

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



**APPLICATION FOR GRANTS
UNDER THE**

TIF General Competition

CFDA # 84.374A

PR/Award # S374A120083

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT11189735

OMB No. , Expiration Date:

Closing Date: Jul 27, 2012

****Table of Contents****

Form	Page
1. Application for Federal Assistance SF-424	e3
<i>Attachment - 1 (1260-14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.))</i>	e6
<i>Attachment - 2 (1261-16. Congressional Districts Of)</i>	e7
2. Assurances Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B)	e8
3. Disclosure Of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	e10
4. ED GEPA427 Form	e11
<i>Attachment - 1 (1236-NYCDOE GEPA427 for TIF4)</i>	e12
5. Grants.gov Lobbying Form	e13
6. Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424	e14
<i>Attachment - 1 (1237-Exempt Research Narrative)</i>	e15
7. ED Abstract Narrative Form	e16
<i>Attachment - 1 (1235-NYCDOE TIF 4 Abstract FINAL)</i>	e17
8. Project Narrative Form	e19
<i>Attachment - 1 (1259-NYCDOE TIF Grant Application FINAL Narrative)</i>	e20
9. Other Narrative Form	e87
<i>Attachment - 1 (1238-NYCDOE TIF4 Schools List 2012.07.25)</i>	e88
<i>Attachment - 2 (1239-2012 Indirect Cost Rate Agreement NYCDOE)</i>	e90
<i>Attachment - 3 (1240-NYCODE Letter of Support TIF4 UFT 2012.07.25)</i>	e92
<i>Attachment - 4 (1241-NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_1 Background Ppal Financial Incentives)</i>	e93
<i>Attachment - 5 (1242-NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_2 Sample Progress Report)</i>	e95
<i>Attachment - 6 (1243-201213CitywideInstructionalExpectationsFINAL)</i>	e96
<i>Attachment - 7 (1244-NYCDOE TIF4 Examples of Effective Evidence_SpEdELL)</i>	e101
<i>Attachment - 8 (1245-Full_Danielson_Rubric)</i>	e110
<i>Attachment - 9 (1246-NYCDOE TIF4 TEP Action Planning Template 20120627)</i>	e167
<i>Attachment - 10 (1247-NYCDOE Letter of Support TIF4 TNTP 2012.07.27)</i>	e171
<i>Attachment - 11 (1248-Bernstein_Vicki resume_2012)</i>	e172
<i>Attachment - 12 (1249-BuschJohnson_Kirsten resume_2012)</i>	e174
<i>Attachment - 13 (1250-Cannon_Joanna resume_2012)</i>	e176
<i>Attachment - 14 (1251-Orlansky_Izaak resume_2012)</i>	e179
<i>Attachment - 15 (1252-Shinkawa_Tania resume_2012)</i>	e181
<i>Attachment - 16 (1253-Way_Amy_Kristina resume_2012)</i>	e182
<i>Attachment - 17 (1254-Weatherby_Kelly resume_2012)</i>	e185
<i>Attachment - 18 (1255-NYCDOE Letter of Support TIF4 NYSED 2012.07.27)</i>	e188
<i>Attachment - 19 (1256-Proposed_Career_Lattice_for_TIF_Schools)</i>	e189
<i>Attachment - 20 (1257-TIF_Reference_Chart)</i>	e190
<i>Attachment - 21 (1258-TOC_for_Additional_Attachments)</i>	e202

10. Budget Narrative Form	e203
Attachment - 1 (1234-NYCDOE TIF4 Budget Narrative)	e204
11. Form FaithBased_SurveyOnEEO-V1.2.pdf	e220
12. Form ED_524_Budget_1_2-V1.2.pdf	e222

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

* 1. Type of Submission:

- Preapplication
 Application
 Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:

- New
 Continuation
 Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:

07/27/2012

4. Applicant Identifier:

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

NA

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

NA

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name:

New York City Department of Education

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):

136400434

* c. Organizational DUNS:

1036692890000

d. Address:

* Street1:

65 Court St. ??? Rm. 310

Street2:

* City:

Brooklyn

County/Parish:

Kings

* State:

NY: New York

Province:

* Country:

USA: UNITED STATES

* Zip / Postal Code:

11201-4916

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name:

Teacher Recruitment & Quality

Division Name:

Talent, Labor, and Innovation

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix:

Ms.

* First Name:

Amy

Middle Name:

* Last Name:

Way

Suffix:

Title:

Exec. Dir., Teacher Recruitment & Quality

Organizational Affiliation:

NA

* Telephone Number:

718-935-2906

Fax Number:

718-935-5715

* Email:

away@schools.nyc.gov

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

*** 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

*** 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Education

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.374

CFDA Title:

Teacher Incentive Fund

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

ED-GRANTS-061412-001

* Title:

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE): Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF): TIF General Competition CFDA Number 84.374A

13. Competition Identification Number:

84-374A2012-1

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Coun | Delete Attachment | View Attachment

*** 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

New York City Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund Grant Program

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments | |

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant

b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date:

* b. End Date:

18. Estimated Funding (\$):

* a. Federal	53,369,664.90
* b. Applicant	(b)(4)
* c. State	
* d. Local	
* e. Other	
* f. Program Income	
* g. TOTAL	

*** 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on

b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.

c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

*** 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**

Yes No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

** I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: * First Name:

Middle Name:

* Last Name:

Suffix:

* Title:

* Telephone Number:

Fax Number:

* Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

New York City (Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, Richmond Counties)

16. Congressional Districts Of:

*a. Applicant: 10

*b. Program/Project: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

<p>* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL</p> <p>Kelly Weatherby</p>	<p>* TITLE</p> <p>Chief Financial Officer, NYCDOE</p>
<p>* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION</p> <p>New York City Department of Education</p>	<p>* DATE SUBMITTED</p> <p>07/27/2012</p>

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C.1352

Approved by OMB
0348-0046

1. * Type of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance	2. * Status of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award	3. * Report Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change
--	--	--

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:
 Prime SubAwardee

* Name:

* Street 1: Street 2:

* City: State: Zip:

Congressional District, if known:

6. * Federal Department/Agency: <input type="text" value="Department of Education"/>	7. * Federal Program Name/Description: <input type="text" value="Teacher Incentive Fund"/> CFDA Number, if applicable: <input type="text" value="84.374"/>
--	---

8. Federal Action Number, if known: <input type="text"/>	9. Award Amount, if known: \$ <input type="text" value="53,421,379.68"/>
--	--

10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant:

Prefix * First Name Middle Name

* Last Name Suffix

* Street 1 Street 2

* City: State: Zip:

b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a)

Prefix * First Name Middle Name

* Last Name Suffix

* Street 1 Street 2

* City State Zip

11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

* Signature:

* Name: Prefix * First Name Middle Name
* Last Name Suffix

Title: Telephone No.: Date:

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct

description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is **1894-0005**. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to:** U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.

NYCDOE GEPA427 for TIF4.pdf

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

GEPA427 Statement
New York City Department of Education
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Application
July 27, 2012

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) intends to formalize peer support structures and diversify our teaching force through a teacher career lattice which increases classroom leadership capacity through professional development of teachers while providing new opportunities for our best teachers to further develop their careers.

NYCDOE's Office of Teacher Quality and Recruitment's standard recruitment processes are designed to ensure a diverse pool of applicants prior to the start of the teacher selection processes. This commitment to diversity in recruitment ensures equitable access and information regarding professional opportunities to all qualified individuals within our system, regardless of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Some of the standard recruitment practices designed to increase the diversity of our applicant pool include targeted recruitment efforts via job fairs and partnerships, and annual review of recruitment and hiring practices to ensure that they are equitable. Equity and diversity absolutely are key priorities for this office. We are committed to ensuring equitable access for all, regardless of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. The proposed career lattice will be available to teachers who have already been recruited and hired at our schools, and the same considerations described above will be afforded to those interested in these new roles.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

*** APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION**

New York City Department of Education

*** PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE**

Prefix: Mr. * First Name: Michael Middle Name:

* Last Name: Tragale Suffix:

* Title: Chief Financial Officer, NYCDOE

*** SIGNATURE:** Kelly Weatherby

*** DATE:** 07/27/2012

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
REQUIRED FOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANTS

1. Project Director:

Prefix:	* First Name:	Middle Name:	* Last Name:	Suffix:
Ms.	Amy		Way	

Address:

* Street1:	65 Court St. ??? Rm. 310
Street2:	
* City:	Brooklyn
County:	Kings
* State:	NY: New York
* Zip Code:	11201-4916
* Country:	USA: UNITED STATES

* Phone Number (give area code) Fax Number (give area code)

718-935-2906	718-935-5715
--------------	--------------

Email Address:

away@schools.nyc.gov

2. Applicant Experience:

Novice Applicant Yes No Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research

Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project Period?

Yes No

Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

Yes Provide Exemption(s) #: 1, 2, 4

--

No Provide Assurance #, if available:

--

Please attach an explanation Narrative:

Exempt Research Narrative.pdf		Delete Attachment	View Attachment
-------------------------------	--	-------------------	-----------------

Exempt Research Narrative

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) plans to conduct a program evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the new roles and programs made possible through TIF. NYCDOE will invite an external evaluator to develop a core set of research questions—including but not limited to the impact the new career lattice positions and financial incentives have on teacher development, teacher effectiveness, school performance, and student performance. Research activities will adhere to the following exemptions:

- Exemption #1: Research will be conducted in established educational settings (schools) and involve normal educational practices by comparing the effectiveness of a distributive leadership/instructional structure with more traditional, non-distributive leadership/instructional structures.
- Exemption #2: Research will involve the use of educational tests (student performance data and teacher achievement data), teacher surveys, interviews, and observations in a way that will not identify individual human subjects (teachers or children) or whose responses could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability. The research investigators will not be active participants in any observations involving children (i.e., teachers will not be conducting research on their own classes).
- Exemption #4: Research will include the collection or study of existing data (e.g., teacher service history, school performance data) that is either publicly available or is recorded by the investigator in a way that does subjects will be directly identified.

In addition, research will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines established by the Research and Policy Support Group, an office within the NYCDOE that supports external researchers and partners to collect data and conduct studies while ensuring that research does not compromise privacy or work.

The NYCDOE believes this program evaluation and research will greatly improve our ability to identify which peer leadership roles are most effective in improving teacher and student performance.

Abstract

The abstract narrative must not exceed one page and should use language that will be understood by a range of audiences. For all projects, include the project title (if applicable), goals, expected outcomes and contributions for research, policy, practice, etc. Include population to be served, as appropriate. For research applications, also include the following:

- Theoretical and conceptual background of the study (i.e., prior research that this investigation builds upon and that provides a compelling rationale for this study)
- Research issues, hypotheses and questions being addressed
- Study design including a brief description of the sample including sample size, methods, principals dependent, independent, and control variables, and the approach to data analysis.

[Note: For a non-electronic submission, include the name and address of your organization and the name, phone number and e-mail address of the contact person for this project.]

You may now Close the Form

You have attached 1 file to this page, no more files may be added. To add a different file, you must first delete the existing file.

* Attachment:

**New York City Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund Grant Program 2013 -
2018: Teacher Career Lattice
ABSTRACT**

The **New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE)** is applying as a **single Local Educational Agency** to the US Department of Education for a grant under the **General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Competition (CFDA# 84.374A)**, to implement a **performance-based compensation system** via a teacher career lattice in high-need schools in order to improve educator effectiveness and increase student achievement at these schools. This career lattice will be developed in the context of a system-wide human capital management system with educator evaluation systems at the center (Absolute Priority 1), wherein said evaluation systems are based, in significant part, on student outcomes (Absolute Priority 2). As the largest school district in the country, we serve 1.1 million students in over **1,700 schools**, of whom approximately 70% are eligible for Title I. Although numerous important strides have been made in recent years to improve the quality of instruction, NYCDOE is committed to continuing and expanding its efforts to ensure quality education for all students. The **70 high-need schools** selected to participate in the proposed TIF project are among the lowest-performing highest-need schools in New York City.

NYCDOE has employed a set of initiatives system-wide to improve the rigor and quality of instruction in an effort to ensure all students are college and career ready. Under the leadership of Michael Bloomberg and Chancellor Dennis Walcott, we have pioneered a culture shift towards increased accountability and empowerment for principals by establishing student outcome-driven metrics and linking principal evaluation and compensation to them. We have also entered a phase of reforms that focuses on extending and deepening the culture shift towards performance-based talent management for teachers.

In order to ensure that all students benefit from great teaching, NYCDOE has devoted significant attention towards integrating the new Common Core standards and improving teacher effectiveness. We believe in measuring teacher effectiveness by student progress because growth in classroom instruction through formative practice is a fundamental lever for improving student learning outcomes.

NYCDOE's proposal for a performance-based compensation system to increase educator effectiveness and student achievement is to create and formalize peer support structures and diversified roles within our teaching force through a teacher career lattice. The lattice increases classroom leadership capacity through professional development of teachers while providing peer leadership opportunities to our best teachers who are interested in new professional challenges. The proposed roles are specifically focused on the implementation of NYCDOE's new teacher evaluation system, which is aligned with recent State legislation, and offer critical avenues for teacher engagement and feedback on the process. Eligibility for the proposed roles, in turn, will depend on educators' performance as measured by the new evaluation system. The lattice benefits our system as a whole by improving our ability to attract, retain, develop and recognize our most talented teachers and creating incentives to work in our struggling schools.

Our focus for this proposal is high-need middle schools. While as a system we have seen student achievement grow over time, we continue to face challenges to progress in the middle grades; middle schools also struggle to attract and retain top teaching talent, which exacerbates the challenges in

achievement. In 2011 Chancellor Walcott announced a department-wide commitment to progress in the middle grades. Piloting a lattice in struggling middle schools will infuse additional resources and leadership into participating schools that meet criteria for serving high-need student populations.. A subset of the participating schools will represent “lab” or “learning” sites serving as models for implementation of the lattice as a strategy to support teacher development and student learning.

Purposeful implementation requires development and support of both principals and teachers who take on leadership roles within the career lattice. Principals will participate in sessions dedicated to implementing distributed leadership models, productively managing culture shifts, maximizing career lattice roles for instructional improvement, and how to use lattice opportunities to attract, retain, and recognize top talent. Career lattice teachers will have regular, role-specific development and ongoing support through central, network and school-based workshops. Sessions will focus on developing coaching skills, application of our teaching competencies (based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching), and structuring meaningful development opportunities, among other topics.

Five core components drive our theory of action for affecting real change in persistently low-achieving schools: 1) a robust approach to teacher development that supports and encourages teachers to learn from one another; 2) the creation of new positions for high-performing teachers that provide opportunities to build school-level capacity through mentoring, instructional leadership, and pathways to school leadership; 3) training and support for principals who implement a teacher career lattice in order to maximize the impact of the lattice; and 4) a thoughtful recruitment, selection, ongoing training, and evaluation of effective teachers who assume these new roles.

The basic principles underlying our initiative are reflected by five anticipated outcomes guiding our mission:

- Pilot the teacher career lattice in order to identify best practices in teacher leadership roles.
- High-need schools attract, retain and develop higher caliber teaching force.
- Career lattice supports development and implementation of new teacher evaluation system.
- Effective teachers develop and exercise leadership skills through responsibilities beyond teaching.
- Effective teachers improve student achievement.

We are applying for **Competitive Preference Priority 4** as a new applicant to the Teacher Incentive Fund, and to **Competitive Priority 5** as we are planning to implement an educator salary structure based on effectiveness. Please find our responses to both within an Addendum attached to our Project Narrative.

Project Narrative File(s)

* **Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename:**

To add more Project Narrative File attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

Add Optional Project Narrative File

New York City Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund Grant Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (HCMS).....Page 2

B. EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEMS..... Page 17

C. SUPPORTING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS..... Page 31

D. INVOLVEMENT OF EDUCATORS Page 41

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT..... Page 49

F. SUSTAINABILITY..... Page 58

G. COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES 4 AND 5..... Page 64

New York City Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund Grant Program

PART A: HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (HCMS)

VISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) is the largest school district in the country, serving 1.1 million students in 1,700+ schools and employing more than 75,000 teachers and 5,000 principals and assistant principals. NYCDOE serves primarily high-need students: 81% of students come from low-income families. In addition, 15% have disabilities and 14% are English language learners; our student population is indeed diverse and we are working hard to ensure that we are able to adequately meet their needs.

NYCDOE's most important and unifying goal is to ensure that all NYC students graduate high school ready for college and careers. Although we have made great strides in student achievement since the start of Mayor Michael Bloomberg's Children First reforms in 2002, too many students are not asked to do the type of rigorous work that success in college, career, and life demands. Higher standards — which are the essence of the new Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) — are necessary to prepare more students with the skills they need to succeed when they enroll in college and/or begin a career.

High-quality teaching is the most powerful tool for helping students reach these higher standards. Our work aims to ensure that all students benefit from great teaching. NYCDOE has therefore combined our focus on integrating the new Common Core standards with an increased attention to improving teacher effectiveness in order to achieve a continuous cycle of improvement based on feedback, support, and standards of excellence for students and

teachers. We believe a crucial component of measuring teacher effectiveness is student progress. We also recognize that the development of effective teaching relies on strong instructional leadership. Given the dramatic shift in the responsibilities and expectations of New York City principals brought on in particular by more rigorous standards for teaching and learning, high-quality leadership training and on-the-job support are vital to helping our school leaders succeed. In short, the greatest gap between current practice in New York City and realization of our fully developed vision of a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) lies in the development, identification, and cultivation of effective educators—both teachers and school leaders.

In a fully developed HCMS, teachers and principals are supported, developed, evaluated, and retained through a system that recognizes individual differences, encourages high performance, and directs resources to targeted development. Supervisors have the tools and training they need to evaluate performance and to use measures of teaching and leadership competency and student learning data in developing their faculty. Without a rigorous, transparent, and fair method in place for performance management and career ladder opportunities, we will not be able to plan effectively for the retention of our highest-performing educators, set expectations for teacher and principal preparation programs, or part with those who are not getting the job done.

