The General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program Competition FY 2012

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

SELECTION CRITERION (a) Coherent and Comprehensive Human Capital Management System (HCMS). (45 points) We will consider the quality and comprehensiveness of each participating LEA's HCMS as described in the application. In determining the quality of the HCMS, as it currently exists and as the applicant proposes to modify it during the grant period, we will consider the extent to which the HCMS described in the application is--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) Aligned with each participating LEA's clearly described vision of instructional improvement (10 points); and	**10**	**10**
Comments Of the seven Local Education Agencies (LEAs) participating in the grant, six were aligned with the described vision of instructional improvement in the 2011-2012 school year, and the seventh has since committed to it as well. The vision incorporates the common core standards to hold educators accountable to providing for student growth. (P. e22) As part of this vision, LEAs are also committed to using a variety of evaluation rubrics to evaluate teacher effectiveness. (P. e22)		
(2) Likely to increase the number of effective educators in the LEA's schools, especially in high-need schools, as demonstrated by (35 points)-- (i) The range of human capital decisions for which the applicant proposes to consider educator effectiveness – based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application. (ii) The weight given to educator effectiveness--based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application--when human capital decisions are made; (iii) The feasibility of the HCMS described in the application, including the extent to which the LEA has prior experience using information from the educator evaluation systems described in the application to inform human capital decisions, and applicable LEA-level policies that might inhibit or facilitate modifications needed to use educator effectiveness as a factor in human capital decisions; (iv) The commitment of the LEA's leadership to implementing the described HCMS, including all of its component parts; and (v) The adequacy of the financial and nonfinancial strategies and incentives, including the proposed PBCS, for attracting effective educators to work in high-need schools and retaining them in those schools.	**35**	34

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

Comments

(i) The focus of the Local Education Agency's (LEA's) Human Capital Management System (HCMS) is on informing decisions related to attracting, placing, retaining and sustaining quality educators. This model is outlined in figure one on page e21. The plan articulates the objectives of the system and the strategies necessary at each phase of the model. The plan also describes specifically how retention and dismissal procedures will be directly linked to evaluations. (P. e26)

(ii) Table 3 on page e27 and e28 clearly articulates what HCMS decisions can be made using the evaluation scores. This table specifically lists a variety of decisions that must be made over all 4 of the key strategies (attract, place, retain, sustain) and the weight (full or partial) with which the score contributes to the decision. The table delineates decisions for both teachers and school leaders.

(iii) The applicant describes state legislation and its impact on HCMS over the duration of the grant. (P. e29 and e30) For example, state statute ARS 15-203 calls for teacher and principal evaluations that include quantitative data on student growth to account for between 33% and 50% of the evaluation outcome. The plan also addresses necessary changes to each LEA's contract language that will need to be modified in order to fully implement the evaluation based HCMS. (Pp. e30; e31; e34) The proposed system is specific, but also has necessary flexibility to adapt to changes at the local state and federal level. This further supports the feasibility of implementing the plan on the timeline described later in the proposal.

(iv) The lead applicant has extensive experience dealing with state and local education agencies to implement the changes necessary for implementing a comprehensive HCMS. (P. e35) Several mandates at the state and local level that encourage/require evaluation based decision making policies support feasibility. (P. e35) Each LEA has signed onto an MOU further solidifying leadership support of the grant process. (P. 37)

(v) Specific financial and non-financial incentives for attracting effective educators are outlined in the proposal (Pp. e31-33). Financial policies of note include faster promotion to higher salary levels for effective teachers and additional incentives to go to highest need schools (spotlight schools). However, the applicant did not show evidence of how these financial incentives compared to other LEAs in the area and whether the incentives would be high enough to adequately promote movement to high need schools. One of the non-financial incentives for recruiting highly effective teachers to spotlight schools is the implementation of a 3-year contract to provide the educator time to implement changes without the fear of a negative impact on their evaluation because their student growth numbers may be lower

initially. Other policy changes to encourage the retention of quality educators are increased opportunities for career pathways and eliminating seniority from reduction in force decisions.		
TOTAL	***45***	44

SELECTION CRITERION (b) - <u>Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable Educator Evaluation Systems</u>. (35 points) We will consider, for each participating LEA, the quality of the educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of each evaluation system, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) Each participating LEA has finalized a high-quality evaluation rubric, with at least three performance levels (e.g., highly effective, effective, developing, unsatisfactory), under which educators will be evaluated (2 points);	**2**	**2**
Comments Each Local Education Agency (LEA) will be using an evaluation system that uses a score to classify a teacher as ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective. (P. e48) This indicates a high quality evaluation rubric.		
(2) Each participating LEA has presented (4 points)-- (i) A clear rationale to support its consideration of the level of student growth achieved in differentiating performance levels; and (ii) Evidence, such as current research and best practices, supporting the LEA's choice of student growth models and demonstrating the rigor and comparability of assessments;	**4**	**4**
Comments The lead applicant has presented a clear rationale for how student growth will be incorporated into the Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership (REIL) score. (Table 13 p. e49) They have integrated components of value-added models that have been supported by		

current research to help isolate teacher effectiveness by eliminating variables related to characteristics of students in the classroom. This provides a level playing field for educators being evaluated and increases the reliability of the evaluation system. (P. e50)		
(3) Each participating LEA has made substantial progress in developing a high-quality plan for multiple teacher and principal observations, including identification of the persons, by position and qualifications, who will be conducting the observations, the observation tool, the events to be observed, the accuracy of raters in using observation tools and the procedures for ensuring a high degree of inter-rater reliability (13 points);	**13**	**13**
Comments Each Local Education Agency (LEA) will be using the same observation tools that are at varying levels of validation and revision, but all of which are at least usable in year 1 of the grant. (P. e44; e45) The events, and the number of events, to be observed are clearly stated (P. e45) and are appropriate for the process. The qualifications for the key personnel conducting evaluations are discussed. (Pp. 112-113 of the other attachments) Examples of these include completing a 30 hour training on passing an assessment evaluating the accuracy of the evaluator's effectiveness. Training will be provided for all evaluators and all evaluators must meet standard on the trainings in order to evaluate staff. (P. e45 and e46) An additional check of inter-rater reliability will be co-observations with field specialists and evaluators. (P. e46)		
(4) The participating LEA has experience measuring student growth at the classroom level, and has already implemented components of the proposed educator evaluation systems (4 points);	**4**	**2**
Comments As previously mentioned, the lead applicant has extensive experience measuring student growth at the classroom level. However, no evidence is provided to demonstrate that the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have experience measuring student growth and implementing it into the educator evaluation system.		
(5) In the case of teacher evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) —- (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating for teachers, in significant part, on student growth;	**6**	**6**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

(ii) Evaluates the practice of teachers, including general education teachers and teachers of special student populations, in meeting the needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English learners;		
Comments The proposed evaluation system uses student growth as a significant indicator of teacher effectiveness. Student growth contributes to 50% of the overall evaluation score for teachers. (Table 13 P. e50) The applicant addresses how measures will be used in areas where there are not state or district assessments available. (P. e54) Plans for evaluating student growth in special education and ELL programs are presented on pages e55 and e56.		
(6) In the case of principal evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating on, in significant part, student growth; and (ii) Evaluates, among other factors, a principal's practice in-- (A) Focusing every teacher, and the school community generally, on student growth; (B) Establishing a collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement; and (C) Supporting the academic needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English learners, for example, by creating systems to support successful co-teaching practices, providing resources for research-based intervention services, or similar activities.	**6**	**5**
Comments The proposed evaluation system uses student growth as a significant indicator of principal effectiveness. Student growth contributes to 50% of the overall evaluation score for principals. (table 13 p. e50) The Leadership Observation Instrument (LdOI) is used to measure the principal's ability to focus the school community on student growth, build a culture of collaboration, and support the academic needs of special student populations. (P. e56) However, there is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the principal will create systems to support activities such as co-teaching practices, providing resources for research-based intervention services, or similar activities.		
TOTAL	**35**	**32**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

SELECTION CRITERION (c) Professional Development Systems to Support the Needs of Teachers and Principals Identified Through the Evaluation Process. (35 points) We will consider the extent to which each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 3(a), to improve their effectiveness. In determining the quality of each plan for professional development, we will consider the extent to which the plan describes how the participating LEA will--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator evaluation systems to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools (8 points);	8	8
Comments Each educator in the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) targeted will work with their administrators to define specific goals that are directly measured by both student performance indicators and the Learning Observation Instrument (LnOI). (P. e58) From this goal, a specific action plan (table 15 p. e59) for professional development will be implemented to help the educator meet this goal. A similar process is outlined for principals, but tied to the Leading Observation Instrument (LdOI) instead of the LnOI.		
(2) Provide professional development in a timely way (2 points);	2	2
Comments Educators can access online video support materials through the REILize (Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership) Decision Support System. (P. e60) This system has a variety of tools designed to help educators see the examples of the different proficiency levels on the various observation instruments. In addition, a 5-year professional development plan listing activities targeted for specific groups of educators is provided (Table 16 P. e60-e61). This model allows educators the flexibility to cater their professional development to their individual needs and schedules.		

