master teachers and principals. This data review provides the foundation for indentifying individual teacher professional development needs regardless of the effectiveness level of the teachers; highly effective teachers receive training based on their needs which may be quite different from the needs of struggling teachers. The program proposal expands the existing program to include a greater number of teachers not already included in the PBCS due to the subject matter they teach. The professional development offered is continually assessed for effectiveness and adjusted for improvements as needed.

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 SC TAP proposal focuses primarily on attracting and retaining high quality teachers to work in hard to fill positions and schools. The program includes substantial incentives for teachers and principals to work and stay in hard to staff schools and subjects (p. 18-19). The schools identified to be included in the proposal are in high poverty areas, with an average poverty index of 83% (page 1). The schools also are deemed minority majority as they have a minority population average of 69%. Previous SC TAP schools have demonstrated a 73% support rate for their teachers of the TAP program (p. 20). All target schools have student achievement data based on state assessments that fall well below the state averages.

##### Weaknesses:

A better description of the comparable schools is needed. Much of the data provided, though compelling, relates to comparisons to state averages.

Reader's Score: 9

#### Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

(i) The methodology the LEA or SEA proposes to use in its PBCS to determine the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The project proposal for a PBCS is an expansion on a previously tested and effective program already in place in the state. A significant amount of the incentive bonuses available to teachers and principals is based on student growth, using a value-added model. This model allows for a differentiated disbursement of bonuses based on a variety of factors linked to student growth. The amount of the awards is \$2500 per teacher which represents a 5.6% increase over the state average salary (p. 22). Notably, because the plan uses a value-added model, teachers can earn up to three times this amount. The plan uses a 5 point factor scale, with 3 representing a year of academic growth. Teachers that have student growth scoring a 5 on the scale can earn three times the base incentive pay of \$2500. All schools who participate in the project needed to have 2/3 initial support of the staff before being considered for inclusion (p. 41). The evaluation system is transparent, rigorous and fair, with multiple evaluations of teachers and principals throughout the year by a variety of certified evaluators. An effective data management system that is already in place and in use will be utilized to track progress and assist in determining the fair and equitable distribution of incentive funds. The plan incorporates a comprehensive, ongoing professional development plan that is directly tied to teacher and student needs based on achievement data collected throughout the year.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No evidence was provided indicating the support of either the local teacher unions, or the local principal associations. Involving these groups would provide even greater support for the project.

Reader's Score: 59

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The management plan is an extension of the existing SC TAP plan which is already successfully in place. Key personnel including the Project Director have the needed experience to successfully implement the plan as presented, and the timeline to implement the project is adequate (p. 51). All participating school districts were required to sign an MOU indicating their financial support of the project, and willingness to implement the PBCS as presented. Each district is committed to providing more funds into the program each year of the grant on a sliding scale (p. 36-38). Having successfully implemented a similar plan already, the cost estimates are sufficient to implement the project.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The project has an extensive evaluation plan in place (p. 55-57). Previous evaluations of the current TAP project already implemented in the state have lead to slight modifications of the present proposal (p. 46). For example, a review of the current program has lead to a significant increase in the baseline incentive award, from \$2000 to \$2500 for each teacher. Data provided is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Multiple methods of evaluation are used throughout the project to insure continuous improvement.

**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 SC TAP project uses a value-added model based on the work of Sanders, et al. Significant weight for incentives is given for student growth and achievement based on statistically significant values (p. 18-19). The model is thoroughly explained to teachers and principals as part of the early site-based professional development provided. Student data is also regularly reviewed with teachers throughout the year helping them to realize areas for improvement.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

All of the schools identified for inclusion in this project meet the criteria determining them to be high-needs schools. The schools are in high poverty areas (83.6% poverty index on average). They are also primarily minority, averaging 69% of the student body (p. 1). Each school has demonstrated low student achievement based on the state standardized testing results (p. 3-4). The incentives provided also focus directly on hard to staff subjects areas including math, science, foreign language and ESL. A clear communication plan was presented in which teachers and principals can be made aware of the program and its progress.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 7/29/10 9:52 AM