HCMS

Having intensively studied human capital management for over ten years, NYCDOE is experienced in analyzing our own data and identifying levers for change. Over the last two years, NYCDOE has created annual Citywide Instructional Expectations (CIE)¹, which articulates the instructional activities in which our school leaders and teachers are expected to engage in order

¹ New York City Department of Education. 2012. Citywide Instructional Expectations for 2012-13.

to improve educator practice and achieve college and career-readiness for all students. As part of the CIE, schools are expected to adopt Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching to strengthen a common language and understanding of what quality teaching looks like, conduct frequent classroom observations, and provide teachers with formative feedback and professional development to support improved practice in identified competencies.

Further, in a growing number of our schools (100 in 2011-12, 200 in 2012-13, and an anticipated 400 in 2013-14), school leaders and teachers have been engaged in a pilot of the Teacher Effectiveness Program (TEP)². As part of TEP, NYCDOE has designed intensive supports and tools for school leaders and networks to observe teachers, identify growth areas, and provide high-quality support. Specifically, TEP schools receive training to learn how to: assess teacher practice and diagnose teacher development priorities; provide teachers with feedback that helps them improve their practice; use data to make more strategic decisions about staff development and career pipelines; measure student growth to ensure that students are making adequate progress; and design and deliver school-based professional development aligned to teacher development needs.

On March 27, 2012, Governor Andrew Cuomo signed legislation (New York State Education Law §3012-c, hereinafter “3012-c”) revising requirements for teacher and principal evaluation in New York State. The new law requires that teacher and principal effectiveness be rated according to a four-point scale: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective. In

² In the 2010-11 school year, the DOE launched a pilot called the Teacher Effectiveness Project with 20 schools to begin to understand the school conditions and practices that lead to accelerated teacher learning. In the 2011-12 school year, the DOE continued this work with 106 schools across six networks in what was referred to as the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot. For the 2012-13 school year, we anticipate the Talent Effectiveness Program (TEP) to involve approximately 250 schools, including 70 that were also participants in the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot and were selected to continue their work through TEP to further build their capacity to support strong teacher effectiveness practices in their schools. For the purposes of clarity, the full scope of teacher effectiveness pilot work will be referred throughout this document as TEP.

addition, the revised law requires Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPRs) that result in a single composite teacher or principal effectiveness score incorporating multiple measures of effectiveness. The results of the evaluations will factor significantly in employment decisions, including but not limited to promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation, as well as teacher and principal professional development (including coaching, induction support, and differentiated professional development).

For the last four years, NYCDOE has produced teacher value-added reports, as well as implemented a principal evaluation system that is closely aligned with 3012-c. Imminently, NYCDOE will fully implement an APPR system fully aligned with the requirements of 3012-c in each one of our more than 1,700 schools. Under this system, multiple measures of effectiveness will be used to evaluate educators, guide their development, and in turn raise the quality of instruction in our schools. These data will also inform performance management and strategic staff decisions across the HCMS. We will enhance citywide data systems and methods for capturing and reporting educator effectiveness data, including measures of student learning.

NYCDOE has piloted various measures of student learning to be used under 3012-c and has been working with the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) on an approach to local measures that uses instructionally meaningful common student work rubrics. We anticipate reaching an agreement with the UFT on the exact metrics to be used as part of principal and teacher evaluation by January 2013 as per the timeline set forth by the New York State Education Department (NYSED), and plan to implement the new system for stakes in a subset of schools during the 2013-14 school year. Pending discussions with the UFT, we anticipate this subset of schools to include those in TIF. This corresponds with the second implementation year of the TIF grant and is therefore aligned with the timeline specified by TIF.

In 2007-08, as part of a joint agreement between NYCDOE and the Council of School Supervisors and Administrators (CSA), NYCDOE established a new Principal Performance Review (PPR). Prior to the implementation of the PPR, principals were evaluated exclusively on their success in meeting their annual goals and objectives, and received a rating of either “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory.” Similar to teachers, most principals received “Satisfactory” ratings. The current PPR measures principal performance on a five-point scale using multiple measures to assess principal performance, emphasizing student and school growth. Principals also are eligible for bonuses based on their Progress Report results. Thus, the existing principal evaluation system aligns with TIF’s requirements; we will spend the majority of this application discussing teacher evaluation since that is where most of our work is focused at this time.

PROJECT PLAN SUMMARY

NYCDOE has rolled out an aggressive set of reforms to improve the rigor and quality of instruction through the Citywide Instructional Expectations, and raise the bar for human capital decisions like tenure. Most of our work to date has been to build school leader capacity to support teacher effectiveness, so we are adding a focus on building teacher capacity. Because a key effective practice in implementing these reforms is teachers supporting teachers, NYCDOE will formalize peer support structures and diversify roles in our teaching force through a teacher career lattice which increases classroom leadership capacity through professional development of teachers while providing new opportunities for our best teachers to further advance their careers. We are using the term "career lattice" rather than "career ladder" to more accurately reflect the complex interconnections and pathways available to teachers in this program.

The career lattice will benefit our system by improving our ability to attract, retain, develop and recognize our most talented teachers by creating incentives to work in our high-need schools. It will consist of 4 new roles for high-performing teachers in 70 middle schools, 10 of which will serve as lab sites where school leaders can observe and thought partner with high-capacity principals; this model is described in greater detail below. To have world-class schools we need to establish opportunities for teachers to hone new leadership skills in the service of students and to be recognized for their accomplishments. In addition, we want to incentivize our most talented educators to work in schools where they are needed most.

Our **theory of action** is grounded in a belief that improved instruction is the lever for improved student achievement, and includes four core components: 1) a robust approach to teacher development that supports and encourages teachers to learn from one another; 2) the creation of new positions for high-performing teachers that provide opportunities to build school-level capacity through mentoring, instructional leadership, and pathways to school leadership; 3) distributive leadership training and support for principals who implement a teacher career lattice, in order to maximize the impact of the lattice on teacher effectiveness and student achievement; 4) thoughtful recruitment, selection, training, and evaluation of effective teachers who assume these new roles; and 5) a school-level peer learning model via “lab sites” where high capacity principals share and model practices with participating school leaders and teacher teams.

FOCUS ON MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Chancellor Dennis Walcott's new priority for New York City schools is a focus on middle schools, an area of local as well as national concern³. Every year since 2006, our students in

³ Navigating the Middle Grades and Preparing Students for High School Graduation, a study by The Research Alliance for New York City Schools and Teachers College, Columbia University, 2011

grades 3-5 have made steady progress on the state's Math and English tests. But in grades 6, 7, and 8, the picture is different. 7th and 8th grade students were the only ones in New York City to actually regress in performance on state English tests in 2011. Similarly, on national tests taken by 4th and 8th graders in big cities, New York City students have made significant progress since 2002—except on 8th grade Reading.

The middle grade years are a time of both great importance and vulnerability in students' K-12 schooling. Students encounter new social and emotional challenges, increased academic demands, and major developmental transitions during the middle grade years. The middle grades are crucial for preventing declining attendance and stagnant achievement, given that changes during these years are predictive of students' later success. Students' performance in middle grades may explain much of the attainment gap in high school graduation. Students who leave eighth grade without the skills they need to be on target for college and career readiness too often leave high school unready for any kind of meaningful future.

The level of academic achievement students attain by eighth grade has a larger impact on college and career readiness by the time they graduate from high school than anything that happens academically in high school⁴. Academic readiness for college and career can be improved when students develop behaviors in middle school that are known to contribute to successful academic performance. The implication is clear: if we want not merely to improve but to maximize the college and career readiness of U.S. students, we need to intervene before high school.

Furthermore, middle schools are consistently our most challenging school level for staffing and teacher retention. We are not retaining our most highly effective teachers at our high-need

⁴ The Forgotten Middle: Ensuring that All Students Are on Target for College and Career Readiness before High School, an ACT Research and Policy report, 2008

schools; 55% of middle school teachers leave their school within three years, which is higher than in elementary and high schools⁵. To this end, NYCDOE has focused efforts to improve access to talent through hiring policies and special programs. We believe that we can make a significant positive impact on middle school academic achievement by investing greater energy and resources in recruiting, developing, and retaining middle school teachers. For this reason, NYCDOE intends to pilot the career lattice in our high-need middle schools where the challenge in recruiting and retaining outstanding teachers is most acute.

ROLE OF THE TEACHER INCENTIVE FUND

Our proposed PBCS will be based on Design Model 2. NYCDOE will select approximately 70 high-need middle schools—including those participating in TEP in order to leverage their ongoing investment in improved instruction and student achievement as they have already built a foundation for implementing a career lattice—to participate in a TIF-funded career lattice pilot. 85% of the selected schools will be high-need/low-middle-capacity (i.e., high-poverty and general leadership population), and 15% will be high-need/high-capacity schools (i.e., high-poverty with notable leadership strength in driving student achievement and leveraging distributed leadership practices) will serve as “lab sites.” Lab sites are the core of the peer learning framework and will be models to document and share practices with participating schools. Lab site principals receive added compensation and added roles and responsibilities associated with leading peer learning. To support the implementation of new teacher effectiveness structures, we will offer these participating high-need schools a menu of peer support options consisting of new and existing teacher leadership roles. Each of the selected schools will pilot the teacher career lattice by developing their own customized combination of

⁴ Will Marinell and Aaron Pallas, *Teacher Turnover in New York City's Public Middle Schools*, 2011

these roles with guidance from NYCDOE. Teachers who are selected to assume the additional responsibilities of these leadership positions, and who maintain overall ratings of Effective or higher, will receive additional compensation⁶. TIF will support this work by providing funding for partial salaries for some career lattice positions, salaries for project staff, professional development for project participants, and technology to collect and share best practices based on the learnings of our pilot.

RANGE OF HUMAN CAPITAL DECISIONS

A major goal of New York City's new teacher evaluation system is to ensure that human capital decisions are strategic and are informed by teacher effectiveness data. Our current teacher evaluation system does not enable us to clearly differentiate among levels of teacher practice. Highly effective teaching goes unrecognized, which prevents us from rewarding, strategically placing, developing, retaining and promoting effective teachers. Teachers are not provided with support or professional development that meets their needs to help them improve and too many students are subject to poor instructional practices. By moving from a binary rating system to a four-point scale and including both qualitative and quantitative metrics that include student outcomes, the new evaluation system will help inform more deliberate choices in the full range of human capital decisions, including tenure, transfer, professional development, termination and advancement. It will also allow us to advocate for specific changes to educator preparation programs by using what we learn about correlations between student achievement and specific skills, competencies and knowledge of exemplary teachers.

⁶ Because the new teacher evaluation system per NYS Education Law 3012-c will not yet be implemented for stakes, we will use a proxy to determine effectiveness rating for the first year of implementation.

Once we can identify top talent as well as teachers who need additional support, we want to provide opportunities for excellent educators to take on new challenges and leverage their expertise to support those who are developing. We have developed four roles to make up our teacher leadership career lattice (described in greater detail in Part C). The primary goal of the lattice is to attract, retain, recognize and support exemplary talent. The range of options will allow for a variety of pathways towards leadership opportunities and increased teacher effectiveness, and enable support systems to be tailored to each school. To be eligible for any of the leadership opportunities in the career lattice, educators must be considered high-performing on multiple measures (principal evaluation, peer recommendation, classroom results, etc.). Selection criteria will align with priority areas of the Danielson rubric, New York State professional teaching standards, and 3012-c.

While principals' salary structure is already based on effectiveness, we intend to revise our teacher salary structure to be based on effectiveness as well (Competitive Preference Priority 5 details are in final section of narrative). TIF will act as a means to establish the value of performance-based compensation for effective educators who take on additional peer support roles. We will review the results of the TIF-funded career lattice pilot in the first two years of implementation and determine appropriate amendments to the overall teacher salary structure, which we hope to begin collectively bargaining by the fifth year of the grant (2016-17) and apply changes to all schools, including the high-need schools participating in the TIF program.

WEIGHTING EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

In order to be eligible for any of the positions included in the teacher leadership career lattice, teachers will need to be rated Effective or Highly Effective on their most recent annual

evaluation. In order to maintain these positions, teachers will be required to uphold standards of practice which will be developed in conjunction with UFT. In addition, decisions around tenure, professional development, transfers, and termination will be guided by explicit rules heavily informed by annual evaluations. In the longer term, we will augment our salary structure to take into account teacher effectiveness. Lower-stakes decisions, such as hiring a teacher seeking transfer, will be less stringently mandated. The evaluation law (3012-c) includes provisions for termination procedures, and NYCDOE will align its approach to this law.

Our school leader evaluation system will similarly require that principals are rated Effective or Highly Effective in order to receive bonus compensation.

FEASIBILITY OF HCMS

To date, the teacher evaluation system that we have been piloting per 3012-c has not been “for-stakes”; that is, evaluation results have been used primarily for research and learning purposes as NYCDOE prepares to implement said system at scale, rather than to inform human capital decisions like tenure, promotion, termination, and developmental opportunities. This has been a deliberate decision, as we want to have full confidence in our evaluation system before we put teachers’ livelihoods and reputations on the line.

That said, NYCDOE does have prior experience in using evaluation data from other systems to make human capital decisions, such as the granting or denial of tenure. Teachers and principals are eligible for tenure after 3 years of service. Their supervisors use multiple measures including evaluation and student learning data in order to inform those decisions, and those who still do not meet the bar set for tenure despite opportunities to improve are subject to termination.

NYCDOE is fully committed to gathering data in a fair and accurate way and using that data to inform its human capital strategy. We know that this is the only way to ensure that all educators have the support they need to improve, high performers are recognized and promoted, and persistently low performers are moved out of our schools, with the ultimate goal of raising student achievement for all New York City students. Our work thus far around piloting a new teacher evaluation system has been rooted in these aims, and the TIF grant will enable us to expand and improve upon teacher effectiveness work we are already doing, such as improving our leadership pipelines and working to adopt Common Core Learning Standards system-wide.

COMMITMENT OF NYCDOE LEADERSHIP

Over the past few years, NYCDOE has prioritized improved teacher practice with the ultimate goal of raising student achievement. To that end, our senior leadership has been instrumentally involved in crafting our HCMS and is fully committed to its success. Senior leadership has also committed to providing the necessary training and financial support for this work going forward.

To ensure buy-in at the local level, schools are expected to provide a base (or partial) salary for pure instructional time, which means that schools will pay for all school-based coaches, mentors and demonstration teachers; TIF funds will primarily cover salary for the additional bonus amount (the Budget Narrative contains additional details). Only the proposed Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador roles will be fully funded by TIF. Beyond the grant period, schools will continue covering teacher leader salaries as part of their regular budget and will only need to furnish a relatively small supplementary sum in order to maintain those positions. We expect that they will be motivated to produce this supplemental income because the support structure of the teacher career lattice will prove to be valuable and effective for schools.

Our commitment is also demonstrated through dedicated resources for teacher effectiveness work citywide and the development of new teacher preparation pipeline programs. The career lattice will provide new opportunities to fill the gap. Another example of how NYCDOE is firmly committed to this work is that it has been the focus of other types of funding for which we have applied, such as the NY State Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE) grant, Race to The Top funds, and the Wallace Grant for School Leadership Development, as well as additional funding from private sources.

ADEQUACY OF INCENTIVES

NYCDOE currently employs multiple strategies to successfully incentivize teachers to work in high-need schools. Some notable examples:

Financial: For the last several years, NYCDOE has received funds from NYSED for the Teachers of Tomorrow (TOT) grant, of which \$10 million is used to provide financial incentives (\$3400/year each) to nearly 3,000 teachers new to NYCDOE who teach in some of the most high-need schools. Eligible teachers may receive this award for up to four years. The remaining \$5 million is used to support alternative certification programs, many of whose graduates also teach in high-need settings. We expect to continue using this funding to attract teachers to schools where the need is greatest. To further incentivize top talent to teacher in NYCDOE schools, we also are providing new teachers who graduate in the top tier of their class with \$25,000 in loan forgiveness, per the Mayor’s 2012 State of the City address.

Common Core Fellows are teachers selected through a highly competitive process to lead the citywide work around articulating and evaluating what quality teaching looks like as we transition to the Common Core Learning Standards. They are paid for their time to vet, edit,

provide feedback on, and refine instructional resources. Additionally, they receive non-financial incentives in the form of co-authorship credit, the title of “NYC Common Core Fellow,” and high-level professional development co-led by national experts.

In each of the last two years, NYCDOE has offered the opportunity for effective educators to receive differentiated compensation if they apply and are deemed eligible to fill career ladder roles in select high-need schools. In each case, several hundred educators applied. Of the nearly 100 outstanding educators who filled these career ladder roles in the last two school years, approximately half transferred to the positions from other higher-performing schools in our system. This experience indicates that the available career ladder opportunities and differentiated compensation were effective in increasing interest for teaching in these high-need schools. NYCDOE intends to apply a similar approach in structuring the career lattice roles to be implemented using TIF funds. We anticipate that response from educators will further illustrate that this is an effective strategy for attracting effective educators to work in high-need schools.

Nonfinancial: Since the 2007-08 school year, principals and their teams have gained broader discretion over allocating resources, choosing staff, and creating programming for their students. This makes principals the primary driver behind non-financial incentives for their teachers, including those in high-need schools. Principals can leverage a number of strategies and resources in this work; many offer their staff the opportunity to take on an informal teacher leadership title such as department head, grade-team leader, or academy leader. School leaders also provide opportunities for their staff to take part in select professional development sessions, to work with specific consultants or network staff, to mentor student teachers and new members of the school community, and/or to visit another school to observe best practices.

To supplement these school-based non-financial incentives, NYCDOE offers additional opportunities through the network organizations that provide instructional and operational support for schools, as well as through Central programs, such as the Middle School Spring Classroom Apprenticeship (MS-SCA) and the Teacher Leadership Program (TLP)⁷.

We are confident that the opportunity provided through teacher leader roles is a significant incentive to educators who are eager to grow their skills and exercise leadership. A significant number of teachers apply each year for limited teacher leader positions and numerous surveys from the TEP indicate high interest in leadership opportunities (this is expanded upon in the High-Quality Evaluation Systems section, below). We also found strong enthusiasm around becoming a cooperating teacher to apprentice/student teachers; in 2012, 409 individuals were in the running for just 143 cooperating teacher positions.

Lastly, a key requirement for principals of TEP schools is to engage in conversations with teachers about retention, teacher assignment, and leadership cultivation. This illustrates the high value we place on teacher satisfaction as a key factor impacting retention.

