

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	8
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	45
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	79

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	0
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	4
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	83
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

### 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 district cites previous participation in the Teacher and Student Advancement Program (TAP) at Wilburn Elementary School. TAP includes professional development related to best teaching practices. TAP is a comprehensive program that addresses different compensation levels and does take into account student growth and teacher observations.

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 plan cites district assuming a greater share of program cost over a five year period. A detailed budget with cost projections is provided with sufficient funds projections outlined on page 9.

**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 use of weekly professional development and comprehensive evaluation rubrics exist. Teachers regularly review student data and use it to inform instruction. Master teachers mentor other teachers. Teachers are evaluated five times per year. Evaluation instruments are aligned with the N.C. Teacher Evaluation Instrument (p12-13).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

Monetary rewards are provided for assumption of additional teacher roles and responsibilities. There is a need to address non-effective teachers in the framework proposed by the applicant (p.4).

**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:**

A detailed description of teacher participation at Wilburn School in the TAP program is provided. A letter of support from the teacher association president (union) provides evidence of understanding and support of this TIF proposal. No references of school communication to parents and other community members about the program is in the document (p.40).

**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:**

Letters of support exist in this proposal from the school principal and teacher association president. Additionally, staff surveys related to the TAP program implementation exists (p.27).

**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 teacher evaluation system includes all elements described in Core Element #3. The principal evaluation instrument is not described in detail and doesn't address compensation issues adequately. (p.24)..

**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 proposed data management system follows the TAP model. The proposal clearly states how student achievement data will be used related to teacher compensation and how student academic performance will impact teacher and principal monetary compensation (p.29).

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 proposal describes the current implementation of the TAP model in Wilburn School that includes on-going professional development training in the use of data to inform instruction, and letters from the school principal/teacher association president supporting the implementation of the TIF proposal (p.11). There is a plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of the plan.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore,

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

**General:**

Using the TAP model, a comprehensive and continuous professional development program exists for school staff (p.11). Specific examples are cited, however, more information is needed in addressing ineffective teachers given the proposal design. An evaluation component is needed to assess the effectiveness of professional development and understanding of the program components.

**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:**

Extensive data/data analysis provided comparing Wilburn with other similar schools in areas of academic achievement is adequate (p. 18-21). Use of master teachers as educational change agents is cited. The applicant offers criteria used in designating comparable schools. A "high need school" definition is provided.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant's proposal lacks specificity in defining the "hard-to-staff" positions. The value added data comparison chart on page 21 is primarily limited with data "not available notations" rendering it less than effective.

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:**

This proposal utilized the TAP model which correlates well with the TIF requirements. The proposal cites teacher support of TAP model. The proposal specifically describes the PBSC design and related incentives tied to teacher performance and student achievement, has the documented support of stakeholders, and has an appropriate teacher evaluation system, data-management system, and professional development plan articulated.

**Weaknesses:**

The linkage with district compensation systems needs to be more clearly articulated (p. 29). Additionally, the principal, teachers and teacher assistants involvement in professional development needs to be more fully detailed.

**Reader's Score: 45**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

A detailed timeline for district assumption of program costs is outlined. A detailed budget is provided. A management plan details appropriate elements of grant requirements and staff are qualified to carry out the plan as evidenced by resumes.

**Weaknesses:**

Time increments and measurement milestones are not clearly articulated.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**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 use of a comprehensive TAP model adequately addressed local evaluation quality concerns (p38-39). The TIF grant proposal has narratives and charts cites measurable performance goals, use of data from many sources, and a feedback/continous improvement process.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant fails to address data collection on teacher retention per the selection criteria.

**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 TIF grant will allow continuation and expansion of the TAP program presently in place (p.4). Additionally, the valued added EVAS and SKR evaluation systems described will be utilized (p.14). All the participants have previously been using TAP, which is a PBCS based value-added model, and staff level of program knowledge appears to be well grounded.

**Weaknesses:**

Existing and available MAP data which has been available for grades one through three was noted, however, it was not utilized in the program design or evaluation proposal elements.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	6
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	40
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	70

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	0
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	4
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	74
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

### 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:

Applicant proposes to implement a comprehensive school-based PBCS (TAPS) that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals and teacher assistants who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement. TAPS has already been in place at Wilburn for two years. Significant weight (50%) is given to student growth as determined by a value added model based on objective data on student performance and the other 50% is based on a SKR score (skills, knowledge and responsibility).