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

(3) Provide school-based, job-embedded opportunities for educators to transfer new knowledge into instructional and leadership practices (5 points); and	**5**	**4**
Comments Site based professional development groups will be created to provide teachers with a network of teachers with support from colleagues with similar needs and experiences. (P. e62) Details on how often these groups will meet, who will be leading the groups and how growth competencies will be measured are not provided. There is also a Career Pathway Academy component of the model to support the development of teacher leaders within each school so that even the most experienced/effective teachers will have rich opportunities for growth and development. (P. e62)		
(4) Provide professional development that is likely to improve instructional and leadership practices, and is guided by the professional development needs of individual educators as identified in paragraph (c)(1) of this criterion (20 points).	**20**	**10**
Comments The lead applicant discusses 3 professional development series with which each educator will engage. (P. e64) Although the plan appears to be comprehensive, there is not sufficient evidence that the workshops allow for the individual needs of each educator based upon the data described in paragraph (c)(1) of this criterion. Another factor limiting the likelihood of improving instruction is the lack of evidence outlining when educators will have the time to engage with the professional development with in the school year. The materials seem to be intense and potentially overwhelming for teachers who may already be feeling frustrated by working in high need schools.		
TOTAL	**35**	**24**

SELECTION CRITERION (d) Involvement of Educators. (35 points)

We will consider the quality of educator involvement in the development and implementation of the proposed PBCS and educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of such involvement, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total**	**Assigned Score**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

	Possible	
(1) The application contains evidence that educator involvement in the design of the PBCS and the educator evaluation systems has been extensive and will continue to be extensive during the grant period (10 points); and	**10**	**6**
Comments Educators were involved in the process leading up to the application by helping with activities such as revising the evaluation system, developing assessments necessary for measuring student growth, and working through the Teacher Incentive Fund elements. (P. e64 and e65) Teachers were especially vital to revising the observation instruments. (P. e65 and 66) However, there is not sufficient evidence of the educator involvement in designing the Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS). Continued teacher involvement is also outlined in the proposal (figure 4 p. e 67) although details regarding how the teacher involvement will take place are limited and unclear.		
(2) The application contains evidence that educators support the elements of the proposed PBCS and the educator evaluation systems described in the application (25 points).	**25**	**25**
Comments Extensive evidence is presented showing the firm commitment of all stakeholders in this process. This includes letters of support, survey results of teachers and administrators, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for each LEA. For example, all of the MOU's include signatures from all stakeholders including teachers. (other attachments p. 24-66) Most importantly, 6 of the 7 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were involved in a process similar to this grant competition this past year and all of them elected to continue with this process. (P. e52) This demonstrates that the buy-in is there from the appropriate stakeholders to facilitate the changes described in this application.		
TOTAL	**35**	**31**

SELECTION CRITERION (e) <u>Project Management</u>. (30 points)
We will consider the quality of the management plan of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, we will consider the extent to which the management plan--

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Clearly identifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of key personnel (3 points);	3	3
Comments The roles and responsibilities of key personnel are clearly defined. (Pp. e71 - e72) For example, the program director will be responsible for coordinating all activities under each of the program objectives, ensuring efficient coordination and communication across program partners. The lead applicant has extensive experience with the Teacher Incentive Fund process.		
(2) Allocates sufficient human resources to complete project tasks (5 points);	5	5
Comments The lead applicant has experience with allocating resources at both the project level and the individual Local Education Agency (LEA) level. (P. e72 and e73) Considerations have been given to providing support to each school as well as to coordination between schools. The roles of the needed specialists have been clearly identified. (P. e72 and e73)		
(3) Includes measurable project objectives and performance measures (5 points); and	5	5
Comments The applicant defines three goals of the project and breaks each of those overriding goals into specific objectives that provide the framework necessary to reach each goal. (P. e73-e74) The applicant defines performance measures to specifically quantify each goal. For example, under the goal of ensuring students graduate college and career ready by increasing student achievement and growth in state-tested content areas, one of the objectives listed has a specific date (September 30, 2017) and measure (at least a ten point gain in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard).		
(4) Includes an effective project evaluation plan (5 points);	5	5
Comments The lead applicant proposes to contract with an external evaluator to provide ongoing		

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

feedback on the project's goals. (P. e75) The applicant proposes numerous research questions and an evaluation matrix which will be used to monitor the success of the program. For example, to assess the progress toward reaching the objective stated in the previous section, the research question "To what extent does the use of LEA-wide HCMS result in increased student learning?" is posed.		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (i) Implementing the components of the HCMS, PBCS, and educator evaluation systems, including any proposal to phase in schools or educators (8 points).	**8**	**8**
Comments Table 23 provides specific and achievable timelines implementing components of a Human Capital Management System (P. e80-e82), a Performance Based Evaluation System (Pp. e82-e83), and a Performance Based Compensation System. (Pp. e83-e84) The timeline includes activities (i.e. hire program staff), timeline (March 2013), and person responsible (program director).		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (ii) Successfully completing project tasks and achieving objectives (4 points).	**4**	**3**
Comments Table 23 (Pp. e80-e86) provides specific and achievable timelines for all aspects of the project. For example, because of the work already done on training educators on the evaluation system, it is realistic to expect a minimum of two observation cycles for all teachers can take place during year one of the process. However, there is not sufficient evidence to validate the reality of implementing five observation cycles for all teachers in year 2. There was not enough supporting evidence that evaluators would have the time necessary to complete that many observations.		
TOTAL	**30**	**29**

SELECTION CRITERION (f) Sustainability. (20 points)

We will consider the quality of the plan to sustain the proposed project. In determining the quality of the sustainability plan, we will consider the extent to which the sustainability plan--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

(1) Identifies and commits sufficient non-TIF resources, financial and nonfinancial, to support the PBCS and educator evaluation systems during and after the grant period (10 points);	**10**	**10**
Comments Pages e86- e90 clearly articulate the resources necessary to complete the project during and after the grant period. Each Local Education Agency (LEA) has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining their ongoing commitment of resources to support and sustain and Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) and educator evaluation systems. Examples include shifting funds from state (i.e. maintenance and operation funds) and federal (Title II-A) sources to allow for the continuation of the work established during the Teacher Incentive Fund process.		
(2) Is likely to be implemented and, if implemented, will result in a sustained PBCS and educator evaluation systems after the grant period ends (10 points).	**10**	**8**
Comments Each LEA has committed to the process and all but one has been involved in similar processes in the past which increases the chances of successful implementation and sustainability of the project. Also, each LEA has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with all stakeholders signing off on continuing the work begun through the Teacher Incentive Fund. There is not sufficient evidence that there will be enough evaluative resources available to continue the 5 observations cycles listed in the applicant timeline required in the evaluation systems after the grant period ends.		
TOTAL	**20**	**18**