PART B: RIGOROUS, VALID, AND RELIABLE EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEMS

HIGH-QUALITY EVALUATION SYSTEMS

⁷ MS-SCA was launched in the spring of 2012 to strengthen the performance of middle schools by pairing talented teachers with prospective teachers (some traditionally certified, and others coming through the NYC Teaching Fellows) in their subject area for ten weeks of intensive classroom-embedded mentoring and training. It allows up to 50 teachers to attend a 16-seminar course that will develop adult leadership skills and an understanding of the Common Core and other aspects of the Citywide Instructional Expectations. The TLP, which will begin in the 2012-13 school year, offers two programs for teachers interested in school leadership, including those working at high-need middle schools: 1) a network-based professional development program and 2) a leadership academy collaborative for future middle school principals. It allows up to 20 teachers to attend a 32-seminar course (and 12 credits from the City University of New York toward a School Building License or a Master's Degree) that will develop similar skills but with a more direct eye towards school leadership.

In May 2011, New York State passed Education Law 3012-c, which requires that every school district in the state implement new teacher and principal evaluation systems based upon multiple measures of performance. Under 3012-c, 40% of an educator's overall evaluation rating must be based upon measures of student learning: 20% based on state growth measures and 20 % based on locally-selected measures. The remaining 60% of the overall evaluation rating must be based upon "other measures of effectiveness", the majority of which must include a research-based teacher/principal practice rubric. The sum of an educator's score on these components results in a final rating on a four-point scale: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing and Ineffective. To ensure educator support for the system, both the 60% "other measures of effectiveness" as well as the 20% local measures of student learning must be collectively bargained with the local teacher's and principal's union. Districts are required to use these evaluation data to inform staffing decisions including educator professional development, termination, recruitment, promotion, and retention. A developmental improvement plan must be created and implemented for all educators rated Ineffective and Developing.

NYCDOE has been a strong supporter of 3012-c from its inception. Significant gains in educator effectiveness cannot be achieved without data that identifies performance differences, and that can be used to inform strategies that will lead to educators' instructional improvement. Teaching and leadership are complex tasks that, when executed well, result in student achievement gains. Thus, for an educator evaluation system to be meaningful it must include measures of student learning alongside measures of teaching and leadership competencies. 3012-c is unique among state evaluation laws in that, to enhance the validity and reliability of an educator's rating, multiple measures of student learning are required. With a rigorous, valid and reliable educator evaluation system, schools can dramatically reform their approach to strategic

staff decisions and systemic resource allocation (ranging from in which schools to allocate recruitment incentive programs to the impact of new curricular reforms on teacher effectiveness).

NYCDOE will complete negotiations with the CSA and UFT on these new evaluation systems by January 2013, with system-wide implementation beginning the following school year. While full implementation is still a few years away, NYCDOE has taken significant steps over the past few years towards readying the field for the implementation of these new educator evaluation systems. This progress is described in the next section.

IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW EVALUATION SYSTEMS

As noted earlier in this narrative, NYCDOE has set the expectation through its annual Citywide Instructional Expectations (CIE) that schools are to adopt Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching to strengthen a common language and understanding of what quality teaching looks like, conduct frequent classroom observations, and provide teachers with formative feedback and professional development to support improved practice in identified competencies. NYCDOE provides significant resources and training to schools and their school support networks⁸ to facilitate effective implementation of the CIE, including: (1) new staff and talent coaches who work directly with networks to help them train and implement school-based instructional leaders in their implementation of the CIE; (2) creation of teacher effectiveness multi-media online content for NYCDOE's learning management system; and (3) web-based, pre-certification, formative assessment on the Danielson rubric of teacher practices for instructional leaders, particularly for those individuals in networks who are responsible for turn-keying CIE training, and supporting its implementation, throughout the system.

⁸ In New York City, school leaders self-select school support networks, which are responsible for providing both operational and instructional support to schools

Through TEP (which was introduced earlier in this narrative), NYCDOE is piloting core components of the new evaluation system in a no-stakes environment to ensure that we are able to accurately identify and meet schools' needs as we look forward to full-scale implementation over the next several years. School leaders are expected to observe teachers at least six times per year, including two observations during Common Core-aligned units of study, and to provide teachers with regular feedback on their practice and related student work products following each observation. They provide teachers with targeted professional development aligned to the Danielson rubric and conduct developmental conversations with teachers at the middle and end of the school year. To strengthen the connection between evaluation and other elements of the Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) continuum, they will engage in conversations about retention, teacher assignment, and leadership identification and cultivation with school leadership and network teams. Further, network leaders, achievement coaches, and other instructional staff affiliated with TEP schools are expected to build their knowledge of the Danielson rubric and related observation and feedback processes by participating in central-led professional development sessions, co-creating and facilitating school leader and teacher professional development on teacher effectiveness. TEP school leaders may also administer the Tripod student feedback survey for their teachers as yet another measure of teacher effectiveness.

NYCDOE provides a range of supports to TEP schools including: (1) talent coaches who work directly with TEP school leaders to norm expectations of teacher performance and support overall implementation of the program; (2) central- and network-based professional development by teacher practice competency experts, as well as "best practice learning" materials documented by qualitative research partners; and (3) funding for teachers and supervisors to attend

foundational professional development, as well as funding to support school-based professional development for teachers and other activities to educate and inform teachers at TEP schools.

Through these citywide and intensive resources, we expect to build the capacity of teachers, school leaders and network staff to foster strong student learning outcomes through improved teacher practice, while ensuring that the system is ready for full-scale adoption of 3012c. In addition, NYCDOE collects data on the new teacher ratings and seeks feedback from both teachers and school leaders to identify what elements worked well and what should change.

PLAN FOR MULTIPLE TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

Under 3012-c, educators are required to be observed multiple times a year. We have developed the following plan for these observations and have been piloting it via TEP. According to this plan, a teacher's official rating is determined by school leaders in their building (either principals or assistant principals; principals are empowered to select whether and which teachers will be evaluated by which APs). As described above, school leaders receive significant support for both the operational aspects of implementing the evaluation system (e.g., readjusting responsibilities, time, and schedules to prioritize classroom observations), as well as the instructional aspects (accuracy and achieving inter-rater reliability on the Danielson rubric, processes for selecting when to observe teachers; providing feedback to teachers).

School leaders undergo rigorous professional development and one-on-one coaching to ensure they are effectively normed and calibrated on the Danielson observation rubric. Specifically, school leaders attend approximately 28 hours of targeted professional development on the Danielson Framework for Teaching and related evidence and feedback training during a school year. The first 8 hours of this training takes place during the summer while the remaining 20

hours are woven into existing network training sessions and structures. In the middle of the year, network instructional staff and superintendents complete a mid-year calibration exercise to inform where they need more support in refining their understanding of the various performance levels detailed in the Framework. By the end of the year, all instructional staff supporting schools should be calibrated on their understanding of what constitutes effective teaching practice. To be considered fully normed, school leaders must achieve mastery on an online assessment, including rating video examples of classroom practice according to the Danielson Framework for Teaching, by the end of the school year.

At the same time that school leaders are undergoing this training, so are selected network and central staff members with significant teaching experience and advanced degrees in education. These staff members participate in three 3-week cycles of teacher effectiveness intensives with a talent coach from the central office during the school year. The goals of these intensives are to provide training to (1) help these staff ensure that their schools are receiving support on the implementation of the teacher observation and feedback process and (2) develop a cadre of experienced “master” observers and coaches who can co-observe and ensure the accuracy and validity of school leaders’ ratings. These staff members also participate in two-hour monthly meetings with their talent coach to discuss progress.

Based on last year’s implementation of the observation process, we found our procedures for training and norming on the Danielson rubric to be effective. For example, 90% of school leaders surveyed indicated that the pilot enabled their teachers to develop in areas most needed to impact student achievement. We found that school leaders were able to achieve inter-rater reliability and have achieved a meaningful distribution of teacher performance ratings (e.g., in Year 1, 40% of teachers in pilot schools were rated as “Effective” or “Highly Effective”).

STUDENT GROWTH

As mentioned above, under 3012-c, 40% of an educator's evaluation is based upon student learning measures: 20% based on state growth measures and 20% based on locally-selected measures. For the "state growth" 20%, the NYSED will generate statewide growth percentile scores for teachers and principals responsible for grades 4-8 ELA and Math instruction. NYSED is required by 3012-c to evolve this measure to a value-added methodology, at which point the state growth measure will be 25% of an educator's evaluation. In addition, NYSED is in the process of creating a statewide growth score for high school principals based on student progress towards graduation (using student credit accumulation and Regents test score performance).

NYSED has contracted with AIR – a well-known research and evaluation firm – to develop their growth percentile and value-added models. In this model development, they have based their methodology, criteria for demonstrating reliability and validity, communication protocols, and professional development training materials on work done nationally in this arena, most notably in NYC, as well as feedback from educators. For example, the state's development of their high school growth metric is informed by research conducted by the Consortium for Chicago Public Schools, as well as New York City's own progress to graduation accountability metrics. In addition, NYSED has selected a growth percentiles model (vs. other growth models) in large part because of successes with similar models in Colorado as well as New York City's own experience adopting a growth percentiles approach for its school accountability reports (Progress Report). Psychometrically, report card results were more stable over time with the adopting of this report; and were more strongly correlated with other measures of school quality than the predecessor methodology. Instructionally, educators expressed that they found the methodology more understandable than other statistical growth calculations. As the state evolves their growth

model to a value-added model, they will translate results in “growth percentile” units to support this transparency and ease of interpretation of results. NYCDOE is working closely with NYSED on this approach so that NYSED can leverage our experiences (from professional development resources to detailed data business rules) developing value-added models.

For educators without state-generated growth/value-added scores, 3012-c requires that districts implement student learning objectives according to NYSED-generated criteria that are common across all educators in the state. These criteria have been informed by similar systems put in place in DC, Rhode Island, Denver and Austin. All student learning objectives are required to include: precise measurable targets, common assessments, clear specifications of how growth will be calculated at two points in time, and how attainment of objectives will convert to the 0-20 points available for the “state growth” component of the overall score. NYCDOE has been piloting the use of student learning objectives, prior to their implementation for stakes, to build a set of NYCDOE-specific resources to supplement NYSED’s. For example, we have been developing a set of exemplar student learning objectives, models for successful goal-setting conversations between teachers and their evaluators, as well as specific analytic tools to assist educators in setting measurable targets for student learning objectives. For example, we have developed growth norm tables, which disaggregate high school Regents exam performance by school and subgroup, and identify expected performance ranges on these exams for different populations of students. These tools are the core mechanisms by which NYCDOE intends to norm educators’ expectations of quality student learning objectives and performance targets and ensure the rigor, fairness and accuracy of the system.

In developing NYCDOE’s approach to implementing these student learning objectives, as well as the local measures components of the teacher evaluation model, NYCDOE has studied similar

work throughout the nation as well as built on our own past experience implementing value-added measures at the classroom and teacher level. For four years, New York City created, with leading researchers at the University of Wisconsin Value-Added Research Center, the Teacher Data Reports. These reports showed value-added scores for all New York City teachers of grades 4-8 English Language Arts and mathematics; they were distributed to over 18,000 teachers and their school leaders. The intent of these reports was to control for factors outside of a teacher's control (using a complex statistical model) to more fairly and accurately measure individual teachers' contribution to student learning. These reports were used, alongside other measures, by teachers and their school leaders to help target professional development initiatives, help school leaders make staffing decisions, and as one piece of data to inform teacher tenure decision-making. These reports have been praised by researchers, even those critical of measuring student learning to assess educator effectiveness, for the rigor and robustness of the value-added methodology NYCDOE employed. With the adoption of 3012-c, New York City phased out the Teacher Data Reports, replacing them with the NYSED-developed measures which enable teacher performance to be compared on the same criteria across the state.

NYCDOE has developed with our colleagues at the UFT an innovative approach to local measures of student learning. The guiding principles of this work were developed based upon core lessons learned from the Teacher Data Reports roll-out and subsequent experiences. The Teacher Data Reports were released to a variety of media outlets in response to Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) requests. Unfortunately, through the course of this media release, including the prolonged litigation and the press coverage it received, many NYC educators have developed misconceptions, anxieties, and mistrust regarding the Teacher Data Reports and the use of student learning data to measure teacher effectiveness in general.

Recognizing this is the “frame” many NYC educators may bring to this work, NYCDOE and UFT set forth these guiding principles for local measures: 1) transparent and easy for educators to understand, 2) supporting the core instructional work of educators, 3) fair to educators (regardless of where and who they teach), and 4) manageable and sustainable to implement.

Based on these goals, our local measures approach uses common rubrics to evaluate student learning for all students in the same grade and subject. These rubrics are created by teacher design teams, working with assessment experts, are field tested in NYC schools, and are revised based upon field test results and teacher and school leader feedback. While rubrics are common across all students in the city, schools select or create the assessments that they will use, aligned to the rubric. The same assessments will be used by teachers in the same grade/ subject; sample assessments will be created by the design teams and field tested as well to provide educators with exemplars to select from and use as models for their own design. To measure student growth and teacher contribution to this growth, NYCDOE will centrally calculate growth scores, which take into account critical demographic factors that influence student growth but are not under the direct control of teachers including special education and English language learner status.

This approach helps ensure the fairness and comparability in teacher scores by using the same scoring rubric for all students, the same assessments for all students within the same school, and the same growth score methodology for all teachers citywide. This commonality also helps ensure rigor, such that a high bar is set for what needs to be demonstrated in student work to be considered reaching different performance levels. Our guiding principles of educator understanding and buy-in, support of the core instructional work at the school, and feasibility of implementation are facilitated both by educator involvement in the rubric design process as well as through educator autonomy in the selection and creation of assessments at the school level.

To ensure that these rubrics are reliable and valid (including accurately measuring the level of rigor we want to achieve for our students and teachers) we have engaged in significant research and piloting of this work, which will continue as we scale-up our efforts. Through this process we are collecting student performance data, from New York City as well as other sites, to test the psychometric properties of the rubrics, as well as collect educator feedback to understand how successful the data are for informing instructional decisions. We are also using these data to model and develop our growth score methodology. For the last two years we have piloted an array of local measures and received feedback from educators about their experiences, including specific requests for tools to support the process. In response to this feedback we will work with lab sites for the next two years, in addition to the teacher design teams described above, to help design feasible implementation processes and tools. Some of these tools will include specific criteria, including student work samples and guiding design questions, to aid educators in creating new assessments.

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

NYCDOE's current principal evaluation system is strongly aligned to 3012-c. In 2007-08, as part of a joint agreement between NYCDOE and the CSA, NYCDOE established a multiple-measures evaluation system called the Principal Performance Review (PPR). The PPR measures principal performance on a five-point scale, with a focus on student outcomes. One-third of a principal's overall rating under the current Principal Performance Review is based on student growth, as measured in each school's annual Progress Report⁹.

⁹ The Progress Report measures students' year-to-year progress, compares the school to other schools with similar students, and rewards success in moving all children forward, especially those with the greatest needs. Progress Reports give each school an overall letter grade based on three categories: student progress (60 %), student performance (25 %), and school environment (15 %). The student progress component measures how well schools

With the adoption of 3012-c, we anticipate using the Progress Report for the local measures 20% portion of the evaluation system, maintaining continuity from the old system to the new, and aligning school and principal accountability measures. As described above, the state will generate the “state growth” 20% of the evaluation based on student growth on state assessments.

The PPR currently offers a critical opportunity to examine school leaders' success with respect to the progress students are making and to identify the decisions and steps needed to help their school improve student outcomes. The PPR is designed as a core component of NYCDOE's accountability system. This annual review will result in a Final Rating for all principals based on performance in several areas of responsibility including accomplishing objectives, school's Quality Review score and addressing the needs of special learners.

NYCDOE's Quality Review¹⁰ currently accounts for 22% of a principal's evaluation rating – with the adoption of 3012-c we anticipate that this will increase to 30%, and serve as the principal leadership and management practice rubric component of the “other 60% measures of

are helping students improve from one year to the next. The student performance component measures student proficiency in reading and math. The school environment component compiles the results of surveys taken by parents, students, and teachers at each school last spring, as well as student attendance rates. Schools can also earn additional credit by achieving exemplary gains with high-need students, including special education and general education students.

¹⁰ The Quality Review is a two-day school visit by experienced educators. During the review, the external evaluator visits classrooms, talks with school leaders, and uses a rubric to evaluate how well the school is organized to educate its students. The Quality Review was designed to look behind a school's performance data to ensure the school is engaged in effective methods of accelerating student learning, in particular establishing a collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement. As a result, the Quality Review focuses on the coherence of a school's systems, measuring how well it is organized to meet the needs of its students and adults, as well as monitor and improve its instructional and assessment practices. The Quality Review rubric defines the school practices that result in college and career readiness for all students, and strongly emphasizes a school-wide focus on student outcomes. The core components of the Quality Review measure evidence of (1) aligned, coherent and rigorous instruction for all students (including those with special needs), (2) rigorous assessment and data analysis, (3) school improvement goal-setting and monitoring, (4) professional development, collaboration and feedback, and (5) evaluation and revision. Research has shown that performance on the Quality Review is a leading indicator of student achievement results.

effectiveness.” Professional and school goals and objectives currently make up 32% of the PPR – this will likely decrease to 20% under 3012-c. NYCDOE publishes annual guidance for principals and their supervisors to support this goal-setting process. In particular, principals are currently required to set at least one goal that aligns with the Citywide Instructional Expectations and principals’ ability to increase teacher effectiveness in their schools.

The final component of the PPR measures legal and regulatory compliance, with a specific focus on compliance with mandates pertaining to populations with special needs. We anticipate that this will remain a component of the evaluation system under 3012-c.

While there are overall insubstantial differences between the current PPR and 3012-c, NYCDOE has been engaged in intensive efforts to support the evolution of the principal evaluation system. In particular, we have created additional materials to support norming around the goal-setting process, engaged in feedback sessions with educators to better understand their reactions to the PPR and how to improve it, and continued to evolve the Quality Review to ensure that it reflects both school quality and a principal’s leadership abilities.

ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Ensuring that special populations’ needs are addressed has been and will continue to be a key goal of our new teacher and principal evaluation systems. As described above, our measures of student learning for both teachers and principals take into account these factors by comparing educators to those teaching similar populations of students and providing additional credit for making exemplary gains with special populations. Our Quality Review considers how well a school is structured to support access to rigorous content for all students and the compliance portion of the principal evaluation system is based on whether s/he has implemented specific

policies that support the needs of students with disabilities and English language learners. In our scale-up of the TEP program we have included District 75 schools (those exclusively serving self-contained special education classes) and have worked with their leadership to develop a list of possible evidence that school leaders may see that is thought to be indicative of excellent teaching in a special needs classroom, since student behaviors and work products may look somewhat different from what one might expect in a general education setting. A draft of this document is enclosed within this application packet for your reference.

PART C: SUPPORTING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION

NYCDOE believes strongly that the implementation of a new teacher evaluation model must be accompanied by high-quality, timely, comprehensive professional development (PD) systems for both teachers and school leaders. NYCDOE's Teacher Effectiveness Program (TEP), which builds upon the work of earlier pilot programs¹¹, has committed extensive resources to developing PD structures and opportunities to support teachers' and principals' needs; these initiatives are described in greater detail below. TIF funding will enable NYCDOE to significantly expand on these efforts by creating unique, school-embedded peer leadership roles

¹¹ In the 2010-11 school year, the DOE launched a pilot called the Teacher Effectiveness Project with 20 schools to begin to understand the school conditions and practices that lead to accelerated teacher learning. In the 2011-12 school year, the DOE continued this work with 106 schools across six networks in what was referred to as the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot. For the 2012-13 school year, we anticipate the Talent Effectiveness Program (TEP) to involve approximately 200 schools, including 70 that were also participants in the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot and were selected to continue their work through TEP to further build their capacity to support strong teacher effectiveness practices in their schools. For the purposes of clarity, the full scope of teacher effectiveness pilot work will be referred throughout this document as TEP.

for teachers and leaders to improve their effectiveness. These roles will be piloted in high-need middle schools and will enable educators to get regular, individualized feedback aligned with the new teacher evaluation model from those whose feedback and support is often most important: their colleagues.

Research has shown that highly effective teachers not only have a direct impact on increasing student achievement in their own classrooms, but also indirectly impact student achievement through the positive effects of peer learning on increasing the knowledge and skills of their colleagues¹². While much of this impact may happen through informal teacher networks, the proposed career lattice would create more formal opportunities for peer-to-peer learning. Within this distributive leadership structure, educators will share new knowledge with one another, leading to the overall improvement of instructional and leadership practices. To ensure the success of this new pilot teacher career lattice, teachers in peer leadership roles would engage in tailored PD, while principals would be coached in utilizing distributive leadership structures.

CURRENT EFFORTS TO CREATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

NYCDOE has committed significant resources to creating systems to improve teacher effectiveness and support teacher development, particularly in the proposed TIF schools that have been (or will be) part of TEP. As New York State moves toward implementation of a new four-point evaluation system for teachers that incorporates measures of teacher practice and student learning, NYCDOE is also moving away from old structures of teacher observation and feedback (one classroom observation with a “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” rating) to a model

¹² Jackson, C.K. & Bruegmann, E. (2009). Teaching Students and Teaching Each Other: The Importance of Peer Learning for Teachers. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1 (4), 85-108. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/c_kirabo_jackson/13/.

that emphasizes regular observation and feedback (six observations with a four-point evaluation rating), along with aligned PD.

As discussed above, during the 2012-13 school year, TEP school leaders will be expected to:

- Observe teachers at least six times per year, including two observations during Common Core-aligned units of study;
- Provide teachers with regular feedback on their practice and related student work products following each observation;
- Provide teachers with targeted PD based on observations and aligned to the Danielson Framework for Teaching;
- Conduct developmental conversations with teachers at the middle and end of the school year; and
- Work with teachers to measure performance based on improved student achievement.

To support this work, educators will attend PD sessions before and during the school year to build their knowledge of the Danielson Framework and strengthen observation and feedback practices. This builds upon the PD provided to TEP participants during the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot¹³. During the summer and fall of 2011, for example, TEP participants had opportunities to view and rate classroom practice via common videos and analyze sample goal-setting proposals for teachers based on student outcome measures used in their classes. In the spring, school leaders participated in breakout sessions such as using the data management system to track observations and feedback, reviewing the rigor of classroom assessments, or using data to drive instructional feedback and other school decisions. Teachers also attended

¹³ Seventy of the TEP schools were also participants in the 2011-12 Talent Management Pilot and were selected to continue their work through TEP to further build their capacity to support strong teacher effectiveness practices in their schools.

breakout sessions to deepen their understanding of effective practice on individual competencies included in the classroom observation rubric.

For the 2012-13 school year, these knowledge-building and PD opportunities will be augmented for teachers, school leaders, and administrators, as well as network staff:

- **School leaders and administrators** will receive PD during the summer and school year to strengthen their knowledge of the Danielson Framework. Each TEP school leader also receives the support of a “talent coach,” a centrally-based teacher effectiveness expert who meets with the school leader two to four times a month to support all aspects of implementing the teacher evaluation and development model, including conducting co-observations with school leaders, coaching on use of the Danielson Framework as well as coaching on providing quality feedback and professional development to teachers.
- **Teachers** will receive PD on the Danielson Framework and teacher evaluation and development model, including centrally-provided foundational PD, periodic network-based PD and at least three rounds of school-based PD throughout the school year that is differentiated based on observation data in conjunction with review of student work
- **Network leaders, achievement coaches, and other instructional staff** will build their knowledge of the Danielson Framework and related observation and feedback processes by attending TEP PD sessions, co-creating and facilitating school leader PD on teacher effectiveness during the school year, and facilitating teacher-centered PD on aspects of the Danielson Framework. Achievement coaches and other network instructional staff members will add additional capacity to support school leaders by shadowing talent coaches on school visits to build their familiarity with TEP work.

In addition to the above, school leaders, network staff, and TEP staff will engage in ongoing conversations about retention, teacher assignment, and leadership identification to strengthen the connection between evaluation and teacher development.

A strong data management system, Achievement Reporting and Innovation System (ARIS), already provides a foundation for identifying the PD needs of individual educators and schools by connecting student performance with individual classes and teachers. School leaders can examine this data through a variety of lenses (e.g., past and current student performance, attendance, special population categories) and on a number of different levels (e.g., by teacher, class, subject area, grade level, school, etc.). Teachers also have access to their classroom data in order to identify the needs of their classes.

ARIS Learn is an additional component of the larger ARIS platform that also serves as a center for PD opportunities for both teachers and school leaders. Within ARIS Learn, educators and school leaders can self-assess performance along the school leadership competencies and/or the Danielson Framework, develop learning plans based on these assessments that can be shared and provide opportunities to recommend resources and feedback. In addition, ARIS Learn provides immediate access to learning opportunities including modules, documents, videos, templates and in-person workshops that are aligned to competencies.

School leaders who participated in TEP during the 2011-12 school year (and those who will participate in TEP during the 2012-13 school year) have added features via the Talent Management section of the ARIS Learn platform – to record observation evidence, notes, and ratings and to identify the PD needs of individual educators. This platform thus becomes a

central place for teachers to see school leader's feedback and immediately connect recommendations for development with the aforementioned PD resources available online.

School leaders and teachers who have participated in TEP report that the PD supports they need are having a meaningful impact on their practice:

- Participating school leaders report spending an average of 2.1 more hours per week on teacher effectiveness tasks at the end of the year (June 2012) than they reported at the beginning of year (September 2011).
- 86% of participating school leaders strongly agree or agree that “All teachers were observed more frequently this school year, than before [TEP].”
- 70% of participating school leaders strongly agree or agree that “Teachers experienced more tailored development due to an increased knowledge of their performance.”
- 67.9% of teachers agree that [TEP] helped them identify strengths and weaknesses in their instructional practice.
- 64.7% of participating teachers agree that they were able to identify resources to help them grow in areas identified in feedback received during the past school year.
- 75% of participating teachers agree that if the [TEP] model is implemented well, it will enable them to develop in areas most needed to impact student.

Anecdotal evidence further demonstrated success: clearer expectations and communications between administrators and teachers, alignment of school-wide PD and the establishment of a common language, and a greater prioritization of observation, feedback, and development.

Given this record of success, the NYCDOE believes it is well-positioned to build upon this work by further involving educators through the additional PD systems outlined below.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO CREATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

While the PD systems outlined above provide multiple opportunities for teachers and school leaders to develop and improve their effectiveness, TIF would provide significantly increased opportunities and lead to even greater impact in schools and for students. With resources to create school-based, timely, job-embedded opportunities for educators within TIF schools, NYCDOE will institute a “bottom-up” approach in which peer teacher leaders take on additional responsibilities to model and share best practices and support their colleagues’ professional development and their overall efforts to improve instruction. Through a pilot “career lattice,” TIF schools will be dynamic places of distributive leadership structures, enhanced teacher engagement, and ultimately better teacher and student performance.

Below is a description of proposed new peer leadership roles to support teacher effectiveness:

Table 2: PROPOSED PEER LEADERSHIP ROLES FOR TIF SCHOOLS

Position Title	Target Teacher Groups Being Supported	Key Skills/Knowledge Required	Key Responsibilities Likely to Improve Teaching Practice and Student Outcomes
Peer Instructional Coach	Teachers of varying levels of practice and experience (school-based position)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others ✓ Motivation, coaching, and listening skills ✓ Ability to deliver effective PD (individual and group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Supports teachers to improve instruction and student learning aligned to Danielson Framework ➤ Deepens connections between formative classroom visits, debriefs and professional learning experiences ➤ Coordinates school based support activities ➤ Plays role on school teacher teams ➤ <u>Minimum of teaching one period a day</u>
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	Peer Instructional Coaches at 5-7 schools (centrally-based position)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Extensive command of the Danielson Framework ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Works across participating schools with principals, Peer Instructional Coaches, and Network support staff to provide peer feedback and support teacher development

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ability to design and deliver effective PD (group-focused) ✓ Strategic and organizational skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provides regular support to Peer Instructional Coaches ➤ Conducts non-evaluative rigorous and consistent observations aligned with the Danielson Framework
Demonstration Teacher	Teachers of varying levels of practice and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others ✓ Ability to deconstruct one's own teaching practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Builds laboratory classroom for teachers to visit ➤ Responsibilities may include: modeling lessons; exploring emerging instructional practices tools/techniques; reflecting on and debriefing own lessons with colleagues; creating classroom videos to share, etc.
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	Pre-service teachers that are part of NYCDOE pipeline programs (Apprentices)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Motivation, coaching, and listening skills ✓ Induction and mentoring knowledge and skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Models best practices in the classroom ➤ Cultivates, mentors, and develops Apprentices ➤ Provides feedback as pre -service teachers lead segments of classroom instruction

There are a number of ways in which new peer leadership roles will lead to PD that is individualized, timely, school-based and job-embedded, and likely to improve instructional and leadership practices. By creating peer leadership roles focused on teacher effectiveness and development, we will significantly improve our ability to identify the PD needs of individual educators and schools. While school leaders and administrators will continue to serve as evaluators, Peer Instructional Coaches will become critical additional members of the school community providing individualized feedback and support to colleagues. The Peer Instructional Coaches will achieve this by building purposeful relationships with colleagues and utilizing their time doing classroom visits and debriefs, as well as structure meaningful peer learning opportunities aligned to the Danielson Framework. The other peer leadership roles will also be involved: working closely with the Ambassador, teams of peer leaders and teachers within TIF schools will become highly knowledgeable on the Danielson Framework. Teachers, who may have otherwise felt less willing to seek feedback and PD from an administrator, will now have multiple potential partners to identify their PD needs and provide them with appropriate support.

School leaders and their school communities will have similarly expanded opportunities for individualized feedback. Talent coaches will continue to work with individual principals and assistant principals (APs), while the distributive leadership structure of the pilot lattice will allow teams of teacher leaders to come together to identify the individual needs of their school. In addition, the creation of “lab sites” at higher-capacity TIF schools will allow peer leaders and principals to identify what may or may not be working at their schools. Teachers will have opportunities to see other teachers in action and learn from them; similarly, school administrators at non-lab sites will be able to learn from effective practices of school administrators at lab sites.

Working with their school leaders, these peer leadership teams will form powerful professional learning communities at their schools. Feedback will become more immediate and accessible – just as we have expected school leaders to follow up with their teachers within a week, we expect similar follow-up from peer leaders. Indeed, the work of TEP has demonstrated that NYCDOE has the ability to implement structures that directly lead to improved instructional and leadership practices. The “cycles” of feedback and PD that school leaders implemented will be emulated by the peer leaders – creating a united approach that will move the conversation away from fear and anxiety around “teacher evaluation” to openness and interest regarding “teacher development.”

These types of distributive leadership structures already exist in New York City's most successful schools, as demonstrated in several schools that participated TEP during the past two years¹⁴. By instituting formal peer leader titles, along with providing additional compensation to recognize this critical work, we expect this type of distributive leadership to be the standard at TIF schools. Through these school-based, job-embedded opportunities, peer leaders will have the capacity and the expertise to transfer knowledge and best practices to their colleagues.

¹⁴ “NYC Teacher Effectiveness Program White Paper #2: Early Implementation Challenges,” 2011

Additionally, peer leaders will engage teachers in career pathways that allow them to exercise leadership skills through responsibilities beyond teaching. The DOE's experience with the Lead Teacher program, along with previous initiatives like the Master Teacher and Turnaround Teacher program, demonstrated that teachers are eager for opportunities to share knowledge with colleagues. By implementing a career “lattice” in TIF schools, we can identify which positions are most effective in engaging teachers, supporting colleagues, and leading to improved performance in schools. Such positions can then be expanded to other schools in the system.

TRAINING AND SUPPORT FOR PEER LEADERS

Some PD is already planned through the TEP, which is focused on building knowledge for school leaders and network staff while ensuring that each school has a high-quality PD plan in place. For the 2012-13 school year, for example, at least two days of teacher-centered PD on aspects of the Danielson Framework and teaching development strategies is planned. This work will continue to move forward and expand during TIF grant years.

At the same time, the integration of peer leadership roles will move teacher effectiveness work farther and enable teachers to get even greater individualized support. Teams of peer teacher leaders will be imbued with knowledge regarding the Danielson Framework that can then be turn-keyed to colleagues. Ambassadors will coordinate with peer instructional coaches and other school-based colleagues to identify needs and respond appropriately. PD opportunities will multiply with each additional peer leader, who will have the capacity to go into classrooms, meet with colleagues, and coordinate with their school leaders to meet the needs of their school.

To build this knowledge in peer leader positions, along with coaching and mentoring skills, NYCDOE plans to offer centrally-coordinated and network-aligned PD. The nature of this PD

will be in accordance with the responsibilities associated with each role. Ambassadors, for example, would participate in intensive initial training and ongoing PD on the Danielson Framework to become calibrated on their understanding of what constitutes effective teaching practice. Demonstration Teachers will be provided strategies and resources so that they can share their best practices with colleagues, as well as with other demonstration teachers (e.g., through online tools, videos, inter-visitation schedules, etc.). Pre-service Apprentice Mentors will be exposed to new teacher induction methods as well as coordinating with related teacher pipeline programs. These rich opportunities for PD will allow peer leaders to be the first line in transferring new knowledge, new initiatives, and new skills to their colleagues.

School leaders will also receive coaching and PD to help implement and manage these new peer leadership positions (in addition to the PD they will already be receiving from TEP). Central and network staff will support school leaders in designing a staffing and organizational plan to ensure that peer leadership roles are distributed evenly and used strategically. By working together with talent coaches and network staff, school leaders will be well-equipped to successfully implement a distributive leadership structure at their school to achieve better results with students.

PART D: INVOLVEMENT OF EDUCATORS

As we prepare for system-wide implementation of our new teacher evaluation and development system, NYCDOE has been and will continue to be very intentional about soliciting educator feedback and making adjustments to evaluation and related systems (e.g., professional development) to reflect their feedback. We believe strongly that successful implementation of these systems will be possible only if educators in the field agree with the principles behind them and genuinely find them meaningful and useful. Ensuring that teachers' and school leaders'

perspectives are represented in the development of these systems is an important way that we engender and cultivate support among those who are engaged in critical work in schools every day. Further, we are committed to engaging with our teacher and school leader unions in this work so that we can proceed in pursuit of our shared goal of better schools for our students. The letter of support for this grant proposal from New York City United Federation of Teachers President Michael Mulgrew, which is included in Part 6 of this application, serves as evidence of this commitment. Because the principal performance-based compensation system has already been negotiated with the Council of School Supervisors & Administrators and is written into the principal contract, school leader union support is implicit.

Historically, the vast majority of New York City public school teachers have been rated “Satisfactory”; in 2009-10 fewer than 3% of teachers received an “Unsatisfactory” (“U”) rating. Even in the rare cases when a U-rating is given, it does not prompt specific development interventions or targeted support. In its failure to distinguish between teachers of varying levels of performance, this system frustrates high-achieving teachers whose good work goes unrecognized, neglects hard-working teachers who would benefit from additional guidance and support, and ignores teachers who persistently perform poorly. The new evaluation system being developed through TEP is intended to address these deficiencies, and it is aligned with the requirements of New York State Education Law 3012-c – legislation that our educators’ unions helped to shape. TEP has also provided an opportunity for NYCDOE to learn more about educator perspectives on both the old and new systems so that we could adjust our approach as necessary to ensure that educators’ concerns and priorities were factored into policy making. We will continue to use this approach as this work moves forward through TEP and the TIF-supported performance-based career lattice.

EDUCATOR FEEDBACK ON EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Teacher Effectiveness Program has incorporated the opinions, ideas and feedback of teachers and school leaders over the last two years. Educators contributed to TEP's design and implementation in a number of ways, including:

- Formal surveys at the beginning, middle, and end of each school year
- Direct feedback to talent coaches
- Discussions and exit surveys at centrally provided in-person PD sessions
- Teacher town hall meetings in all 5 boroughs in both fall and spring
- Targeted focus groups on issues related to both design and implementation
- A “think tank” to provide feedback and develop promising practices
- Lab sites established to drive effective implementation

The data collected through these feedback mechanisms strongly indicate that educators are asking for change. Teachers and school leaders alike overwhelmingly feel that there is a gap between the development and teacher leadership opportunities that currently exist and what is needed. Some salient examples of data gathered from surveys are presented below.