Additionally, Applicant uses trained and certified teacher and principals to complete the 5 yearly observations based on the TAP evaluation.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

**General:**

The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS (TAPS), during the project period and beyond the grant period in Wilburn Elementary.

Applicant is committed to providing a PBCS after the grant period and has identified Title I as the non-TIF funding source. Applicant expects increase student enrollment to increase Title I dollars, with 5% of the incentive funds coming from Title I starting in year three to 25% in year four and 70% in Year 5 (p.9).

**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 very aptly described their coherent and comprehensive evaluation system. Applicant proposed 5 observations based on the TAP evaluation which is aligned to the state evaluation. All evaluators are trained and certified. Applicant proposed other opportunities for teacher incentives by taking on additional leadership roles (Master Teacher and Mentor Teacher) (pp. 12-13).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

Applicant provided an explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of TAPS via the value-added and SKR scores.

The Applicant demonstrated on pages 15-20 the Master and Mentor teacher roles as added responsibilities. There was no mention of additional roles for principals and teacher assistants.

**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:**

While the Applicant has a professional development plan for training staff on content and curriculum, though there was insufficient information to respond to this section. This reviewer did not see a plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system. Further, the past communication plan since TAPS was first instituted, was not described.

**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:**

Applicant minimally addressed the stakeholder/teacher involvement criteria with only two sources of data. The Staff survey results indicate staff support of the four elements of TAPS (p. 27). The extent to which staff were involved in the original design of the TAPS is unclear.

As a comment, The Staff survey results that indicate staff support are too small. Print is not clear or discernable. This reviewer was unable to read.

A letter of support from the Wake Education Association minimally indicated stakeholder involvement (Appendix).

**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:**

Applicant is one school applying for a small grant to hire another Master Teacher and provide a bit higher performance incentives than offered by the district, and for their teacher assistants. Wilburn is already implementing TAPS, its PBCS and has been for two years.

Applicant has also indicated that it is already using EVASS as its value-added model, MAPS, and state EOC scores (pp. 29-30) which are all valid and reliable measures of student growth. Applicant uses trained and certified teacher and principals to complete the 5 yearly observations based on the TAP evaluation. The TAP Instructional Rubric includes 26 research-based indicators (p.3).

While the Applicant did not speak to inter-rater reliability, it is likely that has been established as the Applicant has been implementing TAPS for two years, though, this will need to be clarified.

Applicant provided an explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of TAPS.

**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 already has a data-management system (CODE), consistent with TAPS. The CODE system allows for the entry of value added student achievement data from EVASS and is aligned with the district HR department (p. 29).

**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 minimally addressed this criteria with information or a plan for professional development to ensure that its 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.

**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 demonstrated the provision of high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement. These activities are already in place with the current TAP and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS (TAPS). Page 11 describes the weekly 90 minute professional development, cluster meetings and Master and Mentor teacher modeling.

Additionally, the Applicant demonstrated that it is a high-need school and adequately met the criteria to target individual teachers and their needs as identified in the evaluation process.

All teachers in Wilburn receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS as well as the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom to raise student achievement.

Applicant proposes to provide teacher training to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness. Applicant adequately addressed how they would regularly assess the effectiveness of this professional development.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

Applicant provided data on page 19 that demonstrates a decrease in teacher turnover in the last three years. In addition, Wilburn's turnover is less than the district as a whole.

Applicant is a high needs school with 59% FRL and adequately defined three comparable schools using size, achievement data, language and FRL (pp. 19-21).

#### **Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not address recruiting or retaining highly qualified or effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education.

**Reader's Score: 6**

#### **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:**

Applicant is Wilburn Elementary School. It is one school applying for a small grant to hire another Master Teacher and provide a bit higher performance incentives than offered by the district and for their teacher assistants. Wilburn is already implementing TAPS (its PBCS) and has been for two years.

Applicant has also indicated that it is already using EVASS as its value added model, MAPS and state EOC scores (pp. 29-30)- all valid and reliable measure of student growth.

Applicant provided an explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of TAPS

The Applicant demonstrated on pages 12-13 and 28-29 a comprehensive teacher evaluation system. Applicant uses trained and certified teacher and principals to complete the 5 yearly observations based on the TAP evaluation. TAP evaluation is aligned to the state evaluation.

Applicant proposed other opportunities for teacher incentives by taking on additional leadership roles (Master Teacher and Mentor Teacher) (pp. 12-13).