Competitive Preference Priority – <u>An Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness</u> (Up to 20 points)

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose, as part of its PBCS, a timeline for implementing no later than in the fifth year of the grant's project period a salary structure based on effectiveness for both teachers and principals. As part	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

of this proposal, an applicant must describe-- (a) The extent to which and how each LEA will use overall evaluation ratings to determine educator salaries; (b) How each LEA will use TIF funds to support the salary structure based on effectiveness in the high-need schools listed in response to Requirement 3(a); and (c) The extent to which the proposed implementation is feasible, given that implementation will depend upon stakeholder support and applicable LEA-level policies.	**20**	**20**
Comments The applicant proposes using the evaluation process to establish criteria that will be used to implement a Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) salary structure. Table 9 on page e39 shows an example of this incorporation of performance rating into the salary schedule. TIF grant funds will play a major role in supporting each Local Education Agency's (LEA's) transition to a salary structure based on effectiveness. (P. e40) Specifically, 30% of the TIF funds will be allocated to supplement the salary schedule transition. During the planning discussions for the grant process, each LEA discussed their intent to move toward a Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) directly tied to the salary schedule rather than implemented as short-term bonuses. (P. e41) The LEAs showed strong stakeholder support as reported on page e43. This support includes survey data as well as each LEA's Memorandum of Understanding.		
TOTAL	**20**	**20**
GRAND TOTAL	**220**	**198**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-A**

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

The General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program Competition FY 2012

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

SELECTION CRITERION (a) Coherent and Comprehensive Human Capital Management System (HCMS). (45 points) We will consider the quality and comprehensiveness of each participating LEA's HCMS as described in the application. In determining the quality of the HCMS, as it currently exists and as the applicant proposes to modify it during the grant period, we will consider the extent to which the HCMS described in the application is--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) Aligned with each participating LEA's clearly described vision of instructional improvement (10 points); and	**10**	**10**
Comments The applicant provides assurance that the proposed Human Capital Management System (HCMS) is aligned with the described vision of instructional improvement for each participating Local Education Agency (LEA). The 7 LEAs in the partnership have committed to a common vision of instructional improvement (P. e22). This vision holds educators to new, higher levels of accountability for improved student outcomes (P. e22).		
(2) Likely to increase the number of effective educators in the LEA's schools, especially in high-need schools, as demonstrated by (35 points)-- (i) The range of human capital decisions for which the applicant proposes to consider educator effectiveness – based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application. (ii) The weight given to educator effectiveness--based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application--when human capital decisions are made. (iii) The feasibility of the HCMS described in the application, including the extent to which the LEA has prior experience using information from the educator evaluation systems described in the application to inform human capital decisions, and applicable LEA-level policies that might inhibit or facilitate modifications needed to use educator effectiveness as a factor in human capital decisions. (iv) The commitment of the LEA's leadership to implementing the described	**35**	32

HCMS, including all of its component parts. (v) The adequacy of the financial and nonfinancial strategies and incentives, including the proposed PBCS, for attracting effective educators to work in high-need schools and retaining them in those schools.		

Comments

The applicant provides evidence that the proposed Human Capital Management System (HCMS) is likely to increase the number of effective educators in the schools involved in the partnership, especially in high-need schools.

i. The applicant proposes to consider educator effectiveness based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application to inform HCMS decisions around attracting, placing, retaining and sustaining teachers (P. e24). In addition, effectiveness will drive professional development planning and delivery (P. e25). Educators rated ineffective will receive increased support, with outcomes determining dismissal, probationary or continuing status (P. e25).

ii. Considerable weight is given to educator effectiveness based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application when certain human capital decisions are made. The applicant proposes to give full weight to effectiveness in making decisions about performance-based compensation and placement into specific positions (P. e27). Other decisions give effectiveness partial weight in conjunction with other factors. In some cases, state statute prohibits making decisions (such as reductions-in-force) solely based on effectiveness (P. e27). Though reductions-in-force cannot be solely based on effectiveness, the applicant does propose to give evaluation full weight for dismissal policies (P. e28).

iii. The lead applicant has prior experience using information from the educator evaluation systems described in the application to inform human capital decisions, supporting the feasibility of the HCMS described in the application (P. e35). The applicant has identified district-level policies that might inhibit modifications needed to use educator effectiveness as a factor in human capital decisions (P. e30-31). The applicant has also identified a number of policies that should support the implementation of the proposed HCMS (P. e33). For example, one policy precludes a Local Education Agency (LEA) from using tenure and seniority as priority criteria when making decisions about reductions in force (P. e33, P. e36). Feasibility is further supported by the financial modeling of educator salary schedules,

supporting state legislation, and communication structures designed to elicit stakeholder feedback during the two years prior to implementation (P. e41).

iv. Each partner has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing to program implementation, indicating the commitment of the LEA's leadership to implementing the described HCMS, including all of its component parts (P. e37). Each LEA has also completed a communication plan, related to involving educators in the development and implementation of the HCMS (P. e37). The partnership has collaboratively established a set of six guiding principles (P. e42).

v. The financial strategies and incentives, including the proposed Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS), appear sufficient to attract effective educators to work in high-need schools and retain them in those schools, as per the model educator salary schedules (P. e39). Financial strategies include performance-based compensation embedded in the salary schedule (P. e38) and a career pathway model in a subset of high-need schools (P. e39). In this example a highly effective teacher would earn $20,000 more than a developing teacher with the same amount of experience (P. e39). Financial strategies may be especially appealing to teachers new to the profession, as they would have the ability to progress more quickly to higher salaries (P. e31). The district also proposes to use TIF funds to increase the base/starting pay in high need schools (P. e41; P. e31). The applicant does not provide evidence to demonstrate that the proposed salary is "competitive" (as described on P. e31), such as information on salaries in nearby districts. Non-financial strategies are proposed and include access to regular feedback and high-quality professional development (P. e32). Again, these strategies are likely to be most appealing to newer teachers. Some of the non-financial strategies listed would exist whether the proposed project was in place or not, such as the opportunity to make a difference by serving in a high-need school (P. e32).

TOTAL	***45***	42

SELECTION CRITERION (b) - <u>Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable Educator Evaluation Systems</u>. (35 points) We will consider, for each participating LEA, the quality of the educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of each evaluation system, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

(1) Each participating LEA has finalized a high-quality evaluation rubric, with at least three performance levels (e.g., highly effective, effective, developing, unsatisfactory), under which educators will be evaluated (2 points);	**2**	**2**
Comments The applicant has proposed an evaluation rubric with four performance designations (P. e48). These performance designations are ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective (P. e48). Educators are evaluated in multiple ways, including through observations, value-added scores, and a professional responsibilities rubric (P. e48). These multiple measures are combined into a total Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership (REIL) scores after being weighted (P. e49).		
(2) Each participating LEA has presented (4 points)-- (i) A clear rationale to support its consideration of the level of student growth achieved in differentiating performance levels; and (ii) Evidence, such as current research and best practices, supporting the LEA's choice of student growth models and demonstrating the rigor and comparability of assessments;	**4**	**4**
Comments i. The applicant rationalizes the consideration of the level of student growth achieved in differentiating performance levels through its vision of instructional improvement, which holds educators accountable for student outcomes (P. e23). Inclusion of the value-added model communicates the belief that educators significantly contribute to academic progress of students (P. e23). The applicant proposes basing 50% of the overall rating on student growth (P. e51). This is the maximum allowable per state statute (P. e53). ii. The applicant provides evidence supporting the choice of student growth models, which is a covariate adjustment value-added model (P. e50). This model adjusts for pre-existing differences in achievement levels and student backgrounds, protecting against attributing student growth to factors outside the teachers' control (P. e50). Furthermore, the applicant incorporates confidence intervals to account for imprecision (P. e50). The applicant provides evidence of the rigor and comparability of assessments. The lead applicant developed and field tested assessments in the spring of 2012, with reliability ranging from .85 to .94 (P. e54).		