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED FROM TEACHERS

To better understand teachers' needs and concerns around the evaluation system, NYCDOE surveyed 805 teachers in pilot schools about their opinion of the current evaluation system at the beginning of the 2010-11 school year. The survey showed that the vast majority of teachers who responded do not believe the current evaluation system is accurate or useful. An overwhelming number of teachers (80%) want feedback throughout the year, for example, but fewer than half of the teachers who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they get enough feedback on their

instructional practice. The new evaluation system, which prioritizes ongoing feedback cycles, addresses this concern directly.

Many of the teachers surveyed supported the changes being proposed through the TEP. 77% of teachers who responded to the survey noted above indicated that they support annual formative evaluations that identify clear areas of development for all teachers; 81% said that the teacher evaluation and development process should take into account student outcomes and growth. In short, New York City's teachers know the present system is inadequate and they have faith that a future system could be better for them and for other teachers, and our new system is aligned with the goals that teachers themselves have for an evaluation system.

We also learned that teachers' satisfaction with the new evaluation and development system was highly related to their view of the quality of implementation of the pilot in their school. Among teachers who agreed that (a) their evaluator assessed them fairly, (b) they received clear communications about the pilot model and processes, (c) they received sufficient feedback on their practice, and (d) their evaluator observed their practice frequently enough, over 65% are satisfied with the pilot. These figures underscore NYCDOE's belief in the need to focus resources on supporting strong, comparable implementation across all schools.

Finally, survey data has also revealed substantial interest in teacher leadership. A survey of teachers participating in TEP in 2011-12 found that around two-thirds of 670 teacher respondents were interested in leadership opportunities. Through our proposed career lattice, we would offer such opportunities to effective teachers, thereby responding to teachers' feedback regarding their interest in these opportunities while also creating opportunities for teachers to engage in peer learning and improve educator practice more broadly.

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED FROM SCHOOL LEADERS

According to the end-of-year survey that was administered to school leaders who participated in TEP in 2011-12, 92% net agree that the new model is more effective at differentiating teacher performance than the existing system. This tells us we are indeed making strides in our ability to identify performance levels, and also in terms of school leaders' investment in the new system. This is important. The new model essentially asks schools to make teacher evaluation and development their top priority. This represents a fundamental change for most schools—one that requires substantial reallocation of staff time and responsibilities. Feedback we received indicates this is a welcome change for most school leaders.

Surveys of TEP school leaders illustrate the extent of the time reallocation that will be necessary for most school leaders. Before TEP, these school leaders spent an average of about 12 hours a week on tasks related to evaluation and development, such as reviewing student achievement data to help develop teachers. While participating in TEP, school leaders reported spending an average of 14 hours a week on evaluation and development. At the same time, the amount of time school leaders spent on tasks related to school management and administration decreased from 22 hours a week to 18.5 hours a week. Most importantly, 86% of school leaders agreed that all teachers in their school were observed more frequently than before the pilot.

On average, though, school leaders want to spend even more time on evaluation and development work: about 23 hours a week, compared to only 10 hours a week that they want to spend on management and administration. But many school leaders also report that finding more time to devote to teacher evaluation and development is a challenge. Nearly 80% of school

leaders cited finding sufficient time to implement all the components of the new evaluation and development system as one of the top two challenges they faced during the pilot.

At first glance, survey results seem to indicate the ratio of teachers to evaluators at some schools may be the root cause of their time challenges. Indeed, nearly two-thirds of respondents said that they simply cannot manage the number of teachers they supervise and support. But these administrators supervise an identical number of teachers on average—about 24—as those who say they can manage the teachers assigned to them.

This suggests that many school leaders have found ways to manage teacher/evaluator ratios that others see as unrealistic, by organizing their staff and delegating responsibilities in a way that gives administrators enough time to devote to teacher evaluation and development¹⁵. In general, pilot schools that established organizational structures to help them allocate more time to evaluation and development have had the most success in implementing a new evaluation and development system. The career lattice that we are proposing as part of our performance-based compensation system would facilitate this type of distributed leadership, which our research to date shows is integral to successful implementation of the new teacher evaluation system. In addition, the principals who have demonstrated high leadership and management capacity may be asked to contribute to the career lattice pilot by hosting lab sites at their schools.

These data all demonstrate that there is a very real appetite among our teachers and school leaders for more frequent and higher quality feedback and professional development as well as a career lattice that provides opportunities for differentiated compensation. By creating a robust human capital management system, rooted in a nuanced evaluation system and including

¹⁵ “NYC Teacher Effectiveness Project Whitepaper #2: Early Implementation Challenges,” 2011

performance-based compensation opportunities, we are responding to feedback that we have repeatedly heard directly from teachers and school leaders. Feedback from participants in this year's evaluation pilot suggests we are on the right track: 84% of school leaders net agree that implementing the pilot model increased student achievement outcomes for all their teachers, and 75% of teachers net agree that, if implemented well, the new evaluation and development system will enable them to develop in areas most needed to help them impact student achievement.

CHANGES BASED ON FEEDBACK

Educator feedback has led to changes in the design and implementation of our new evaluation and development model. NYCDOE has adjusted its approach as a direct result of educator feedback in several critical areas related to both design and implementation.

First, in response to feedback from teachers that their satisfaction in the pilot was strongly related to quality of implementation, NYCDOE is enhancing its support structure this year to ensure school leaders have access to the resources they need to do this work well. Schools will again have access to a Talent Coach to assist with implementation and rating calibration; this year, they will also receive additional support from their school networks, who agreed to make teacher effectiveness work a priority area this year as a condition of participating in our pilot. Finally, NYCDOE will amplify its efforts to provide school leaders with tools and resources to calibrate their classroom observation ratings to ensure fair and equitable ratings across schools.

Second, teachers told us that we did not provide enough resources to help them develop their classroom practice, so the 2012-13 TEP will ask participating schools (with support from NYCDOE and their school networks) to provide substantially more professional development opportunities for teachers, including at least one PD opportunity designed to ensure foundational

knowledge of the TEP Teacher Practice Rubric, as well as three rounds of differentiated PD opportunities to which teachers will be directed based on data collected via classroom observations and review of student work.

Finally, the development of the proposed career lattice itself is in response to educator feedback. Principals at pilot schools have shared that capacity is an obstacle to successful implementation of the evaluation system, and we know that the most successful principals have engaged in distributed leadership practices. The career lattice will facilitate distributed leadership practices that will enable principals to implement the new system successfully and will also allow teachers to receive richer and more frequent development opportunities. It will also offer effective teachers access to leadership opportunities that they both exhibited an interest in via surveys and which research shows makes them more likely to stay in our city's classrooms.

EDUCATOR INPUT MOVING FORWARD

As illustrated above, educator input into the development of the evaluation system and career lattice has been extensive and will continue to be extensive. We firmly believe that ongoing input is crucial to the success of this initiative and we will build in a variety of opportunities for meaningful educator involvement to help shape the direction and evolution of successive stages. During the planning year, we will solicit input from TEP participants regarding our proposed career lattice through several focus groups and surveys and make adjustments as needed to ensure that the performance-based career lattice we will pilot beginning in the 2013-14 school year is designed in a way that addresses educators' needs, interests and concerns. Each year of implementation will include middle- and end-of-year focus groups and surveys through which we will collect additional feedback and continue to adjust course as necessary; please see Part E

(Project Management) for additional information on the feedback and revision cycle we plan to implement. Because the lattice we pilot will be heavily informed by educators' feedback on the front end, we hope that any such adjustments will be minimal, much like changes have been over the course of TEP. However, we know that it is crucial that we build in opportunities for educators to provide additional feedback throughout all implementation years so that we are able to continually refine our performance-based compensation system based on that feedback.

PART E: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The project will be led by Vicki Bernstein (Deputy CEO, Division of Human Resources and Talent) and Amy Way (Executive Director, Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality). They will be ultimately responsible for ensuring that high-level project objectives are met in a timely manner and that relevant stakeholders from other divisions of NYCDOE have opportunities to collaborate when their areas of focus and expertise intersect with the project. The Director of the Strategic Incentives team, which resides within the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, will more directly lead the project by managing toward intermediate goals and coordinating monthly, weekly, and daily work for other project staff. The Strategic Incentives team, which currently is limited to four Program Managers, intends to add a Project Director to lead overall implementation, along with two Project Managers to support the TIF project. Specific job responsibilities will be assigned based on those individuals' unique strengths and preferences, but generally speaking, the Project Director will be responsible for working with school-based project participants as well as key stakeholders from across the DOE to ensure that the project is

implemented in a high-quality way and that the work shifts as needed in response to feedback from participants, while the Project Managers will conduct data analyses, manage communications, and complete similar tasks. Additionally, the resources from the grant will fund a senior staff person to manage the Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors and ensure they are being supported in their work. The Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador will oversee the recruitment, training, support, and ongoing management of the centrally-based Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors. This team will directly oversee the management of the career lattice strategy, including the overarching HCMS and PBCS.

HUMAN RESOURCES ALLOCATION

We believe that the Project Director, Project Managers and Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador will provide sufficient capacity to support this work without compromising other key projects and initiatives that currently reside with the Strategic Incentives team. The DOE will provide “in kind” support to the TIF program through the efforts of the Office of Teacher Effectiveness, which oversees TEP, the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, which houses the Strategic Incentives team that will oversee TIF, as well as key staff from the Division of Human Resources and Talent and the Division of Academics, Performance and Support.

Specifically, Kirsten Busch Johnson, Executive Director, Office of Teacher Effectiveness within the Division of Human Resources and Talent will oversee and direct the implementation of the approach to teacher evaluation aligned with State Law §3012-c. The Office of Teacher Effectiveness includes a staff dedicated to developing our local strategy, designing and implementing professional development to support it and deploying Talent Coaches who directly support principals with the implementation the new evaluation within their school.

Joanna Cannon, Chief Strategic Officer of the Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, and Sarah Foster, Deputy Executive Director of the Office of Research and Data oversee the design of data systems to support the implementation of the new evaluation as well as lead in the approach to negotiation of the new APPR for principals in accordance with 3012-c.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Objective 1: Successful implementation of the career lattice described within this application at schools selected for project participation.

Measure 1a: By the end of project year 2, 70% of participating school leaders who respond to a survey indicate a net positive response to questions around satisfaction with (1) the range of career lattice positions available, (2) the support DOE provides for the selection and development for teacher leaders in career lattice roles, (3) impact career lattice has on teacher development and student learning, (4) impact career lattice has retention of high performing teachers, (5) impact career lattice has on attracting high performing teachers to a high need school community.

Measure 1b: By the end of project year 2, 70% of career lattice teachers respond net positive to questions around satisfaction with 1) the range of career lattice positions available, (2) the support DOE provides for the selection and development for teacher-leaders in career lattice roles, 3) impact career lattice has on teacher development and student learning, (4) impact career lattice has retention of high performing teachers, (5) impact career lattice has on attracting high performing teachers to the school.

Measure 2: By the end of project year 3, evidence of a positive correlation between implementation of distributed leadership models via the career lattice and increased student achievement. (Note: this measure will be re-evaluated following project years 4 and 5.)

By the end of project year 5:

Measure 3: Evidence of a positive correlation between availability of in-school advancement opportunities and effective and highly effective teacher retention.

Measure 4a: 80% of participating school leaders who respond to a survey indicate a net positive response to questions around satisfaction with (1) the range of career lattice positions available and (2) the support DOE provides for the selection and development for teacher leaders in career lattice roles, (3) impact career lattice has on teacher development and student learning, (4) impact career lattice has retention of high performing teachers, (5) impact career lattice has on attracting high performing teachers to a high need school community.

Measure 4b: By the end of project year 2, 80% of career lattice teachers respond net positive to questions around satisfaction with 1) the range of career lattice positions available, (2) the support DOE provides for the selection and development for teacher-leaders in career lattice roles, 3) impact career lattice has on teacher development and student learning, (4) impact career lattice has retention of high performing teachers, (5) impact career lattice has on attracting high performing teachers to the school.

Objective 2: Successful implementation of a rigorous evaluation system for both teachers and school leaders, based partly on student growth, which serves as the primary driver for a range of

human capital decisions, including professional development, promotion, and termination, at schools selected for project participation.

By the end of project year 3:

Measure 1: 100% of participating schools evaluate teachers and school leaders based on the evaluation system described within this application, and make professional development, promotion, and termination decisions based on evaluation data.

Measure 2: 100% of teachers and school leaders who receive “Ineffective” as their final rating are placed on improvement plans. (Note: This goal will be assessed again at the end of project years 4 and 5.)

Measure 3: By the end of project year 4, 80% of the teachers and school leaders who were on improvement plans earn a rating of at least “Developing,” and those who earn a second consecutive “Ineffective” rating are terminated. (Note: This goal will be assessed again at the end of project year 5.)

Measure 4: By the end of project year 5, there is evidence of a positive correlation between the evaluation system and student academic growth.

Objective 3: Successful implementation of a robust and comprehensive professional development system that provides support and opportunities for growth to teachers based on their levels of performance.

Measure 1: By the end of project year 3, 60% of teachers and school leaders at participating schools have attended at least 4 professional development opportunities offered according to their performance levels and/or leadership roles.

By the end of project year 5:

Measure 2: 80% of teachers and school leaders at participating schools have attended at least 3 professional development opportunities offered according to their performance levels and/or leadership roles.

Measure 3: By the end of project year 5, 80% of teachers and school leaders who attended 2 or more professional development opportunities offered according to their performance levels and/or leadership roles and responded to a survey following said opportunity(/ies) indicated a net positive response to a question about the session as a good use of time.

Measure 4: By the end of project year 5, evidence exists to support the impact of professional development via career lattice roles positively impacting teacher performance levels.

Objective 4: Majority support for the HCMS from teachers and school leaders at participating schools.

Measure 1: By the end of project year 3, 60% of teachers and school leaders at participating schools who respond to a survey provide a net positive response to questions designed to assess the following:

The evaluation system's ability to provide them with meaningful, actionable feedback to improve their practice;

The degree to which they are motivated by new leadership opportunities being offered;

The degree to which they feel supported by their direct supervisor in their professional growth.

Measure 2: By the end of project year 5, 80% of teachers and school leaders at participating schools who respond to a survey provide a net positive response to questions designed to assess the following:

The evaluation system's ability to provide them with meaningful, actionable feedback to improve their practice;

The degree to which they are motivated by new leadership opportunities being offered;

The degree to which they feel supported by their direct supervisor in their professional growth.

PROJECT EVALUATION PLAN

We will measure the success of this project according to the goals outlined above. In addition, we will measure our progress against these goals well in advance of their target dates and make changes as needed to ensure that we are continually refining and improving our work in order to meet teachers' and school leaders' needs and, ultimately, improve student growth and teacher retention at participating schools. In addition to soliciting teachers' and principals' feedback in year 1 so that it informs our initial iteration of the career lattice and associated professional development offerings, we will administer surveys and host focus groups for project participants at the middle and end of each implementation year and revise our models as needed. We will also analyze student achievement data and teacher and principal evaluation data at the end of each implementation year to identify trends and work to address any gaps we may identify before the start of the following school year.

PROJECT TIMELINE

During the planning year, we will focus on hiring project staff and preparing for the first year of implementation. We plan to hire a Project Director and two Project Managers by December 2012; finalize the career lattice (including process for evaluating individuals in these roles) with input from teachers, school leaders, UFT and other NYCDOE offices by February 2013; Hire Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors for Office of Teacher Effectiveness and solidify research partnership with external evaluator by March; invite “Effective” and “Highly Effective” teachers from participating schools to apply for career lattice positions¹⁶; and finalize central pool of teachers eligible for career lattice positions by May. In July, TEP will provide foundational professional development for participants in teacher effectiveness program, and in that same month, TIF project staff will finalize professional development offerings for the upcoming year with input from teachers, school leaders, and other DOE offices. In August, we will launch a TIF project website (to be updated throughout the project period) within ARIS, which will include info on career lattice, evaluation, and professional development, as well as resources and best practices based on work being done in participating schools. Finally, career lattice hiring decisions will also be finalized by August 2013.

We will prepare TIF schools for the work of the first implementation year (2013-14 school year) through an orientation meeting to be held in August 2013. In January 2014, we will administer midyear surveys and hold focus groups for all project participants in order to gather data to reflect on our progress and inform future work, and to celebrate our successes to date. In March, we will invite “Effective” and “Highly Effective” teachers from participating schools to apply for career lattice decisions, and finalize the central pool of teachers eligible for career lattice

¹⁶ Because the new teacher evaluation system per NYS Education Law 3012-c will not yet be implemented for stakes, we will use a proxy to determine effectiveness rating for this first year of implementation.

positions by May. In June, we will administer end-of-year surveys and hold focus groups whose intent will mirror that described above for midyear surveys and focus groups, and will also analyze relevant teacher and student data to measure against our goals (enumerated above). We will spend the summer using the various data we will have collected to make necessary adjustments to our project design for the following year, including professional development offerings, and the roles and responsibilities included in the career lattice, with input from teachers, school leaders, and other DOE offices. Career lattice hiring decisions will be finalized for the second year of implementation (2014-15 school year) by August 2014. Please note that differentiated professional development opportunities will be offered to educators at all participating schools at regular intervals throughout the year.

The following three years of implementation (2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years) will follow a cycle similar to that described above. An overview session at the beginning of each year will highlight any changes to the project design, drawing explicit connections between those changes and feedback from previous year. Data will be gathered from project participants via surveys and focus groups at the middle and end of each school year, and additional data will be analyzed at the end of the year to measure progress against goals. We will use that data to inform revisions to the project structure each summer. Throughout each year, differentiated professional development will remain a priority. We will also reflect on lessons learned during each implementation year and synthesize our learnings to form policy recommendations regarding salary structure and formal evaluation, which we plan to collectively bargain with our unions by September 2017, at which point the project period will close.

Concurrent with the TIF-supported career lattice work described above, NYCDOE will be implementing its new evaluation system across a growing number of schools. At schools where

the new evaluation system is in place, either for-stakes or as part of TEP, there will be several additional components, most notably: additional professional development opportunities, formal development conversations at the beginning and end of each year, and Improvement Plans for educators rated “Developing” or “Ineffective.” Educators receiving two consecutive “Ineffective” ratings may be subject to termination.