It appears as if the Applicant already has a data-management system (CODE), consistent

with TAPS. The CODE system allows for the entry of value added student achievement data from EVASS and is aligned with the district HR department (p. 29).

The Applicant demonstrated the provision of high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement. These activities are already in place with the current TAP and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS (TAPS). Page 11 describes the weekly 90 minute professional development, cluster meetings and Master and Mentor teacher modeling.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant minimally addressed stakeholder/teacher involvement criteria by presenting Staff survey results that indicate staff support of the four elements of TAP. (p. 27)  
The Staff Survey Results that indicate staff support are too small to read. The print in the charts is not clear or discernable. Reviewer was unable to read.

A professional development plan or timeline would have supported the narrative description.

**Reader's Score: 40**

**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:**

Applicant adequately presented a timeline with big picture milestones (p. 31-32).

The project director (TIF Program Senior Administrator) has not yet been determined. Though a clearly defined job description of this position as well as other key personnel was provided(Appendix).

Wilburn School principal and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities. The Applicant proposes to have qualified district office staff provide support at .10 FTE (pp. 33-34). This seems to be an appropriate and adequate amount of time to implement the project, as the PBCS - TAP has already been in place for two years. This grant will primarily add one more Master Teacher as well as additional incentive funds.

The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of

the Wilburn Elementary PBCS (TAPS), during the project period and beyond the grant period (p.36).

The Applicant demonstrated commitment to supporting the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs to sustain TAPS at this level after the grant period and has identified Title I as the non-TIF funding source. Title I dollars, will cover 5% of the incentive funds coming starting in year three, fund 25% in year four and 70% in Year 5 (p. 9).

Applicant expects increase student enrollment to increase Title I funding.

The Applicant has requested a small grant only for Wilburn Elementary. The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and very reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project. 11 percent of the budget will go towards personnel and support, the remainder will be used for incentive funds (pp. 35-37).

**Weaknesses:**

While the Applicant did provide a time line, it was not detailed (by month or smaller increments of time), nor, were milestones clearly defined.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Applicant presented a Logic model (pp 38-39) to guide the evaluation. This seems appropriate given the size and scope of the grant request. District staff will facilitate the selection of an external evaluator.

Applicant proposes to produce evaluation data that are quantitative (MAPS, EOG scores, survey results, etc) and qualitative (teacher observations, interviews and focus groups) (pp. 41-42).

Applicant adequately addressed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement throughout the course of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

External evaluator has yet to be determined.  
The data collection methods do not align with the performance objectives (p.39).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The Applicant demonstrated that it has a plan to continue to implement EVAAS as the proposed value-added model (p. 14). This model is already in place as part of TAP. Additionally, the Applicant ably described the professional development that is provided on a weekly basis to clearly explain the chosen value-added model to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices (p. 11).

**Weaknesses:**

It is still unclear why grades four and five represent a larger part of the formula (p. 4)

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

Applicant did not seek to address competitive priority 5.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not seek to address priority 5.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	6
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	42
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	72

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	0
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	3
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	75
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Wake County Public School System -- Grants Administration, (S385A100070)

### 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 TAP system involves four distinct and interrelated elements, as a way to improve student achievement in varied ways. Instructionally focused accountability is an element that focuses on teacher observations based on 26 research-based indicators of effectiveness and student growth, as defined through value-added measures (p. 2-4). TAP is being used at Wilburn as part of the systemic reform efforts.

The additional use of multiple career paths and ongoing professional development are TAP elements that provide teachers with essential skills and valuable leadership roles. The participation as a mentor or master teacher gives an individual both increased responsibilities and increased expectations for effectiveness.

The primary factor in determining administrator effectiveness is that of student growth; the schoolwide value-added score and the NIET program review score that demonstrate over a year's worth of growth would make an administrative team eligible for compensation.

Differentiated compensation is based on multiple factors, including teachers' SKR scores,

student growth (school or classroom level), and additional responsibilities undertaken (p. 3). The proposal indicates that \$2000 is set aside for each teacher (p. 7).

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:

Since Wilburn has already been implementing the TAP model, they have been using Title I funds, as well as other state, federal, and local funds to "support performance-based compensation awards for classroom teachers, salary enhancements for master and mentor teachers, professional development, and software licenses" (p. 8). Because of the fact that implementation of TAP has already begun, Wilburn was able to make reasonable estimations of project costs for the project period. It appears that based on their current status of implementation, as well as their plans for school expansion, and by using various other funding sources, Wilburn will reasonably be able to support the PBCS beyond the funding period.