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

(3) Each participating LEA has made substantial progress in developing a high-quality plan for multiple teacher and principal observations, including identification of the persons, by position and qualifications, who will be conducting the observations, the observation tool, the events to be observed, the accuracy of raters in using observation tools and the procedures for ensuring a high degree of inter-rater reliability (13 points);	**13**	**13**

Comments

The Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have a common plan for multiple teacher and principal observations (P. e45), which is that teachers will be observed at least twice in 2012-13 and 5 times a year thereafter (P. e45). Administrators will be observed in school-site settings to collect a minimum of two scores per element, and will participate in three conference settings with their evaluator over the course of each year (P. e45). The application does not state whether this involves multiple observations.

The application includes details on the qualifications of those who will be conducting the observations (P. 112 of Other Attachments). For example, evaluators must have completed a 30-hour Qualified Evaluator Training, have a passing score on the Qualified Evaluator Assessment, and be approved as a qualified evaluator by the district's governing board (P. 112 of Other Attachments).

The lead applicant describes four observation tools to be used: 1) Learning Observation Instrument, 2) Leading Observation Instrument, 3) Coaching Observation Instrument, and 4) Peer Evaluator Observation Instrument (P. e44). Although the applicant does not state the event to be observed for teachers, the events to be observed for the administrators, teacher leaders, and peer evaluators are described (P. e44). These events include leadership team meetings, collaborative team meetings, teacher observation and scoring, pre- and post-conferencing, and professional development settings (P. e44).

The applicant provides details regarding how it will ensure the accuracy and inter-rater reliability of raters in using observation tools. Specifically, evaluators will undergo 30 hours of workshop training and 30 hours of extended training, including job-embedded application (P. e46). Co-observations with field specialists and evaluators will be conducted (P. e46).

(4) The participating LEA has experience measuring student growth at	**4**	**3**

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

the classroom level, and has already implemented components of the proposed educator evaluation systems (4 points);		
Comments The lead applicant has experience measuring student growth (P. e53), and has already implemented components of the proposed educator evaluation systems (P. e53). Specifically, the lead applicant has implemented the proposed educator evaluator system in six Maricopa County school districts. The applicant did not provide evidence regarding whether any of the other districts in the partnership have experience with the proposed educator evaluation system.		
(5) In the case of teacher evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) —- (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating for teachers, in significant part, on student growth; (ii) Evaluates the practice of teachers, including general education teachers and teachers of special student populations, in meeting the needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English learners;	**6**	**6**
Comments i. The proposed evaluation system bases the overall evaluation rating for teachers in significant part on student growth. Specifically, the applicant proposes to base 50% of the overall evaluation rating for teachers on student growth (P. e51). This is the maximum allowed under state statute (P. e53). ii. The evaluation system evaluates the practice of teachers, including general education teachers and teachers of special student populations, in meeting the needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English language learners. The applicant notes that under the Learning Observation Instrument rubrics and elements, teachers must make content accessible for all students (P. e55). Further, a special education version of this instrument will be issued in August 2012 (P. e55). Finally, the instrument was created to include elements that apply across classrooms, including those with English language learners (P. e55). Teachers of English language learners will be assessed on their ability to make content accessible to learners and to anticipate and plan for student misconceptions related to background knowledge and vocabulary, among other		

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

things (Pp. e55-56).		
(6) In the case of principal evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating on, in significant part, student growth; and (ii) Evaluates, among other factors, a principal's practice in-- (A) Focusing every teacher, and the school community generally, on student growth; (B) Establishing a collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement; and (C) Supporting the academic needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English learners, for example, by creating systems to support successful co-teaching practices, providing resources for research-based intervention services, or similar activities.	**6**	**5**
Comments i. The applicant proposes to base 50% of principals' overall evaluation ratings on student growth, the maximum allowable under state statute (P. e51). ii. The proposed evaluation system, and specifically, the Leading Observation Instrument, considers a principal's ability to ensure that the shared vision for high student achievement is clearly articulated and acted upon (P. e56). The Leading Observation Instrument also considers a principal's ability to set and monitor rigorous, gap-closing goals (P. e56). The principal evaluation instrument includes components that evaluate the principal's ability to collaborate with staff on goal-setting and action planning (P. e57). The instrument also focuses on the needs of special populations, by holding administrators accountable for meeting performance goals for student achievement in targeted subgroups (P. e57). The applicant's description of the instrument is focused on establishing goals and planning. A weakness of the application is that evidence is not provided to indicate whether principals are evaluated on whether they provide specific resources to support teachers in working with special populations, such as systems to support successful co-teaching practices or research-based intervention services (P. e57).		
TOTAL	**35**	**33**

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

SELECTION CRITERION (c) Professional Development Systems to Support the Needs of Teachers and Principals Identified Through the Evaluation Process. (35 points) We will consider the extent to which each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 3(a), to improve their effectiveness. In determining the quality of each plan for professional development, we will consider the extent to which the plan describes how the participating LEA will--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator evaluation systems to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools (8 points);	8	8
Comments The applicant proposes to use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator evaluation systems to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools. Specifically, all teachers and administrators will receive individual goal plans based on the results of their Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership (REIL) Scores (P. e23). Each educator and evaluator will annually analyze observation instrument scores and student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses and develop the Educator Goal Plan (P. e57-58). Administrators will focus on elements identified by the instructional leader rubric (P. e59).		
(2) Provide professional development in a timely way (2 points);	2	2
Comments Professional development is to be provided in a timely way. The applicant describes its online video professional development as provided "just-in-time" access to educators (P. e60). Educators can access online video professional development aligned to elements from the observation instruments (P. e60).		
(3) Provide school-based, job-embedded opportunities for educators to transfer new knowledge into instructional and leadership practices (5	5	4

points); and		

Comments

The applicant proposes to use the Career Pathway Academy to provide school-based, job-embedded opportunities for educators to transfer new knowledge into instructional and leadership practices. Although the applicant states that this program would prepare teachers to become master educators, the application does not contain details on how the Career Pathway Academy does so (P. e62).

In addition, teachers may serve as peer evaluators, providing support to colleagues in the observation process (P. e62). Peer evaluators will provide feedback to give just-in-time support needed to transfer new learning to application (P. e62). Principals will be provided training on the elements of their Leadership Observation rubric.

The applicant does not address the issue of time to implement the described strategies for either teachers or administrators.

(4) Provide professional development that is likely to improve instructional and leadership practices, and is guided by the professional development needs of individual educators as identified in paragraph (c)(1) of this criterion (20 points).	**20**	**10**

Comments

The professional development proposed is guided by the needs of individual educators. The applicant proposes to use information from the proposed educator evaluation systems to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools. Specifically, all teachers and administrators will receive individual goal plans based on the results of their Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership (REIL) Scores (P. e23). Each educator and evaluator will annually analyze observation instrument scores and student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses and develop the Educator Goal Plan (P. e57-58). The applicant proposes forming differentiated professional development groups at the school level to provide training and coaching that address the Educator Goal Plans (P. e62). Administrators will focus on elements identified by the instructional leader rubric (P. e59).

One weakness of the application is that some aspects of the proposed professional development are not guided by professional development needs. For example, the application

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

states that new educators will receive the same training through an induction program to ensure that all educators in the system acquire the same foundation. (P. e64). The workshops described, which vary in length from two hours to three days, are scripted (P. e64). The applicant does not explain how scripted workshop will meet individual professional development needs, such as by stating that educators will be assigned to workshops based on performance data. Much of the professional development described is aligned to the observation rubrics (P. e63). Since the observation rubrics focus on instructional and leadership practices and the professional development is based on these rubrics, the applicant has provided some support that the professional development is likely to improve instructional and leadership practices. The applicant does not provide evidence of the quality of the professional development, such as research supporting the proposed approach to professional development. The applicant also does not indicate whether any effort will be made to evaluate the effectiveness or perceived usefulness of the professional development. This is a weakness of the application given that educators will be investing considerable time in this professional development.		
TOTAL	**35**	**24**

SELECTION CRITERION (d) Involvement of Educators. (35 points)
We will consider the quality of educator involvement in the development and implementation of the proposed PBCS and educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of such involvement, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) The application contains evidence that educator involvement in the design of the PBCS and the educator evaluation systems has been extensive and will continue to be extensive during the grant period (10 points); and	**10**	**6**
Comments Educator involvement in the design of the educator evaluation system has been extensive, as documented by the applicant (P. e64). For example, teachers were involved in developing and		

revising the evaluation score components and developed assessments for non-tested areas (P. e64). In three of the partner Local Education Agencies (LEAs), educators have begun training to support the observation rubric (P. e65). The applicant notes that teachers also provided input and feedback in focus groups and served on committees (P. e64). As such, the applicant has provided evidence of educators' involvement in the evaluation systems.