PART F: SUSTAINABILITY

NYCDOE has a very strong track record of success in designing and implementing large-scale reforms in a sustainable manner. During the early years of Children First, the central reform effort initiated in 2003, NYCDOE focused on creating system-wide coherence and stability with a streamlined structure and set of standards and systems for accountability. As of 2012, we have refined our system structures and supports with significant results. These systematic reforms have brought important successes: for example, the four year graduation rate for New York City public high schools held above 65% in 2011, an increase in 19 points since 2005 and the tenth consecutive year of gains. The NYCDOE is fully committed to providing all of the resources necessary for successful implementation of the proposed TIF project and to the development and implementation of a HCMS centered on supporting teachers to improve instruction for greater academic gains through a career lattice.

OVERARCHING SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

TIF will help fund the development, pilot and initial implementation of the teacher leadership career lattice. During this phase, we will be testing and analyzing effective practices for more widespread implementation. We intend to capture lesson plans, video, and trainings in ways that

allow for the development of interactive media (on-demand video, synchronous webinars, downloadable resources, etc.) to support succeeding generations of teacher leaders. Efforts to continue the program after the preliminary piloting and testing phases will no longer depend on supplemental funds. At the core of our sustainability plan are two concepts 1) the investment of key stakeholders – principals, teachers, and support networks – in the vision as well as resourcing of the grant and 2) a long term commitment to revising our teacher pay structure to formalize positions associated with added compensation for varying performance levels and roles and responsibilities.

A large portion of the activities to be carried out during year 1 are of a planning nature, in order to ensure that all core elements are in place prior to launching the initiative. We expect that the various stakeholders, including union representatives and personnel in the target schools, will need to engage in a significant amount of dialogue in order to solidify and fully embrace the mission of the initiative. We will identify key research questions to address the long term sustainability of a new teacher career lattice and identify a partner to support our research.

Beginning in year 2, while project planning and ongoing management of grant activities will continue at the same level, the main focus of the project management team will be on getting the TIF program up and running in all participating schools. This will include tasks such as ensuring that all TIF-related positions are filled and addressing any issues that arise within the schools. In addition, staff will receive training on the new or revised evaluation systems to promote their understanding of the specific measures of educator effectiveness included in the evaluation systems, as well as training on how to use the data collected from the review process to develop individualized professional development plans aimed at improving their leadership or instructional practice. We expect to see lessons emerging in years 2 in beyond that will inform

how we approach collective bargaining the revised salary schedule. Our initial proposal is to adjust the differential pay for added professional development credits to reflect merit. By year 4 we hope to initiate formal conversations about the salary structure and formalize them based on the learnings of the TIF grant by year 5.

Included below we elaborate on plans for the budgeting, commitment and resource sustainability.

We are confident that our program will be feasible and sustainable for the following reasons:

1. **FOUNDATIONAL WORK UNDERWAY:** As described in previous sections, NYCDOE has invested significantly in the implementation of our Teacher Effectiveness Program. Our school leaders in the program take part in professional development and receive support from Talent Coaches. Since the inception of the Talent Management Program in 2010, we have taken steps to grow it to 400 of our nearly 1,700 schools in the coming school year. The career lattice roles proposed through the TIF grant play a critical role in ensuring the sustainability by bridging the central support to principals with teacher leaders. By involving our teachers in the observation, feedback, and development process in a purposeful way we will invest them in the success of the new system and the opportunities it will present for all teachers to grow and achieve more with students.
2. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS WITH PREVIOUS CAREER LATTICE ROLES WITH ADDITIONAL PAY:** The proposed teacher leadership career lattice builds upon existing teacher leadership positions. Current teacher leader positions include: Lead Teachers, Common Core Fellows (develop and review instructional materials), mentors, and achievement coaches. There is considerable interest among our teachers in assuming these positions, as evidenced by a high volume of applications each year. We have piloted career

ladder roles with additional pay in partnership with our local union, the United Federation of Teachers, through the Master and Turnaround Teacher program funded through School Improvement Grants. This experience offers valuable lessons learned, which will enable us to make smart design choices with the roles proposed through this grant. The most critical difference between current opportunities and what we hope to achieve through TIF is the integral connection with the improvement of instruction through rubric-based observation, feedback, and professional development as well as the connection between career opportunities and teacher evaluation outcomes. Based on our determination of which roles prove to be most successful through the TIF grant, we will revise our career lattice structure where ineffective positions will be phased out and successful ones formalized. TIF support will help us to expand and enhance this mission through incorporation of the most current promising practices in more innovative ways.

- 3. INVESTMENT OF SCHOOLS AND NETWORKS:** School leaders and support networks know the best path for any given school to achieve its goals. Over the course of our TIF grant, we will actively engage networks and schools in decision-making about the TIF career lattice design and implementation. Beginning in year 1 of program implementation, schools will be asked to fund part of the salary for most of the lattice roles. Networks will be involved in the staff budgeting and professional development of principals and teachers on how to best utilize a career lattice structure for overall instructional improvement, which will lay the foundation of knowledge and skills need to continue the work beyond the life of the grant. The continued growth of the Lead Teacher program, for which some schools must fully fund or partially fund teacher leadership positions, indicates real commitment to this pay model and long-term value in such positions.

4. **BUDGET DESIGN AND OTHER FUNDING SOURCES:** NYCDOE has allocated significant resources – financial and non-financial – to the ongoing implementation of the TEP. Upon review of our budget you will see that the majority of TIF grant money will go to teacher performance/career lattice bonuses as opposed to full salaries. The vast majority of the cost for staff lines will be borne by NYCDOE as an in-kind contribution. As further evidence of NYCDOE’s strong commitment to implementing 3012-c, the educator evaluation law, we have sought out and have been awarded additional federal and non-federal resources in support of TIF activities, including:

- Funding from Title I under No Child Left Behind, which supports a wide range of direct service (e.g., targeted interventions) and professional development activities.
- Funding from Title IID ARRA, along with tax levy and Contracts for Excellence funding, to provide support for ARIS Learn, which be a part of the professional development resources available for the staff in the target schools.
- Funding from national corporate and private foundations, including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which has supported the development of the teacher evaluation pilot, among other high profile donors.
- Race to The Top funds and the Wallace Grant for School Leadership Development, both of which support teacher and school leader effectiveness.
- Funding from national corporate and private foundations, including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which has supported the development of the teacher evaluation pilot, among other high profile donors.

5. **REASONABLE COSTS:** The proposed expenditures are fully aligned with the priorities of the TIF grant: to seed a transformational human capital model that is designed to address student achievement challenges in the nation’s largest school system. Furthermore, the system will be self-sustaining long after the grant expires. While the US ED would be making a sizeable contribution to the development of the proposed performance-based compensation system, the return on investment will be substantial, both within New York City and for other large, urban school systems that may want to replicate the model.

Moreover, we believe the funds requested are both reasonable and sufficient to realize the project's full potential for meeting stated objectives and outcomes. All possible efforts have been made to minimize costs of this project and we believe the costs are reasonable in terms of the target population of students and staff to be served.

6. **COMMITTED LEADERSHIP:** Enhancing teacher effectiveness and fully developing the HCMS are core priorities for NYCDOE’s leadership team. Chancellor Dennis M. Walcott specifically cites “raising expectations for teaching and learning” as one of the three fundamental strategies we will pursue as we work to achieve college and career readiness for all students¹⁷. NYCDOE leadership including the Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, and the Deputy Chancellor for Talent, Labor, and Innovation are actively involved in setting strategy around teacher effectiveness and the HCMS, and they support the use of TIF funds to build the teacher leadership career lattice as an important component of these efforts. Attached are letters of support from our local teachers’ union (UFT), the New York State Department of Education (NYSED) and TNTP, a national expert in teacher talent.

¹⁷ “Raising the Bar for Students and Schools: Our Commitment to Action,” 2012

ADDENDUM: COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITIES

COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 4: NEW OR RURAL APPLICANTS TO THE TEACHER INCENTIVE FUND

NYCDOE has not implemented a TIF program project and hereby requests to be considered as a **new applicant**. We have formally requested this status via communications with Michael Yudin, Assistant Deputy Secretary.

COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 5: AN EDUCATOR SALARY STRUCTURE BASED ON EFFECTIVENESS

NYCDOE is proposing a revision of its teacher salary structure to include and build on the proposed performance-based career lattice roles in high-need schools that are the core of the TIF proposal. As with most public school districts, NYCDOE's current teacher salary structure provides higher compensation based on years of service and credits. The annual salary starts at \$45,530 for a first year teacher with just a Bachelor's degree and tops out at more than twice that amount: \$100,049, for a teacher with 22 or more years of service and 30 credits above a Master's degree. At the same time, it has been well established that neither longevity – past the fifth year of experience – nor coursework are strong predictors of teacher effectiveness in raising student achievement. While there may be other reasons to provide financial compensation tied to these factors (for example, creating stability in the workforce, making the position attractive for its long term financial prospects, and promoting teacher improvement through continuing education), that these factors not only trump actual performance in determining compensation but that actual performance isn't a factor at all is astounding.

NYCDOE sees the TIF program as a means to establish the value of performance-based compensation for its educators who take on additional roles (and responsibilities) to extend their success to positively influence their peers, and we will seek accordingly to amend the overall teacher salary structure by the fifth year of the grant (school year 2016-17). These changes are intended to be applied to all schools, including the high-need schools that will participate in the TIF program and which are specified in this application.

As described elsewhere in this proposal, the performance-based career lattice positions for teachers require candidates to achieve a minimum evaluation rating of Effective with some positions requiring a rating of Highly Effective (also as described elsewhere, these ratings are based on State law using a combination of measures of student learning/growth as well as performance on an evidence based rubric. The proposed change in the salary structure is, at a minimum, to incorporate these same compensation changes for all teachers. Hence:

- All teachers who are rated as Highly Effective who are selected and agree to take on the additional responsibilities as a Demonstration Teacher will have their annual salary adjusted by \$6,000 as long as they maintain that rating/role.
- All teachers who are rated as Highly Effective or Effective who are selected and agree to take on the additional responsibilities as a Peer Instructional Coach will have their annual salary adjusted by \$15,000 as long as they maintain that rating/role.

The TIF program will give NYCDOE an outstanding opportunity to gain insight and knowledge about the optimal adjustments to our salary structure, as well as provide a vehicle for the ongoing dialogue that will be necessary with our educators and their union to achieve these changes. To that end, it is the intent of NYCDOE to use the evaluation and findings from the first two years

of the implementation of TIF (2013-2015), as well as from its Teacher Effectiveness Program, to identify other opportunities to further adjust the salary schedule based on performance. For example, in addition to the salary schedule changes outlined above, there could be additional salary for those Highly Effective teachers who work in high-need schools, and/or a permanent salary adjustment and accelerated steps for educators who are Highly Effective for two consecutive years. NYCDOE will also seek to make more significant structural changes to the salary schedule to diminish/compress the increments based on years of service (particularly after the fifth year) and for coursework, and use the same resources to instead pay more to teachers who earn higher evaluation ratings. This shift may need to be phased in, with the new performance-based salary schedule applying to new hires while incumbents are given a choice to stay on the old salary schedule (adjusted for the new performance-based, career lattice roles) or the new schedule. Note also that the outcomes of the first two years of the implementation of the career ladder roles may lead to adjustments in the actual roles/responsibilities and compensation before they are incorporated into the overall salary schedule. In all cases of changes to the salary schedule, evaluation ratings will be determinative of the eligibility for the additional salary.

Below is a development and implementation timeline for an effectiveness-based salary schedule:

Timeline	Action
September 2013 – June 2017	Implementation of the TIF supported performance-based, career lattice roles in 70 high need schools
January 2014 and ongoing	Review and evaluation of outcomes of new performance-based, career lattice roles.
January 2015 – October 2015	Develop proposals for effectiveness-based salary schedule by reviewing evaluation of new TIF program, focus groups, surveys, dialogue with employee representatives, Task Force (see below) city and NYCDOE stakeholders/agencies, and financial analysis.

March 2015 – August 2015	Convene Joint NYCDOE –UFT Task Force to discuss preliminary proposals
Nov. 2015 – February 2016	Bargain new salary structure with the United Federation of Teachers
March 2016	Announce new salary structure and begin selection for new hires, transfers and career lattice positions which will fall under the new salary structure.
September 2016	Begin implementation of new, effectiveness-based salary structure for all NYCDOE schools and teachers.

NYCDOE teachers are represented by the UFT, and any changes to compensation, including the salary structure, would need to be collectively bargained. As this means that NYCDOE cannot unilaterally implement changes, we cannot provide absolute assurance that we will implement a new salary schedule. However, there is ample evidence from bargaining history with the UFT, as well as in current discussions about the performance-based career lattice roles and the new teacher evaluation system, to indicate this idea is feasible. Among the relevant precedents of compensation changes the UFT has agreed to in recent years are the following:

- Additional pay (approximately \$6,000) for educators who earn Professional Board Certification. Agreed to in 1997.
- Additional 15% pay to educators working in the State-designated lowest performing schools (Schools Under Registration Review); pay coupled with extended time. Agreed to in 1999.
- Additional pay (approximately \$11,000) for Lead Teachers – teachers selected through rigorous screening process to provide staff development support (half time) in high need schools. Agreed to as pilot in 2004 and citywide in 2006.

- School-wide performance bonuses of approximately \$3,000 for educators in up to 300 high need schools where the whole school met targets for substantial student gains. Agreed to in 2007 (pilot program implemented for three years).
- Additional pay (30% and 15%, respectively) to highly effective teachers selected through a rigorous process to serve as Master Teachers and Turnaround Teachers in persistently low achieving schools. These roles/positions each had additional responsibilities. Agreed to in 2010 and 2011.

In addition to these precedents, the UFT has clearly expressed an interest in such changes to compensation especially when coupled with teacher leader opportunities. Their letter in support of this application is evidence of their interest in performance-based, career lattice opportunities and their willingness to negotiate these roles with appropriate compensation. There is ongoing and open dialogue on related issues and the NYCDOE is fully committed to a collaborative approach on the implementation of TIF including on the final screening and selection for the career lattice roles among the pool of eligible, high performing candidates. This collaboration will also extend to involving the union in the evaluation of the TIF and how we can best take those learnings to apply the same concepts to a significant revision of the salary schedule for all teachers. We anticipate forming a Joint Task Force to formalize those discussions in advance of collective bargaining on the salary schedule.

The other important consideration in whether or not this approach will be feasible is financial. From the perspective of the union and its employees any changes must at best be break-even, and for the City, which has limited resources, it also must also be at or close to cost neutral. NYCDOE believes these objectives can be easily resolved by redirecting some of the salary

resources that are being paid out for coursework and longevity to performance and career lattice roles. The longevity and coursework differentials (as compared to base pay) account for 40% of the overall salary paid to teachers. Even reallocating a portion of these differentials – especially for new/newer teachers – should allow for a more robust salary structure that rewards and incentivizes excellence.

NYCDOE is deeply committed to the development of an effectiveness-based salary structure for our teachers, and to maintaining or enhancing what is in place for our principals.ⁱ We are confident that this can be achieved in collaboration with our union and welcome the opportunity to use the TIF program to launch this model in 70 of our high-need schools and use the TIF project as the foundation for a change for all of our teachers.

ⁱ Please note that as described elsewhere in this grant application, the salary structure for principals in the NYCDOE is already based on effectiveness. Principal effectiveness, which is currently measured by school ratings (which incorporate in large part student growth on assessments), results in higher compensation ranging from \$7,000 to \$25,000 a year. In addition, high performing principals who are selected to take on an assignment in a high needs school earn \$25,000 a year more as an Executive Principal conditional upon maintaining a high rating.