The proposal outlines the plan to use TIF funds during the first two years of the project and then transition to using 5%, 25%, and 70% of Title I funds in the subsequent three years of the project (p. 9).

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 proposed PBCS at Wilburn "utilizes weekly professional development and a comprehensive evaluation rubric for teachers," (p. 11). A focus on teacher reflection and the use of data to understand student learning are promoted as schoolwide efforts for increased teacher effectiveness.

By aligning teacher evaluations with professional development strategies, an effort is made to differentiate support based on teachers' varied areas of weakness (p. 12).

The TAP evaluations and instructional rubrics are aligned to North Carolina's New Teacher Evaluation Instrument and are used in making retention and tenure decisions.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Requirement - Requirement**

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

##### **General:**

Master and mentor teachers are mentioned throughout the proposal, and play an important role in training and supporting teachers at Wilburn.

Mentor and master teachers must apply for these positions each year and they undertake responsibilities such as conducting evaluations, providing staff development, and mentoring teachers (p. 4).

The proposal does not clearly state how teachers can progress through these leadership roles, although one of the main component of TAP is that of multiple career paths. Other leadership options are not described in the proposal.

**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 provides insufficient information to respond to this core element. As a result, this reviewer documents the following weaknesses in the applicant's description of the core element:

Beyond the initial efforts made to get teacher buy-in for TAP, it is not clear how communication takes place between stakeholders, with respect to the PBCS.

The proposal describes annual reports and interim status reports to be produced, but the proposal fails to describe when, how, and to whom these reports will be made (p. 40).

**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:**

Wilburn secured staff support for TAP in 2008, with an 85% approval vote for the reform (p. 27). The most recent annual survey results show that teachers continue to support the initiative. It is not clear how involved stakeholders were in the selection and decision-making process about the adoption of TAP.

There is a letter of support from Wake NCAE demonstrating support for the project, however it appears that they have a misunderstanding about the overall goals of the project (appendix).

**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:**

There are multiple components to Wilburn's evaluation system. Student growth data, including end-of-grade test scores and value-added measures, are used (p. 24), in conjunction with the TAP evaluation rubric (p. 28-9). Because teachers and evaluators have received extensive training on the instrument, it is a fair and transparent method of assessment.

While CODE offers options for determining inter-rater reliability, the process for making that determination is not clearly described.

The TAP evaluation instrument provides for 5 observations per year and includes a rubric that outlines major instructional expectations.

**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:**

TAP offers a Comprehensive On-line Data Entry system (CODE) that allows for score input, inter-rater reliability tracking, and teacher progress tracking, as well as value-added data input and calculation of teacher bonuses (p. 29). CODE is not linked to payroll and human resources systems for streamlined transfer of student achievement and performance compensation data (p. 29).

**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:**

Wilburn staff members have been provided with training on TAP, and continue to participate in professional development that addresses instructional strategies to promote student achievement, but specific efforts aimed at understanding the comprehensive nature of teacher and principal effectiveness are not in place.

Wilburn relies on weekly, job-embedded professional development in which teachers are divided into clusters with the support of mentor/ master teachers (p. 30). Professional development activities are based on school-based field-tested strategies, as well as the use of modeling and collaborative planning.

There is no evidence that professional development activities are planned for principals and teacher assistants who will be part of the project.

**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:**

Wilburn relies on weekly, job-embedded professional development in which teachers are divided into clusters with the support of mentor/ master teachers (p. 30). Professional development activities are based on school-based field-tested strategies, as well as the use of modeling and collaborative planning. It is not clear whether professional development activities will be aimed at helping teachers better understand the effectiveness measures.

There is no evidence that professional development activities are planned for principals and teacher assistants who will be part of the project.

The assessment of the professional development system is minimally addressed.

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 proposal defines the criteria used to determine comparable schools as those of similar size, those having close percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch, and coming from the same area of the county. Four comparable schools were selected.

In most areas, the student achievement data at Wilburn reflects lower scores than the comparable schools, both in proficiency levels and in meeting growth targets.

The proposal provides data to document the trends in teacher retention (p. 19), both for Wilburn and for WCPSS. Additional information about the impact this has had on Wilburn since TAPS inception in 2008 indicates that only five teachers have exited the school during that time (p. 27). This data provides evidence that teacher retention is not a serious problem at Wilburn.