LEA teams convened for a Teacher Incentive Fund 4 feedback session in which embedding performance based compensation in the salary schedule was specifically addressed (P. e66-64). The application does not state whether these teams included teachers and administrators or consisted of central office personnel, or the extent to which feedback was incorporated into the design of the Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS). Thus, the application does not provide sufficient evidence of educators' extensive involvement in the design of the PBCS.

Each LEA has completed a communication plan, assuring that the LEAs will "engage" educators in the development and implementation of the Human Capital Management System (HCMS) (P. e37; P. e67). Although the application includes stakeholder engagement and communication plans (Pp. 58-100 of Other Attachments), this evidence does not suggest educator involvement in the design will be extensive. For example, the communication plans include phrases such as "distribute a letter" (P. 58), "inform stakeholders" and "provide updates" (P. 59). These phrases indicate one-way communication rather than extensive educator involvement.

(2) The application contains evidence that educators support the elements of the proposed PBCS and the educator evaluation systems described in the application (25 points).	**25**	**23**

Comments

The applicant provides evidence that educators support the elements of the proposed Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) and the educator evaluation systems described in the application. Specifically, teacher and administrator surveys were administered to gauge support (P. e43, P. e69, Pp. e70-71). The survey results indicate that 82% of teachers and 91% of administrators who completed the survey gave a positive response regarding whether teacher evaluation results should inform decisions about teacher compensation. Among administrators, 95% indicated that results from the administrator evaluation should inform decisions about administrator compensation (P. e43). These survey results are based on responses from 303 teachers (P. 83 of Required Attachments), which

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-B**

constitutes 23% of the 1296 teachers in the partner districts (P. e19). Twenty-three administrators completed surveys (P. 92 of Required Attachments) out of 64 administrators in the partner districts (P. e19 of Required Attachments), for a response rate of 36%. While some educators support some elements of the Human Capital Management System, the low survey response rates weaken the evidence regarding whether educators support the elements of the proposed PBCS. Other evidence of support includes feedback from teachers and administrators attending trainings and workshops (P. e70). For example, between January and July of 2012, written feedback was submitted from teachers and administrators in partner districts who attended training and workshops and this feedback indicated that the Learning Observation Instrument was a good tool to support teacher growth (P. e70). The application includes Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (Pp. 24-66 of Required Attachments). The MOUs include signatures from teacher and principal representatives as well as the district superintendent and the president of the governing board (P. 30, P. 42, P. 48, P. 54, P. 60, P. 66). The applicant references letters of support (P. e68) and notes that letters came from the state governor as well as legislators who attested to the alignment of the grant goals to state legislation (P. e69). Numerous professional organizations also submitted letters of support (P. e69). Although the application does not contain letters of support from teacher unions, exclusive representation applies only to teachers in one of the partner districts (P. e71). Thus, the lack of evidence of union support is not viewed as a weakness.		
TOTAL	**35**	**29**

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

SELECTION CRITERION (e) Project Management. (30 points)
We will consider the quality of the management plan of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, we will consider the extent to which the management plan--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Clearly identifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of key personnel (3 points);	3	3
Comments The applicant identifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of key personnel (Pp. e71-72). For example, one of the co-principal investigators will serve in an advisory role (P. e71). Another will provide agency leadership for cross-LEA implementation (P. e72). The third key personnel member is the program director, responsible for coordinating all activities (P. e72).		
(2) Allocates sufficient human resources to complete project tasks (5 points);	5	5
Comments The applicant appears to allocate sufficient human resources to complete project tasks. For example, the applicant proposes to have nine field specialists (Pp. e72-73), as well as administrators for the overall Human Capital Management System (HCMS) and the performance-based evaluation system (P. e73). Separate full-time positions are designated for the financial, assessment, communication, professional development, and data management aspects of the proposed project (P. e73).		
(3) Includes measurable project objectives and performance measures (5 points); and	5	5
Comments The applicant includes measurable project objectives and performance measures (P. e74). These objectives address both the ultimate outcomes as well as benchmarks of implementation (P. e74). For example, goal 1 addresses the ultimate outcome of increased student achievement (P. e74). Goal 2 addresses the implementation of an district-wide Human Capital Management System (P. e74). Each objective has multiple indicators (P. e74). For Goal 1, the specific performance measures include 1) 55% of students will score in the		

meets or exceeds category on the math portion of the state assessment; 2) 48% of students will score in the meets or exceeds category on the science portion of the state assessment; and 3) 72% of students will score in the meets or exceeds category on the reading portion of the state assessment (P. e74).		
(4) Includes an effective project evaluation plan (5 points);	**5**	**5**
Comments The applicant includes a project evaluation plan (Pp. e75-79). One strength of the plan is its grounding in a theory of change (P. e75 and P. 109 in Other Attachments). Another strength is the alignment of the evaluation plan with the project objectives and performance measures (Pp. e77-78). Table 20 lists the research questions, and next to each question indicates the objective the research question addresses (P. e76). For example, Objective 3.1 is to increase the number of effective and highly effective teachers and leaders (P. e74). In Table 20, under Human Capital Management System, research question 2 asks "What changes are occurring in the distribution of educators on the performance continuum over time?" (Obj. 3.1) (P. e76). In addition, the applicant includes an Evaluation Plan Matrix with data sources and analysis linked to each component of each objective (Pp. e77-78) and a timeline for key evaluation events (P. e79). Both the matrix and the timeline support effective implementation of the evaluation plan.		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (i) Implementing the components of the HCMS, PBCS, and educator evaluation systems, including any proposal to phase in schools or educators (8 points).	**8**	**8**
Comments The applicant provides a detailed timeline with realistic and achievable targets for implementation (Pp. e80-e86). Table 23 designates the person(s) responsible for each element of the timeline (Pp. e80-e86). This table includes separate sections for the implementation of the overall Human Capital Management System (HCMS) (Pp. 80-82), the performance-based evaluation systems (Pp. 82-83), and the Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) (Pp. e83-e84). In addition, Table 23 provides a timeline for implementation of elements supporting the HCMS and PBCS (Pp. 84-86). Specifically, it details the time frames		

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

for getting the data management system and professional development in place (Pp. e84-85).		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (ii) Successfully completing project tasks and achieving objectives (4 points).	**4**	**3**
Comments For the most part, the applicant's built-in planning year should enable the applicant to successfully complete project tasks and achieve objectives. The timeline indicates that all teachers will undergo a minimum of five observation cycles per year in years 2 through 5 (P. e82), which may not be realistic or achievable. With 1,296 teachers and 64 administrators (P. e19), this plan amounts to 101 observations cycle per administrator per year. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that sufficient resources are available to ensure that this component of the proposed project will be successfully completed.		
TOTAL	**30**	**29**

SELECTION CRITERION (f) Sustainability. (20 points)
We will consider the quality of the plan to sustain the proposed project. In determining the quality of the sustainability plan, we will consider the extent to which the sustainability plan--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) Identifies and commits sufficient non-TIF resources, financial and nonfinancial, to support the PBCS and educator evaluation systems during and after the grant period (10 points);	**10**	**10**
Comments The applicant notes that each of the participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) has accepted responsibility for using funds to ensure sustainability (P. e86). The Memoranda of		

Understanding (MOUs) submitted by each of the LEAs obligates LEAs to "implement a systemic and fiscally sustainable performance-based compensation system and evaluation system for teachers, principals, and school leaders" (P. 29 in Required Attachments).