Other Attachment File(s)

* Mandatory Other Attachment Filename:

To add more "Other Attachment" attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

School Name	% Free and Reduced Lunch	PLA	SINI	Student Enrollment	%ELL	%SpEd
Academy for New Americans	89	No	No	152	91.4	0
Andries Hudde	74	No	No	1007	9.6	14.5
Bronx Early College Academy for Teaching & Learning	79.4	No	No	493	11	16.2
Bronx Writing Academy	82	No	No	472	30.5	15.7
Catherine & Count Basie Middle School 72	68	No	Yes	851	5.3	20.4
E.S.M.T- I.S. 190	69	No	No	246	10.6	18.7
EAST NEW YORK MIDDLE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	90	No	No	214	1.4	26.2
Elijah Stroud Middle School	82	No	No	180	5.6	20.6
Essence School	90	No	No	182	6.6	16.5
I.S. 010 Horace Greeley	91	No	No	940	14.4	14.1
I.S. 093 Ridgewood	69	No	No	1296	13.3	14.6
I.S. 125 Thom J. McCann Woodside	71	No	No	1642	19	11.4
I.S. 136 Charles O. Dewey	89	Yes	Yes	490	40.6	21
I.S. 141 The Steinway	63	No	Yes	1118	8.1	15
I.S. 204 Oliver W. Holmes	78	No	Yes	739	13.1	18.8
I.S. 206 Ann Mersereau	91	No	Yes	390	31.5	18.2
I.S. 228 David A. Boody	72	No	No	825	17.9	16.1
I.S. 229 Roland Patterson	94	No	Yes	220	20.5	30
I.S. 281 Joseph B Cavallaro	72	No	No	1221	17.7	15.6
I.S. 318 Eugenio Maria De Hostos	71	No	No	1647	5.3	10.9
I.S. 340	84	No	No	271	0.4	7.7
I.S. 347 School of Humanities	97	No	No	501	22	16.2
I.S. 349 Math, Science & Tech.	92	No	Yes	467	23.8	11.6
I.S. 364 Gateway	61	No	No	392	0.8	13.8
I.S. 392	64	No	No	311	0.6	4.2
I.S. X303 Leadership & Community Service	100	No	No	340	16.8	15.3
J.H.S. 013 Jackie Robinson	75.3	No	No	233	9	30.9
J.H.S. 118 William W. Niles	83	No	No	1163	11.3	13.2
J.H.S. 123 James M. Kieran	88.1	No	No	519	22.4	19.7
J.H.S. 125 Henry Hudson	84	No	Yes	632	17.9	17.6
J.H.S. 127 The Castle Hill	79	No	No	726	11.3	14.7
J.H.S. 131 Albert Einstein	76	No	No	839	6.4	19.7
J.H.S. 143 Eleanor Roosevelt	84	No	Yes	612	44.8	22.1
J.H.S. 144 Michelangelo	69	No	Yes	951	6.5	17.9
J.H.S. 145 Arturo Toscanini	86	No	Yes	485	36.1	21.6
J.H.S. 162 The Willoughby	90	No	No	531	18.5	21.3
J.H.S. 189 Daniel Carter Beard	75	No	No	814	29.2	10.9
J.H.S. 201 The Dyker Heights	68	No	No	1517	10.1	11.2
J.H.S. 210 Elizabeth Blackwell	76	No	No	2071	14	13.8
J.H.S. 220 John J. Pershing	88	No	No	1261	43.3	12
J.H.S. 226 Virgil I. Grissom	69	No	Yes	1328	6	18.1
J.H.S. 259 William Mckinley	82	No	Yes	1469	21.4	11.3
J.H.S. 291 Roland Hayes	95	No	Yes	643	26	15.7

J.H.S. 302 Rafael Cordero	76	No	Yes	924	18.7	14.5
J.H.S. 383 Philippa Schuyler	52.7	No	Yes	844	0.6	5.1
Knowledge and Power Preparatory Academy VI	69	No	No	264	4.9	6.4
M.S. 035 Stephen Decatur	79.7	No	No	228	0.4	23.7
M.S. 061 Dr. Gladstone H. Atwell	69.5	No	Yes	1073	5.2	12.4
M.S. 246 Walt Whitman	75	No	Yes	613	18.1	21.2
M.S. 250 West Side Collaborative Middle School	64	No	No	177	9.6	27.7
M.S. 256 Academic & Athletic Excellence	82	No	No	169	16	27.8
M.S. 328 - Manhattan Middle School for Scientific Inquiry	93	No	Yes	405	49.9	21.5
M.S. 582	81.7	No	No	313	8.9	29.1
M.S. K266 - Park Place Community Middle School	70	No	No	189	2.6	14.8
Mott Hall III	85	No	No	365	7.9	11.8
MS 596 Peace Academy	71.3	No	No	155	9.7	14.2
P.S. / I.S. 224	89.9	No	Yes	373	35.1	19.3
Satellite East Middle School	78.8	No	No	220	5	17.3
School for Global Leaders	71.1	No	No	271	11.4	25.5
School of Business, Finance and Entrepreneurship	71	No	No	188	8.5	31.4
Technology, Arts, and Sciences Studio	71	No	No	170	7.6	31.2
The Forward School	79	No	No	239	5.9	28
The Hunts Point School	93	No	No	388	19.1	23.2
The School of Integrated Learning	89	No	No	264	7.6	26.9
THE URBAN ASSEMBLY INSTITUTE FOR NEW TECHNOLOGIES	77	No	No	160	8.7	29.4
The Urban Assembly School for the Urban Environment	86	No	No	117	4.3	30.8
The Young Scholars Academy of The Bronx	73	No	No	352	7.7	18.5
Thomas C. Giordano Middle School 45	89.3	No	Yes	978	18	17.8
Upper School @ P.S. 25	86	No	No	221	7.2	21.7
York Early College Academy	60	No	No	489	0	9.6



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

FISCAL MANAGEMENT
89 Washington Avenue
Room 410 EB
Albany, NY 12234
(518-474-7751)

June 2012

Chief Administrative Officer
New York City Department of Education
52 Chambers Street
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chief Administrative Officer:

The State Education Department calculated indirect cost rates for local agencies for the 2012-2013 program year in accordance with the regulations found in United States Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) 34 CFR parts 75.560-75.564 and 76.560-76.569, United States Department of Education guidance. The methodology was reviewed and formally approved by the US Department of Education (USDOE) Indirect Cost Group.

This approved methodology included the following exception for NYCDOE:

- Net city government chargeback may be included as an indirect cost. The net city government chargeback was calculated as using total city government chargeback reported on the ST-3 less board percentage of repair and maintenance and estimated building use charge. Detail of this item is shown in Attachment A.

Your rates were calculated with data submitted by your agency on its ST-3 Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2011. The final 2012-2013 rates for your agency are:

Restricted Rate	3.2%
Unrestricted Rate	13.1%

Federal regulations require the use of restricted indirect cost rates for grant programs that prohibit supplanting. Consistent with Department policy, the restricted rates will be used for all categorical grant programs allowing indirect costs. Program specific requirements may further limit indirect cost recovery. The unrestricted rate is used for school food service programs and certain direct funded Federal programs.

The maximum dollar amount of indirect costs allowable under a grant can be determined by multiplying the restricted indirect cost rate by the modified total direct cost base (MTDC) of the grant. MTDC is computed as total direct costs less equipment, alterations and renovations, the portion of each subcontract exceeding \$25,000 and any flow through funds.

Costs considered to be indirect for purposes of calculating your restricted rate are limited to the following ST-3 account codes:

- A1310 Business Administrator
- A1325 Treasurer
- A1420 Legal
- A1460 Records Management
- A1670 Central Printing & Mailing
- A1620 Pro rata share of Operation of Plant
- A1621 Pro rata share of Maintenance of Plant
- A5530 Pro rata share of Garage Building
- A1380 Adjusted - Net City Government Chargeback
- A1320 Auditing
- A1345 Purchasing
- A1430 Personnel
- A1660 Central Storeroom
- A1680 Central Data Processing

Types of costs that are not treated as indirect in calculating your rate may be allowable direct charges in grant programs, subject to the approval of New York State Education Department program managers. To be approvable, such costs must be:

- Allowable per program specific regulation and policy
- Reasonable and necessary
- Allocable. Grantees must maintain documentation or methodologies that demonstrate that the costs were incurred for grant purposes.
- Supplementary. Costs are considered to supplement and not supplant local effort, if such costs would not be incurred in the absence of the grant funds.

We will continue to work with Marc Alterman and other individuals from your agency to address any additional questions or issues of concern related to indirect costs.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Margaret Zotto
Assistant Director of Financial Administration

Attachment

cc: M. Alterman
S. David
M. Walters
D. Juron



United Federation of Teachers
A Union of Professionals

July 25, 2012

Chancellor Walcott
NYC Department of Education
52 Chambers Street
New York, NY 10007

Dear Chancellor Walcott:

Thank you for sharing the plans of the New York City Department of Education to submit an application to the United States Department of Education for the Teacher Incentive Fund general competition.

As you know, the United Federation of Teachers has for a very long time advocated for the kind of initiatives that we see in your grant proposal. The UFT strives to always reach higher levels of student achievement and your proposal for advanced professional development and career opportunities for teachers is one we support – provided we can reach a collectively bargained agreement setting teachers' terms and conditions of employment.

We share your belief that establishing new leadership positions for teachers to work with and help develop the skills of their colleagues is an important component of school improvement strategies. The titles in your application – such as peer instructional coach, demonstration teacher and teacher development ambassador – are new positions that build on existing work to further advance teacher development and expertise, and we look forward to negotiating the establishment of these positions.

As you are aware, the lead teacher program already provides opportunities for many high quality teachers to work in low performing schools, for teachers to provide support for their peers and for teachers to obtain additional compensation. We hope we can utilize some of the same processes we currently have in place for the screening, selection and hiring of lead teachers to select candidates for the newly proposed titles.

We look forward to continuing negotiations to advance the concept of a career lattice for teachers and to bargaining with you all aspects of these new positions (e.g. selection, compensation, qualifications, etc.) that will allow us to promote greater student achievement in New York City Schools.

Should the grant be awarded to New York City, we would commence these negotiations during the planning year to develop the required elements of the grant.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Michael Mulgrew
President

52 Broadway, New York, NY 10004 212.777.7500 www.uft.org

Officers: Michael Mulgrew *President*, Michael Mendel *Secretary*, Mel Aaronson *Treasurer*, Robert Astrowsky *Assistant Secretary*, Mona Romain *Assistant Treasurer*
Vice Presidents: Karen Alford, Carmen Alvarez, Leo Casey, Richard Farkas, Catalina Fortino, Sterling Roberson
PR/Award # S374A120083

Background on Existing Performance-based Financial Incentives for Principals in NYC Department of Education

The following information is designed to provide the reader with an overview of the current performance-based financial incentives NYC public school principals are eligible to receive. As a system, the NYC Department of Education is committed to a human capital management system wherein student performance is a fundamental driver of assessment and performance. Below are excerpts from the most recent collective bargaining agreement between the NYC Department of Education and the Council of School Administrators¹ and restated information publicly available on the NYC Department of Education's website

Performance Bonuses

Principals, along with Assistant Principals, school-based intermediate Supervisors and Education Administrators, are eligible for annual performance increases. The bonus, or financial performance increase, is based on outstanding growth in student achievement measured according to value-added criteria, and such other objective criteria as the Chancellor. The specific performance criteria and the amount of the increases will be set by the Chancellor in his/her discretion after consultation with CSA (Council of School Administrators). Principals who meet the criteria shall receive increases up to \$25,000. While there is no stated maximum total amount of bonuses that must be paid each year, no more than 25% of the top performing Principals shall receive the performance increase each year.

Executive Principal Program

Principals selected by the Chancellor for a 3 year assignment to serve in a high-needs school will receive a \$25,000 annual salary enhancement. The bonus is contingent upon the receipt by the Executive of a "satisfactory" rating on their Principal Performance Review (PPR). After the 3-year principal assignment, the Executive Principal may agree to continue in that role, accept another Executive Principal assignment for mutually agreed upon one-year term, or return to a regular principal assignment.

Measures of Principal Performance

Financial incentives for principals are contingent, in part, on A) principal's rating on their Principal Performance Review (PPR) and B) their school's performance as assessed by the Progress Report.

Principal Performance Review (PPR)

A principal's rating on their PPR is based on the following areas of responsibility:

1. Accomplishing the goals and objectives that you set by him or her for themselves at the beginning of the year
2. The principal's school's previous year's Progress Report results
3. The principal's school's most recent Quality Review score
4. Addressing the particular needs of English Language Learners and Special Education and adhering to legal requirements and other key DOE policies that apply to your school and that are addressed in the Compliance Review conducted each year by the DOE's Office of Compliance Services:

Based on performance, a principal may earn one of the following ratings on his or her PPR:

- 4 - "Substantially Exceeds"
- 3 - "Exceeds"
- 2 - "Meets"
- 1 - "Partially Meets"
- 0 - "Does not Meet"

A "satisfactory" rating for the purposes of the financial performance-based incentives includes "meets," "exceeds," and "substantially exceeds."

Progress Reports

Progress Reports help parents, teachers, principals, and school communities understand schools' strengths and weaknesses. The Progress Report measures the longitudinal progress with students (to and beyond proficiency), mastery by all students of state learning standards as required by state and federal (NCLB) law, Student attendance in school, closing of the achievement gap for high need populations, desired conditions for learning as assessed by hundreds of thousands of parents, teachers, and students, student readiness for high school (and

ultimately) college success, and high school graduation and progress toward high school graduation. Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on:

- Student progress (60%)
- Student performance (25%)
- School environment (15%)

Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide. A sample Progress Report is included in this application as an attachment.

¹AGREEMENT between THE BOARD OF EDUCATION of the CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK and COUNCIL OF SUPERVISORS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK LOCAL 1, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, AFL-CIO (July 1, 2003-March 5, 2010)

Department of Education

Ensuring a bright future for every child

P.S. 158 Adam Clayton Powell

OVERALL
GRADE

PRINCIPAL: Faren Bailey

ESN: 06N158

ENROLLMENT: 975

DC-DCU TYPE: Elementary

PEER INDEX: 68.70

Address: 158th Street, New York, NY 10032

OVERALL
SCORE

68.2
out of 100

PERCENTILE
RANK

90

The grade index is a percentage of the total score of 100 percent of elementary schools.

Overall Grades - Elementary

Grade	Score Range	Percentage
A	80.0 or higher	25% of schools
B	40.5 - 80.0	35% of schools
C	25.0 - 40.5	30% of schools
D	10.0 - 25.0	7% of schools
F	0.0 or lower	5% of schools

The percentage of schools graded "A" or "B" represents the number of schools that are in the top 60 percent of schools in the state based on the average English and Math performance in the state. Schools that are graded "C" or "D" are in the middle 30 percent of schools and schools that are graded "F" are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the state.

Each year's Progress Report (a) measures student growth year-over-year in (1) core subjects (math, science, and English) and (2) towards proficiency in reading. It also measures overall school growth in the grade 3-5 math Strong Business Report results and measures for elementary schools (e.g., math, science, and English) as an important factor in determining whether schools require a new accreditation. In addition, the report includes information on the school's performance on state planning goals and standards for the year.

CATEGORY	SCORE	GRADE	DESCRIPTION
Student Progress	40.1 <small>score</small>	<input type="text"/>	Student Performance in core subjects (math, science, and English) on state tests in English and Math (between 30.0 and 50.0) compared to other students who started at the same grade.
Student Performance	12.4 <small>score</small>	<input type="text"/>	Student Performance in core subjects (math, science, and English) on state tests (English and Math).
School Environment	9.6 <small>score</small>	<input type="text"/>	School Environment measures state data on the safety and quality of the school environment, including student safety and respect, communication, and engagement.
Closing the Achievement Gap	6.0 <small>score</small>	<input type="text"/>	Schools receive additional points for exceeding a goal by students with disabilities, English language learners, and students starting with the lowest proficiency levels.
Overall Score	68.2 <small>score</small>	<input type="text"/>	The overall grade is based on the total of all four measures, including adjustments for closing the achievement gap. Gaps in scores may not add up to total score because of rounding.

CITYWIDE INSTRUCTIONAL EXPECTATIONS FOR 2012-13

In 2012-13, schools will deepen and broaden the work of the New York City Department of Education's (DOE's) 2011-12 citywide instructional expectations, including the pedagogical aspects of the special education reform. This work asks school leaders and teachers to adjust their practice as they work together to understand the learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners, in order to support them in developing the qualities and skills necessary to enroll, persist, and succeed in college and careers. Schools will continue to share Common Core work and student progress with families.

School leaders will ensure that:

1. Teacher development focuses on supporting all students to meet the Common Core standards.

- a. Schools will strengthen the common language and understanding of what quality teaching looks like by deepening the school community's comprehension of Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*.¹
- b. Schools will select competencies relevant to teachers' developmental needs and that most support implementation of the Common Core standards. While schools have discretion, they should consider:
 - Designing coherent instruction (1e);
 - Using questioning and discussion techniques (3b);
 - Using assessment in instruction (3d).
- c. School leaders will conduct frequent formative classroom observations and provide teachers with formative feedback and professional development to support improved practice in identified competencies and across a common framework.

2. Students experience Common Core-aligned instruction across subjects.

Teachers will engage in job-embedded professional learning as they explore ways to implement pedagogical practices that focus on the following instructional shifts:²

<i>In math</i>	<i>In ELA, social studies, and science</i>
Require fluency, application, and conceptual understanding	Require students to ground reading, writing, and discussion in evidence from text

To this end:

- a. **In grades PK-5, students will experience four Common Core-aligned units of study: two in math and two aligned to the literacy standards in ELA, social studies, and/or science.**
- b. **In grades 6-12, students will experience eight Common Core-aligned units of study: two in math, two in ELA, two in social studies, and two in science.**

Ideally, all teachers in these subjects will implement Common Core-aligned units, but principals have discretion to select the teachers, courses, and number of units to meet this expectation (see [implementation guidance](#)). Each unit will provide points of access for all students and culminate in a performance task aligned to the Common Core. Schools may choose to upgrade existing units, engaging in cycles of inquiry and looking closely at student work to make adjustments to curriculum, assessment, and instruction. This work should be done in the context of the schools' current curriculum. If teachers will perform extensive curriculum revisions, professional development, support and dedicated time should be provided. Schools without a year-long curriculum are asked to opt in to the DOE's core curriculum and implement units posted in the Common Core Library to practice the shifts.

c. In grades PK-8, schools will use guidance from the DOE³ to review their scope and sequence and:

<i>In math</i>	<i>In literacy across content areas</i>
Reorganize math content to teach fewer topics and allow for more time to focus on the major work ⁴ of the grade	Infuse opportunities to read and respond to a combination of literary and informational texts

As a result, all students will engage in more challenging assignments that will accelerate their learning, deepen their conceptual understanding, and strengthen their ability to use textual evidence in writing and discussion.

¹ Schools are strongly encouraged to work with Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* to support teacher practice. Current collective bargaining rules are in effect for the formal observation and evaluation of teachers.

² For further information on instructional shifts, refer to <http://www.achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools> and <http://engageny.org/resource/common-core-shifts/>.

³ Guidance will be available in early June 2012.

⁴ For a listing of content emphases by cluster, refer to <http://engageny.org/resource/math-content-emphases>. For additional information, refer to

CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of this work is a multi-year process. Schools, in consultation with their networks, are expected to strategically implement the work in ways most likely to shift teaching practice and enhance individual students' learning based on school strengths and areas of development. Successful schools will create an environment that enables this work.

A. In every classroom, ensure a culture for learning.

- Set high expectations for all students.
- Plan in advance for multiple access points and ways of demonstrating understanding so that all students engage in rigorous learning experiences. These are two components of Universal Design for Learning (UDL).
- Ensure that all students have access to learn within their least restrictive environment.
- Find opportunities to work with all students on critical academic and personal behaviors necessary for college and career readiness: persistence, engagement, work habits/organization, communication/collaboration, and self-regulation.
- In K-5 reading, make specific plans for screening and provide tiered instruction and interventions for students, as required by New York State's implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI). Note that while schools will be held accountable in the current phase of implementation for K-5 reading only, all schools should consider systems for supporting students across the content areas.

B. Ensure the entire school community is engaged in this work.

Ideally, teachers of math, ELA, science, and social studies, including ESL, bilingual, and special education teachers, will implement two units of study aligned to the Common Core (subject to principal discretion; see [implementation guidance](#)). Teachers may adapt existing units or adapt/adopt units from the [Common Core Library](#) or other external sources; units should include points of access for all students. The culminating task for at least one unit must be aligned to the DOE's selected Common Core standards, which in 2012-13 include the addition of a speaking/listening and a language standard (see page five of this document).

- Classes that require significant reading, writing, and discussion of text should begin to shift instruction toward the Common Core. These classes may include the arts and technical subjects.
- In addition to the two math units, bilingual teachers may choose to implement one literacy unit in English and one literacy unit in students' native language.
- In classrooms with co-teachers, teachers should focus on implementing units together.