**Weaknesses:**

Particular attention could have been paid to the recruitment and retention data as it pertains to hard-to-staff content areas. Additionally, a comparison of pre-TAP and post-TAP retention information could have been provided to document any changes in the movement of teachers in and out of the school.

Since value-added measures have only been used in the past two years, and since a significant amount of data is missing from the table that is provided, it is difficult to determine how Wilburn fares in relation to the comparable schools (p. 21).

**Reader's Score: 6**

**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:**

Student growth data, including end-of-grade test scores and value-added measures, are used to determine bonus eligibility (p. 24).

The proposal indicates that \$2000 is set aside for each teacher (p. 7, 24), with half resulting from SKR scores and half resulting from student growth data.

Wilburn secured staff support for TAP in 2008, with an 85% approval vote for the reform (p. 27). The most recent annual survey results show that teachers continue to support the initiative.

The TAP evaluation rubric appears to offer a detailed and comprehensive look at multiple factors that impact instruction and is completed five times each year (p. 28-9). Because teachers and evaluators have received extensive training on the instrument, it is a fair and transparent method of assessment.

TAP offers a Comprehensive On-line Data Entry system (CODE) that allows for score input, inter-rater reliability tracking, and teacher progress tracking, as well as value-added data input and calculation of teacher bonuses (p. 29).

Wilburn relies on weekly, job-embedded professional development in which teachers are divided into clusters with the support of mentor/ master teachers (p. 30). Professional development activities are based on school-based field-tested strategies, as well as the use of modeling and collaborative planning.

**Weaknesses:**

TAP is a national reform effort, but it is not clear whether it is being used throughout WCPSS or statewide in North Carolina. While school-level impact is important, it would be helpful to understand how the reform fits into the LEA's overall strategy to promote teacher effectiveness.

CODE is not directly linked to payroll and human resources systems for streamlined transfer of student achievement and performance compensation data (p. 29).

There is no evidence that professional development activities are planned for principals and teacher assistants who will be part of the project.

Reader's Score: 42

**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:**

Staff roles and responsibilities are described and an adequate amount of personnel and time appears to be allocated to the project (p. 32-34). Designated staff members are qualified to carry out the defined responsibilities.

The proposal outlines the plan to use TIF funds during the first two years of the project and then transition to using 5%, 25%, and 70% of Title I funds in the subsequent three years of the project and beyond (p. 9, 35). In addition, school expansion will allow for additional funding over the course of the next few years.

The proposed budget presents sufficient costs that appear to align with project goals and project design.

**Weaknesses:**

A yearly timeline is provided, but it does not provide sufficient information about the major activities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, especially as those are aligned with the overall project objectives (p. 31-2). Therefore, the management plan is not adequate.

Reader's Score: 20

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

other personnel;

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

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

**Strengths:**

Measurable performance objectives are defined within the logic model, and are delineated according to short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes (p. 39).

Multiple measures and data collection activities are generally laid out (p. 40-1), and include both quantitative and qualitative forms of data.

Opportunities for feedback and continuous improvement efforts are made throughout the evaluation process.

**Weaknesses:**

Data collection techniques do not necessarily align with the performance objectives; for example, there is not an example of data to be collected that would demonstrate whether teacher retention rates were met (p. 39-40).

**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:**

Wilburn uses EVAAS as the "value-added model to determine student growth and as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to school personnel" (p. 14). Half of a teacher's bonus can potentially come from their value-added score (either classroom or school level) and teacher assistants will be compensated accordingly as well (p. 14-15).

As part of the schoolwide focus on professional development and data analysis, Wilburn staff regularly collaborate to analyze value-added data and make decisions about the instructional impact.

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear what mechanisms are in place at Wilburn to effectively collect data and ensure data quality through the value-added model. Specific staff members and specific data management systems are not mentioned as evidence that the school has the capacity to support the value-added model.

The proposal offers a vague description of the way in which communication about the value-added model is made to teachers. "Teachers receive training on value-added analysis and what it means for their individual classrooms," (p. 15).

The Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) is described in the evaluation section of the proposal (p. 41-2), but it is unclear why this tool is not being used as part of the PBCS if it is able to offer K-5 student progress scores with a value-added component over the course of the year. This appears to be an additional tool for Wilburn to use in assessing all students in the school, and not only those with test data in 4th and 5th grades. P. 41-42

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

This priority was not addressed in the proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

This priority was not addressed in the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:55 PM