The applicant proposes that strategically redirecting funds currently used to support traditional salary schedules, in addition to state and federal funding sources, will be used to sustain the Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) (P. e86).

The application includes a chart delineating the use of Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant resources for Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS). Specifically, for three years the PBCS will be supported 100% by the TIF grant, in 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 (P. e87). However, the chart indicates that state Maintenance and Organization (M&O) funds will also be used to support the PBCS in these years (e87). As the M&O funds appears to constitute half or more of LEA's combined FY 13 revenues to support personnel costs (P. e87), this is a considerable investment of non-TIF resources.

The application further describes a plan for LEAs to carry over funds to prepare for the end of the funding cycle (P. e88). While funds mostly target the PBCS, fund 13 will be used to support on-going, job-embedded professional development (P. e89).

Nonfinancial resources include multi-year contracts for highly effective educators who accept positions in a spotlight school, and protections for teachers transferred to schools with state labels of D or F, as well as reduction-in-force policies that prohibit use of seniority as a priority (P. e90). These nonfinancial resources may support the PBCS by making transfer to high-need schools more attractive.

(2) Is likely to be implemented and, if implemented, will result in a sustained PBCS and educator evaluation systems after the grant period ends (10 points).	**10**	**8**

Comments

The applicant has provided evidence that the proposed project is likely to be implemented. For example, participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (P. e91; Pp. 24-66 of Required Attachments). These MOUs include signatures from principal and teacher representatives (Pp. 24-66 of Required Attachments). This is a strength of the application as the likelihood of implementation hinges on educator support. The project is consistent with recent state legislation, and educators in the partner

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-B**

LEAs have begun to move forward with the requisite training (P. e65). If implemented, the project appears likely to result in sustained Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) after the grant period ends. To provide support for the sustainability of the PBCS, the applicant has described an overhaul of the salary structure and has presented evidence of how LEAs could reallocate funds to support the PBCS (P. e86). The applicant proposes that strategically redirecting funds currently used to support traditional salary schedules be used to sustain the PBCS (P. e86). The funds to be redirected include two state funding sources and Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I and II-A funds (e86). The minimum of five observations cycles per teacher (P. e82) requires considerable human resources. The applicant has not provided enough information to assure that the educator evaluation system as described will be sustained after the grant period ends, such as strategies that enable administrators to spend more time on evaluations.		
TOTAL	**20**	**18**

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency Reviewer Code: 20-B

Competitive Preference Priority – An Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness (Up to 20 points)

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose, as part of its PBCS, a timeline for implementing no later than in the fifth year of the grant's project period a salary structure based on effectiveness for both teachers and principals. As part of this proposal, an applicant must describe-- (a) The extent to which and how each LEA will use overall evaluation ratings to determine educator salaries; (b) How each LEA will use TIF funds to support the salary structure based on effectiveness in the high-need schools listed in response to Requirement 3(a); and (c) The extent to which the proposed implementation is feasible, given that implementation will depend upon stakeholder support and applicable LEA-level policies.	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
	20	**18**

Comments

The applicant has delineated the extent to which, and how, each Local Education Agency (LEA) will use overall evaluation ratings to determine educator salaries. Specifically, the applicant indicates that under Design Option 1, performance based compensation will be embedded in the salary schedule, such that effective educators will receive differential pay (P. e38).

The applicant describes how each LEA will use TIF funds to support Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) (P. e87). The budget narrative (Pp. 1-39 of Budget) delineates the specific costs, including personnel (Pp. 1-3 of Budget), travel and equipment (P. 4 of Budget) and contractual items (P. 5 of Budget). For example, contractual items to support the PBCS in year 1 include ongoing support for value-added measures implementation (P. 5 of Budget). Contractual items also include a wide variety of assessments in subjects and grades not coved by the current state assessment system (P. 5 of Budget). Other costs include professional development (P. 6 of Budget).

The proposed implementation is feasible in the sense that LEA-level policies that are viewed as obstacles have been clearly identified and appear surmountable (Pp. e30-31). While the applicant provides evidence that a subset of educators support the proposed Human Capital Management System (HCMS) (P. e43, P. e69, Pp. e70-71), there is not sufficient evidence that this level of support is sufficient to implement the plan as described. The application does not provide evidence that stakeholder support is sufficient to feasibly to implement 5 observation

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-B**

cycles per teacher (P. e45 and P. e82). These observations constitute the basis for 50% of the overall score (P. e49). The implementation of the salary structure based on effectiveness depends critically on these observations. Thus, the lack of evidence regarding the feasibility of observations is a weakness of the application.		
TOTAL	**20**	**18**
GRAND TOTAL	**220**	**193**

The General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program Competition FY 2012

Application Number: S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Educational Service Agency **Reviewer Code: 20-B**

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

The General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program Competition FY 2012

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (a) <u>Coherent and Comprehensive Human Capital Management System (HCMS)</u>. (45 points) We will consider the quality and comprehensiveness of each participating LEA's HCMS as described in the application. In determining the quality of the HCMS, as it currently exists and as the applicant proposes to modify it during the grant period, we will consider the extent to which the HCMS described in the application is--

Factor/Sub-criterion	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
(1) Aligned with each participating LEA's clearly described vision of instructional improvement (10 points); and	**10**	**10**
Comments The vision of instructional improvement is strongly aligned with the Human Capital Management System. The application indicates that all seven participating local education agencies have committed to a common vision of instructional improvement. This vision, follows the InTASC Common Core Teaching Standards and incorporates student learning expectations as outlined in the *Common Core Standards*. Six of the seven targeted local education agencies (LEA) committed to the Reading Excellence in Instruction and Leadership during the 2011 -2012 school year. The other LEA has since committed and is moving forward with the described vision. (P. 22)		
(2) Likely to increase the number of effective educators in the LEA's schools, especially in high-need schools, as demonstrated by (35 points)-- (i) The range of human capital decisions for which the applicant proposes to consider educator effectiveness – based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application. (ii) The weight given to educator effectiveness--based on the educator evaluation systems described in the application--when human capital decisions are made; (iii) The feasibility of the HCMS described in the application, including the extent to which the LEA has prior experience using information from the educator evaluation systems described in the application to inform human capital decisions, and applicable LEA-level policies that might inhibit or facilitate modifications needed to use educator effectiveness as a factor in human capital decisions; (iv) The commitment of the LEA's leadership to implementing the described HCMS, including all of its component parts; and (v) The adequacy of the financial and nonfinancial strategies and incentives, including	**35**	34

the proposed PBCS, for attracting effective educators to work in high-need schools and retaining them in those schools.		

Comments

The proposed Human Capital Management System is likely to increase the number of effective educators especially in high-need schools.

i. The application states that the Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership – The Next Generation (REIL-TNG) will use the educator evaluation to inform several key HCMS decisions such as 1.) performance based compensation, 2.) professional development, 3.) hiring, selection, and placement, and 4.) retention and dismissal decisions. Specifically, the revised performance based compensation system, which includes a revised educator salary schedule based on effectiveness, will be implemented in 45 high-need schools. The overall educator effectiveness rating (Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership) REIL score will be used for rewarding effective teachers and planning professional development. (Pp. e24 – e26)

ii. Table 2 (page e26) and Table 3 (page e27) clearly indicates the close alignment of both teacher and principal effectiveness and Human Capital Management System (CMS) decisions with regards to the four strategies of attract, place, retain, and sustain. For example, a first year teacher will be retained if they fall within the ineffective range and demonstrate improvement. Dismissal will occur during the second year if that teacher still receives an ineffective rating. Table 3 further indicates Human Capital Management System decisions for which teacher effectiveness will receive full or partial weight. For example, placement and base pay progression on the educator salary structure will receive full weight. (P. e27) The table delineates decisions for both teachers and school leaders.

iii. Challenges found in the current LEA's Human Capital Management System have been examined and identified. For example, one local education agency's policy of transfer of personnel from one school to another will have to be revised. This will allow for more effective and efficient implementation of the proposed plan. (Pp. e30 – e31) The lead applicant, Maricopa County Education Service Agency, also has experience in developing and implementing the project in schools funded by a previous grant. (P. e35)

iv. The application documents the dates that the Teacher Incentive Fund 4 Leadership teams met. Each LEA also submitted a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the

	superintendent, Principal, Board representative, teacher representative, and Superintendent and Chief Deputy Superintendent of Maricopa County Service Agency. (P. e37; Attachments Pp. 25 – 66) To further document commitment, each LEA completed a communication plan to engage and develop understanding of the project. (P. e37)		
v.	The project's financial strategies to attract and retain effective educators are geared to the strategic use of compensation tied to educator effectiveness and career pathway positions. (page e32) Non-financial strategies are numerous and described in detail on page e32. For example, a three year contract is offered to effective educators who will serve in a high-need school. These educators will be protected from any consequence related to possible temporary lowering of a performance classification. This will encourage teachers to focus on making effective changes in a high-need school environment. (P. e32)		
	TOTAL	***45***	44

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (b) - Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable Educator Evaluation Systems. (35 points) We will consider, for each participating LEA, the quality of the educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of each evaluation system, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Each participating LEA has finalized a high-quality evaluation rubric, with at least three performance levels (e.g., highly effective, effective, developing, unsatisfactory), under which educators will be evaluated (2 points);	2	2
Comments The project will implement an evaluation rubric using four performance levels: ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective. (P. e48) The Evaluation Rubric was comprehensively explained on page e48 – e50 and further clarified with Table 13: Weighing of Individual Performance Measures within the Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership (REIL) Score. (P. e49) This score will include observation results and student growth.		
(2) Each participating LEA has presented (4 points)-- (i) A clear rationale to support its consideration of the level of student growth achieved in differentiating performance levels; and (ii) Evidence, such as current research and best practices, supporting the LEA's choice of student growth models and demonstrating the rigor and comparability of assessments;	4	4
Comments i. The applicant indicates that a value-added model (VAM) is used to measure teacher effectiveness related to student growth. This accounts for 50% of the Rewarding Excellent in Instruction and Leadership Score. This value added model supported by Braun, 2010; Glazerman, 2010; Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin, 2009; and McCaffrey, 2004, adjusts pre-existing differences in such factors as achievement levels and student backgrounds, to produce estimates of teacher and school effectiveness. This creates a valid and fair comparison across teachers and schools. (P. e50)		

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

ii. Current research and best practices from other school districts are cited to support the LEA's student growth model incorporating the value added model. Braun, Chandowski, Koenig, 2010 provide research that indicates that without controlling the impact from these factors, growth models can describe the amount of achievement growth but cannot identify the factors that are responsible. (P. e50)		
(3) Each participating LEA has made substantial progress in developing a high-quality plan for multiple teacher and principal observations, including identification of the persons, by position and qualifications, who will be conducting the observations, the observation tool, the events to be observed, the accuracy of raters in using observation tools and the procedures for ensuring a high degree of inter-rater reliability (13 points);	**13**	**13**
Comments The application includes a detailed plan for educator observations including the frequency (P. e45) and the position and qualification of the evaluator (Other Attachments page 111 -113). For example, teachers will be observed a minimum of two times during the 2012 – 2013 school year and five times annually from that point forward. Evaluators conducting these observations will complete a certification process involving 30 hours of training and obtain a passing score on an evaluation assessment. (Other Attachments Pp. 114 – 127) This will ensure evaluator accuracy. The observation tools are thoroughly explained in the Coaching Observation Instrument, the Leading Observation Instrument, and the Learning Observation Instrument. These tools are also available to be viewed in the Other Attachments section, page 145 – 214. Inter-rater reliability is addressed by utilizing co-observations with field specialists and evaluators. (page e46)		
(4) The participating LEA has experience measuring student growth at the classroom level, and has already implemented components of the proposed educator evaluation systems (4 points);	**4**	**3**
Comments The lead applicant has experience implementing the proposed educator evaluation system in six Maricopa County school districts participating in a previously funded Teacher Incentive Fund. Some of the targeted local education agencies have indicated experience in using		

student growth models. None of the targeted local education agencies identified in the application have already implemented student growth models directly into their evaluation systems. (P.e53)		
(5) In the case of teacher evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) —- (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating for teachers, in significant part, on student growth; (ii) Evaluates the practice of teachers, including general education teachers and teachers of special student populations, in meeting the needs of special student populations, including students with disabilities and English learners;	**6**	**6**
Comments i. Student growth plays a significant part in the overall evaluation rating for teachers. The application proposes to base 50% of the overall rating for teachers on student growth. 40% will be at the classroom level with 5% at both the team and school level. (Table 13: *Weighting of Individual Performance Measures within the REIL Score*, P. e49) **ii.** The application has created a comprehensive plan to evaluate teacher effectiveness in meeting the needs of all students. The plan is committed to ensuring that teachers will make content accessible for all students. However, a version of the Learning Observation Rubrics will be issued in August 2012 to specifically address special education . This will also include English language learners. (P.e55) The ability to revise the instrument was provided from pilot testing during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (P. e55)		
(6) In the case of principal evaluations, the proposed evaluation system (6 points) (i) Bases the overall evaluation rating on, in significant part, student growth; and (ii) Evaluates, among other factors, a principal's practice in-- (A) Focusing every teacher, and the school community generally, on student growth; (B) Establishing a collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement; and (C) Supporting the academic needs of special student populations,	**6**	**5**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

including students with disabilities and English learners, for example, by creating systems to support successful co-teaching practices, providing resources for research-based intervention services, or similar activities.		
Comments i. The proposed principal evaluation system is based significally on student growth. Principals' evaluation ratings will be based 45% on student growth at the building level and 5% on student growth at the District level.(page e56; other attachments page 185 -199) ii. The proposed principal evaluation is definitely principal focused. The Leading Observation Instrument includes measures for an administrator which address the following: focus on a continuous improvement plan, goal setting, and action planning with the staff to ensure a collaborative setting and ensure that the shared vision of high student achievement is clearly addressed. (P. e56) Although a detailed plan for supporting academic needs for the special student population is included in the proposal, there is no evidence of specifics of how resources will be provided. (P. e57)		
TOTAL	**35**	**33**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (c) Professional Development Systems to Support the Needs of Teachers and Principals Identified Through the Evaluation Process. (35 points) We will consider the extent to which each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 3(a), to improve their effectiveness. In determining the quality of each plan for professional development, we will consider the extent to which the plan describes how the participating LEA will--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator evaluation systems to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools (8 points);	8	8
Comments The comprehensive Professional Development Plan implements a three-track system aligned to instructional improvement. Through this system, individual professional development needs can be met. In track 1, educators will be participating in an individualized educator goal plan that is aligned to the school's professional development plan and addresses individual specific needs. In track 2, educators can access on-line video professional development. In track 3, educators will participate in one of four series of professional development to build teacher and leader effectiveness. This disaggregated data identifies the professional development needs of both teacher and principals. All teachers and administrators will receive individual goal plans based on their results. The Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership Score is the instrument to be used. (Pp. e57 - 63)		
(2) Provide professional development in a timely way (2 points);	2	2
Comments Professional development can be provided in a timely manner by educators reflecting on the rubric indicators and examining the next level of proficiency to strengthen their skills. Educators have the opportunity to access online, video professional development aligned to elements of the observation instrument. The video library will house examples for each of the proficiency levels on the observation instruments of classroom and leadership practices.		

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

(P. e60)		
(3) Provide school-based, job-embedded opportunities for educators to transfer new knowledge into instructional and leadership practices (5 points); and	**5**	**4**
Comments The Career Pathway Academy will effectively provide opportunities for teacher leadership roles. The program targets teachers with potential to prepare for possible service in a master educator role. Teachers will gain a deeper understanding of content, rubric elements, collaborative learning team strategies, data use, and coaching strategies. Peer evaluations should also prove to provide immediate transfer of knowledge into instructional practices. However, the proposal does not document how time will be allotted to implement the above strategies. (P.e62) In addition, teachers may serve as peer evaluators. Peer evaluators will provide timely and job-embedded support to transfer new knowledge into instructional and leadership practices. (P. e62)		
(4) Provide professional development that is likely to improve instructional and leadership practices, and is guided by the professional development needs of individual educators as identified in paragraph (c)(1) of this criterion (20 points).	**20**	**10**
Comments In Track 3, educators will participate in one of four series of professional development. This indicates that the professional development may not be as effective because of the lack of individualization to meet specific needs. However, the video library may address specific, identified needs. The proposal did not support the proposed professional development with research based evidence. (page e62)		
TOTAL	**35**	**24**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (d) Involvement of Educators. (35 points)
We will consider the quality of educator involvement in the development and implementation of the proposed PBCS and educator evaluation systems described in the application. In determining the quality of such involvement, we will consider the extent to which--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) The application contains evidence that educator involvement in the design of the PBCS and the educator evaluation systems has been extensive and will continue to be extensive during the grant period (10 points); and	10	6
Comments The educator involvement in the design is outlined on pages e64 – e67and has been extensive in the educator evaluation system. Educators were involved in the following ways: focus group interviews on the development and revision of the Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership score, informational meetings on implementing an educator evaluation system; and collaboration on the development of observation tools, assessments, and student growth metrics. However, the focus was placed on the evaluation, not the Performance based Compensation System. It is not evident that teachers were involved in the design of the Performance Based Compensation System. The plan for future involvement is not clear. (Pp.e66 – e67)		
(2) The application contains evidence that educators support the elements of the proposed PBCS and the educator evaluation systems described in the application (25 points).	25	23
Comments Evidence of educator support includes a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from each participating local education agency. Each MOU was signed by the superintendent, president of the governing board, principal representative, and teacher representative. (required attachments P. 24 – 66) Also letters of support from state and professional organizations (required attachments Pp. 67 – 81), were also included. However, even though a May 2012 survey indicated high support, the response rate to the survey was low. This does not provide strong evidence of support. (P.e70)		

The General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program Competition FY 2012

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

TOTAL	**35**	**29**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (e) Project Management. (30 points)

We will consider the quality of the management plan of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, we will consider the extent to which the management plan--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Clearly identifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of key personnel (3 points);	3	3
Comments Key personnel are identified and roles and responsibilities defined in detail in Job Descriptions for REIL: TNG Personnel located in other attachments, page 3 – 55. Following is an example of some of the jobs proposed to aid in the effective implementation of the project: program director, field specialist to facilitate communication and stakeholder involvement, peer evaluator, financial / business systems specialist, and assessment coordinator. Qualifications for each job are also included to ensure effective candidate selection.		
(2) Allocates sufficient human resources to complete project tasks (5 points);	5	5
Comments To enhance the effectiveness of the program, REIL-TNG is dedicated to hiring key positions such as Field Specialists, Human Capital Management System Administrator, a Performance-Based Evaluation System Administrator and others to ensure successful implementation. Additional support staff have also been identified in the budget narrative. The applicant is committed to allocating sufficient human resources to complete all project tasks. (page e72 – 73)		
(3) Includes measurable project objectives and performance measures (5 points); and	5	5
Comments Objectives and performance measures are identified in Table 19. (page e74) Objectives and performance measures are very clear and concise. Goal 1 will address that students graduate college and are career ready. This is proposed to be achieved by increasing student achievement and growth in state tested content areas. Goal 2 addresses career enhancement by implementing an effective Human Capital Management System. Goal 3 addresses developing teaching and leading through a sustainable, comprehensive program of performance based evaluations and support. (P.e74) The objectives are sound and		

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

measureable as presented.		
(4) Includes an effective project evaluation plan (5 points);	**5**	**5**
Comments The project evaluation plan is described on page e75 – 79. The plan includes multiple measures to effectively track implementation. Table 20, page e76, outlines the focused research questions. A valuable component is the ongoing communication and feedback of the program information to key stake holders.		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (i) Implementing the components of the HCMS, PBCS, and educator evaluation systems, including any proposal to phase in schools or educators (8 points).	**8**	**8**
Comments Table 23 (page e80 – e86) will be an effective tool in facilitating and ensuring that project activities and milestones will be achieved in a timely manner. All necessary aspects are documented with dates and names of responsible person(s). The timeline is detailed and is realistic and achievable.		
(5) Specifies realistic and achievable timelines for: (ii) Successfully completing project tasks and achieving objectives (4 points).	**4**	**3**
Comments Table 23 (page e80- e86) also includes all project tasks that must be completed to ensure success. Listing responsible people for each task should ensure that tasks will be completed in a timely and efficient manner. However, there is not sufficient evidence to determine the reality of achieving five observation cycles for all teachers in year 2. For example, there is not enough supporting evidence that evaluators would have the time necessary to complete that many observations.		
TOTAL	**30**	**29**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

SELECTION CRITERION (f) Sustainability. (20 points)

We will consider the quality of the plan to sustain the proposed project. In determining the quality of the sustainability plan, we will consider the extent to which the sustainability plan--

Factor/Sub-criterion	Total Possible	Assigned Score
(1) Identifies and commits sufficient non-TIF resources, financial and nonfinancial, to support the PBCS and educator evaluation systems during and after the grant period (10 points);	**10**	**10**
Comments The applicant is dedicated to identifying other sources for funding to sustain the project. The application mentions using Federal Title I and II-A funds. Table 24 (P. e87) outlines the amount of non-TIF funds that will be committed at each local education agency. Table 25 (P. e87) indicates how these funds can effectively be used for a phase in / phase out approach that should support solid sustainability.		
(2) Is likely to be implemented and, if implemented, will result in a sustained PBCS and educator evaluation systems after the grant period ends (10 points).	**10**	**8**
Comments The signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) by each local education agency is a proof of commitment. The MOU actually becomes an even stronger commitment in light of its strong alignment with recent changes in state statues. (P. e91) However, the rigorous cycle of 5 evaluations per year per teacher seems difficult to sustain.		
TOTAL	**20**	**18**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

Competitive Preference Priority – An Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness (Up to 20 points)

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose, as part of its PBCS, a timeline for implementing no later than in the fifth year of the grant's project period a salary structure based on effectiveness for both teachers and principals. As part of this proposal, an applicant must describe-- (a) The extent to which and how each LEA will use overall evaluation ratings to determine educator salaries; (b) How each LEA will use TIF funds to support the salary structure based on effectiveness in the high-need schools listed in response to Requirement 3(a); and (c) The extent to which the proposed implementation is feasible, given that implementation will depend upon stakeholder support and applicable LEA-level policies.	**Total Possible**	**Assigned Score**
	20	**19**

Comments

The program is committed to phasing in a Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS). The following aspects of the program demonstrate this commitment: effective allocation of human resources; letters of support; a Memorandum of Understanding from each local education agency; and detailed timelines.

Table 8: Rewarding Excellent in Instruction and Leadership Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) Design Option and Timeline demonstrates how a PBCS will be implemented within the participating local education agencies. The applicant is committed to providing additional compensation to teachers and principals who are rated at effective or higher. The proposal plans to use 52 percent of the total Teacher Incentive Fund grant to support transition to a salary structure based on effectiveness. (P. e40)

The proposed implementation of the program may not be feasible. The quality of the program may suffer due to the overwhelming work load placed upon school leaders to complete the intensity and number of evaluations. A plan is not evident that will allow reassignment of duties or tasks to support school leaders in completing five observation cycles per year per teacher.

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

TOTAL	**20**	**19**
GRAND TOTAL	**220**	**196**

Application Number S374A120089 [redacted]

Applicant Name: Maricopa County Education Service Agency, AZ **Reviewer Code: 20C**

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]