C. Maximize opportunities for teachers to learn and grow in their practice.

Schools should provide opportunities for teacher development that promote independent and shared reflection and leadership growth, and that enable teachers to continuously evaluate and revise their classroom practices to improve learning outcomes.

<i>Teachers will</i>	<i>School leaders will</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use a shared understanding of Danielson to identify areas on which to focus and actively pursue professional growth.• Based on actionable feedback, reflect on and shift daily practice as well as the planning and implementation of Common Core-aligned units.• Participate in teacher teams engaging in inquiry to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Analyze student work to adjust teaching practice and instructional planning;- Plan Common Core-aligned units to gain familiarity with key instructional practices;- Plan for shifts in instruction;- Review their scope and sequence in light of changes to the grades 3-8 tests;- Deepen their understanding of Danielson.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• With support from networks, integrate instructional expectations into the school's plan for improving instruction during the 2012-13 school year.• Optimize resources (human, budget, time), data, and systems to support and monitor instructional work.• Build a culture in which the use of a research-based framework is viewed as a formative tool designed to strengthen practice through frequent observations, followed by formative feedback and professional development focused on improved student learning.• Develop a normed understanding of Danielson, together with networks and central staff, to deepen expertise of both administrators and teachers.• Deepen their understanding of the instructional shifts required to meet the Common Core.



ASSESSMENT

Our collective goal is to prepare students to think and read critically, communicate strongly both orally and in writing, and solve complex problems. New York State (NYS) is working to align state assessments with the Common Core standards, and schools should be aware of these changes. However, no single test can capture the full range of knowledge and skills our students are learning in the classroom each day. Schools with the most rigorous instruction infuse test readiness into their lessons in ways that do not disrupt the curriculum; cognitively demanding tasks and assignments do more to prepare students to perform well on tests than prolonged, de-contextualized, and rote practice of sample test questions. In order to ensure teachers and school leaders are well informed of changes to the NYS tests during the transition to the Common Core, the DOE offers the following guidance.

Changes to the New York State tests

Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)⁵: In 2014-15, NYS is planning to adopt new PARCC assessments, designed to measure student learning according to the Common Core. PARCC exams will include two summative components for ELA and math: a performance-based assessment with extended tasks requiring application of knowledge and skills in the spring followed by an end-of-year assessment with shorter questions, including multiple-choice items. In literacy, these assessments will emphasize writing effectively when analyzing texts. In math, these assessments will focus on applying mathematical thinking and solving problems.

Before then, NYS tests will evolve to align to the Common Core.

Grades 3 to 8: In 2012-13, the content of the NYS grades 3-8 ELA and math tests will change to align to the Common Core, but the structure will remain similar to current tests (administration time, paper/pencil format).

In ELA:

- Tests will focus on:
 - Comparing two or more texts, including listening passages, writing passages, and graphics;
 - Reading and analyzing informational passages without narrative structure, dialogue, or characters, and discussing arguments, evidence, and claims;
 - Requiring students to engage with a 50/50 split of literary and informational texts; and
 - Responding to prompts that are more text-dependent: 35% of prompts will require students to convey an opinion/argue, 35% to explain, and 30% to convey experience.

In math:

- In keeping with the Common Core's emphasis on depth over breadth, tests will emphasize the major work of the grade, a set of key concepts that helps teacher prioritize where to spend most of their instructional time.⁶ Concepts may be assessed at different grade levels from those in the past. For example, the new grade five tests will include more items assessing fractions and no items assessing probability and statistics;
- Tests will include more questions that require students to take multiple steps in order to solve them;
- Questions that in the past have focused on testing mathematical vocabulary will instead require students to apply skills based on their understanding of that vocabulary;
- Questions using tools like rulers or protractors will include prompts that require students to both choose the appropriate tool and apply mathematical concepts in using the tool.

High schools: In 2012-13, the NYS Regents exams will not be modified to align to the Common Core. In 2013-14, the English, Algebra 1/Integrated Algebra, and Geometry Regents exams will align to the Common Core. During the transition, high schools are encouraged to focus on increasing the rigor of their courses. Beginning in fall 2012, the Progress Report will include a new College Readiness section measuring how many students pass college preparatory courses and exams, meet college readiness standards, and enroll in college or a postsecondary program after graduation.⁷

⁵ For more information about PARCC, refer to http://www.parcconline.org/sites/parcc/files/PARCC_Overview_January2012.ppt.

⁶ For a listing of content emphases by cluster, refer to <http://engageny.org/resource/math-content-emphases>. For additional guidance, refer to http://www.parcconline.org/sites/parcc/files/PARCC%20MCF%20for%20Mathematics_Fall%202011%20Release.pdf.

⁷ For a description of the Progress Report College Readiness metrics, refer to http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/B4D1BD81-1E62-4FAA-B22A-061AF1372235/0/201112FinalChangesHS2012_04_17.pdf PR/Award # S374A120083



ACCOUNTABILITY

We will continue to evaluate our citywide instructional work as part of existing accountability tools.

Progress Report:

- NYS grades 3-8 exams will evolve to align to the Common Core; the results of these tests contribute to a significant portion of the points on the Progress Report for elementary, middle, and K-8 schools.
- The high school Progress Report will include college and career readiness metrics; middle school and K-8 Progress Reports will include high school readiness metrics. These metrics underscore schools' need to organize to help students meet the expectations of the Common Core and prepare students for the next level of education.

Quality Review:

The Quality Review rubric and process will be aligned to the 2012-13 instructional expectations. Schools will need to show evidence that:

- Teachers receive actionable, high-quality feedback and professional development connected to instructional improvement efforts, school goals, and the revision of Common Core-aligned units of study;
- All students experience rigorous, Common Core-aligned units of study, and requisite supports and extensions, including those particular to students with disabilities and English language learners;
- At least during these units, lessons aligned to the selected Common Core literacy standards show evidence of planning with a focus on text-dependent writing, questioning, and discussion;
- At least during these units, lessons aligned to the selected Common Core math standards show evidence of planning with a focus on integrating conceptual understanding and application opportunities for all students, along with working on procedural fluency;
- Principals articulate a clear rationale for their strategic choices, e.g. selecting Danielson competencies to support teacher practice, identifying which teachers will implement Common Core-aligned instruction, and determining how many units each teacher will implement;
- The school uses resources (human, budget, time), data, and systems to monitor and improve organizational and instructional quality in light of the instructional expectations and school, staff, and student needs.

As in past years, reviewers will take the time of year into consideration, as implementation of the 2012-13 instructional expectations will look different in fall, winter, and spring.

Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP):

Schools should feel free to use the language of the citywide instructional expectations in their goals, but it is not required that CEP goals use the exact language of the expectations.

Principal Performance Review (PPR):

The 2012-13 PPR guidelines will continue to require principals to align some of their goals to the citywide instructional expectations, pending discussions with the Council of Supervisors and Administrators.

Please note:

Teachers and school staff: Until a collective bargaining agreement is reached, principals and administrators will continue to observe and rate teachers and relevant school staff within the guidelines of existing labor contracts. The instructional expectations provide an opportunity for formative feedback and support.

School Survey: New questions on the 2012-13 teacher survey will focus on the quality of formal and informal feedback teachers receive to support their improvement efforts, in particular in the area of understanding and integrating the expectations of the Common Core. Teachers' responses to these questions will not contribute to schools' Progress Report scores and will not be publicly shared.

SELECTED COMMON CORE STANDARDS⁸

Literacy

To build upon the work done during the 2011-12 school year, one of each teacher’s Common Core-aligned units of study in 2012-13 should focus on the standards below. The other unit may focus on the same standards or other key concepts within the literacy standards.

Grade Band	Literacy Focus—Reading, Writing, Speaking/Listening, and Language	
PK-2	Reading Informational Text Standards 1 & 10; Writing Standard 2 Speaking/Listening Standard 1; Language Standard 6	
3-5	Reading Informational Text Standards 1 & 10; Writing Standard 1 Speaking/Listening Standard 1; Language Standard 6	
	Literacy Focus— Reading and Writing	ELA-specific Focus⁹— Speaking/Listening and Language⁹
6-12	Reading Informational Text Standards 1 & 10; Writing Standard 1	Speaking/Listening Standard 1; Language Standard 6

Note: for grades 6-12, teachers of history/social studies, science, and technical subjects should reference Reading Standards 1 and 10 and Writing Standard 1 in the relevant section of the standards.

Math

To build upon the work done during the 2011-12 school year, one of each teacher’s Common Core-aligned units of study in 2012-13 should focus on Mathematical Practices 3 and/or 4 and the selected domain of focus (below). The other unit should also focus on Mathematical Practices 3 and/or 4 as well as on other relevant Mathematical Practices and may center on standards in the same domain or on other major work¹⁰ of the grade.

Grade Band	Domain of Focus		Mathematical Practices
PK-K	Operations and Algebraic Thinking	AND	Model with Mathematics and/or Construct Viable Arguments and Critique the Reasoning of Others
1-2	Number and Operations in Base Ten		
3	Operations and Algebraic Thinking		
4-5	Number and Operations—Fractions		
6-7	Ratios and Proportional Relationships		
8	Expressions and Equations		
<i>Algebra</i>	Reasoning with Equations and Inequalities		
<i>Geometry</i>	Congruence		

⁸ To view the full Common Core Learning Standards, refer to http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/common_core_standards/.

⁹ The Common Core Learning Standards for grades 6-12 include speaking/listening and language standards in ELA only. Teachers of other disciplines may refer to these standards as they consider ways to improve their ability to engage students in effective classroom discussion.

¹⁰ For a listing of content emphases by cluster, refer to <http://engageny.org/resource/math-content-emphases>. For additional guidance, refer to <http://www.parcconline.org/sites/parcc/files/PARCC%20MCF%20for%20Mathematics%20Fall%202011%20Release.pdf>.

DRAFT Examples of Effective Practice

Design Question: As written this document provides clarifying statements and some examples of effective practice in a D75 context. Moving forward we need to decide whether to broaden the audience for this document or whether we want to create separate tools intended for use with all teachers of students with disabilities in alternate and standardized settings (that captures best practices from special educators throughout NYC)

What this document IS

- A supplemental tool that teachers, administrators, coaches, network staff and others can use to consider *some* examples of effective classroom practices that **-when implemented well-** meet the expectations embedded in the Danielson framework
- A useful tool for administrators and teachers to reference when engaged in pre and/or post-observation conferences
- A guide for administrators and coaches to inform the selection of strategies upon which to focus during professional development
- A resource for teachers looking for new ideas and strategies to employ in their classroom practice
- Intended to spark conversation and generate new ideas about effective instruction
 - The tool has been formatted with an empty column titled- *What this Looks Like in Your School* – to encourage school communities to generate additional examples that contribute to a common understanding of instruction, and to make connections between the expectations of the rubric and school-wide instructional norms/expectations.
- Created with input from many constituents and sources including teachers of special education, D75 leadership, Network staff, Network Leaders, Principals, the Office of Teacher Effectiveness (and other Central Offices)
 - Drafts were developed and edited in close collaboration with the Network staff, the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of D75
 - Feedback on drafts was solicited through focus groups with D75 pilot Principals and with D75 teacher leaders
 - Pilot staff, Network staff and D75 Principals field tested the document by observing lessons to refine the examples provided
 - Network staff from multiple Networks (including SPED Directors and former SPED teachers) offered input on drafts
 - Through the Spring of 2012 we plan to field test the document through our D75 Talent Coaches for feedback

What this document IS NOT

- A replacement for the observation tools provided by the Talent Management pilot that align with the Danielson framework
- A checklist of practices that must be in place in all classrooms at all times
- An observation tool
- A comprehensive list of strategies that can be employed for effective teaching

Design Notes:

- “Teacher” refers to both teachers in a ICT model. We expect the Special Educator and the General Education Teacher to assume equal responsibility for planning and lesson execution
- Support personnel refer to all adults charged with supporting a student’s learning experience including paraprofessionals, related service providers, SETTS providers
- To the extent possible key references have been repeated, but complete lists of examples associated with them have not been repeated in every competency (e.g. references to alternative communications devices are made throughout the document, but we list examples of what this can look like in depth in select competencies only). While we expect that there are times when users may read or use a single competency, we want to encourage users to review other parts of the document for further clarification or information, as needed.

NYCDOE Talent Management Pilot 2011-2012

Competency	Students with Disabilities	Examples of <i>What this Looks Like in Your School</i>
<p>Designing Coherent Instruction</p> <p><u>Elements of this Competency:</u></p> <p>-Learning activities</p> <p>-Instructional Materials and Resources</p> <p>-Instructional Groups</p> <p>-Lesson and Unit Structure</p> <p>-Assessment Plans</p>	<p>✓ Instructional outcome(s) for the lesson (and corresponding unit) are standards-aligned (including common core and when appropriate, transitional competencies, career skills and/or functional goals) and are relevant and rigorous</p> <p>Possible examples of rigorous goals could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Those that provide an opportunity for students to access increasingly higher DOK levels at appropriate points in the lesson ○ Those that reflect a student’s ability to increase independence by applying a transferable skill in different contexts (like worksites) or over increasingly long periods of time (including functional or real-world skills such as opportunities for socialization and appropriate personal interactions) <p>✓ Activities, and the structure of the lesson, clearly and directly support the learning outcomes, are functionally appropriate and provide differentiated opportunities for students to reach the goals</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access to a wide variety of age-appropriate resources coded by reading level, interest, functional areas so students can make the best selection ○ Station or center tasks and other methods of grouping are assigned strategically according to readiness, IEP goals, interest and learning style ○ Variety of activities provided to allow students to demonstrate understanding and move towards independence; with appropriate guidance students choose those that suit their needs or approach to learning <p>✓ A student’s IEP goals and the progress students are making against them, along with assessment data from previous lessons and assessments (such as Brigance, SANDI, ABLLS, Vocational, Unique, Math-in-Focus, task analysis, videos, captioned-sequenced photographs, teacher checklists and other information in data binders/portfolios), are used to inform the design of the lesson</p> <p>✓ The lesson design reflects the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) because it is organized to provide access to the students with the most significant challenges</p> <p>✓ Purposeful plans for modifications or adaptations are in place so that scaffolds and other resources are provided to allow all students an opportunity to accomplish the lesson goals and be cognitively challenged</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of low or high tech ○ The lesson plan may reflect differentiated timing or a modified quantity of student work for some students against the same learning outcomes as all students (e.g. a math assignment may be cut down to reflect all standards with fewer question) ○ Functional objectives of the lesson may be applied to different vocational tasks to differentiate for individual students ○ Organizational scaffolds to support both individual students and the whole group may include visual aids like a posted list of the members of instructional groups; picture cues; job charts; public timing of activities ○ Low or high-tech communication devices should be accessible to support student’s voice and ability to exercise choice during the lesson ○ Plans to provide access to appropriate support equipment should be in place to insure access for all students (e.g. standing equipment) ○ Grouping and student partnerships support the instructional outcomes and needs of individual students <p>✓ Along with a summative assessment of all the lesson and unit’s instructional outcomes, the teacher has incorporated multiple checks for understanding for individual students tracked during the lesson, and throughout the unit, that are intended to inform adjustments to instruction. These methods are differentiated in format for individual students, as needed</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students are asked to demonstrate understanding through a student’s method for communication including Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) systems such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Graphic symbols ● Manual signs ● Picture Exchange Communication Systems (PECS) ● Voice activated devices (like ipads or a switch) ● Eye-gaze ● Gestures ● Illustrations/drawings or real pictures ● Dramatizations/role plays ● Braille ● Taped response ● Social stories ● Counters ● Video ● Use of functional objects related to lesson ✓ Plan reflects targeted and purposeful responsibilities for all teachers that have been determined through collaboration of all teachers and that reflect the needs of the students for a particular lesson <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parallel teaching ○ Station Teaching ○ Alternative Teaching ○ Teaming ✓ Plan includes strategies to make content materials more accessible for students that are also English Language Learners <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The use of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) ○ Reviewing clearly defined language objectives at the beginning of class and students state at the end if they were met ○ Appropriate use of charts, close passages, highlighters, graphs and illustrations to support access to lesson objectives ✓ Plan reflects the role of paraprofessionals and other support personnel¹ to scaffold student learning to achieve IEP goals and lesson objectives. <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan exists for the support personnel to inform and provide the differentiation a student may need for a particular lesson 	
--	---	--

¹ Throughout this document support personnel refers to all adults responsible for supporting a student’s learning experience including paraprofessionals, related service providers, SETTS providers

NYCDOE Talent Management Pilot 2011-2012

Competency	Students with Disabilities	Examples of <i>What this Looks Like in Your School</i>
<p>Establishing a Culture for Learning</p> <p><u>Elements of this Competency:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Expectations for Learning and Achievement -Student pride in work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The teacher holds all students to equally high levels of learning with consideration for a student’s functional abilities ✓ Teacher actively promotes a student’s progress towards IEP goals and individual instructional goals (aligned to common core standards)with a belief that they can meet or exceed them ✓ Teacher establishes expectations for group work, models appropriate roles and establishes routines to support productive group work ✓ Students know their own student learning needs, including IEP goals, and self-advocates, as appropriate, to insure that their learning is well supported ✓ Dialogue with and among students reflects that they value their work ✓ There is evidence that all students feel comfortable taking risks, asking questions and support each other’s pursuit of learning. Routines are in place to support this culture. <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Independence is encouraged, supported and promoted in the areas outlined above ○ Students may ask classmates to explain a procedure or concept if she/he did not understand a teacher’s explanation fully ○ Students may question one another on answers or provide rubric-based feedback ○ Students respond to peer mistakes by offering a suggestion or thought ○ Students recognize the efforts of a classmate (e.g. students give each other “thumbs up”) ○ Teacher prohibits students from making fun of their peers or laughing at errors made by other students ○ Teacher encourages risk-taking in language production and views errors as a natural progression of language learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teacher reminds students of the characteristics of high quality work (rubric or assessment criteria) and asks probing questions through the appropriate means of communication to problem solve ✓ Teacher supports students to discover a response on their own through prompts, restatements, providing wait time and/or encouragement. ✓ Paraprofessionals and other support personnel encourage and provide targeted support for students to reach IEP and the lesson’s goals independently. 	
<p>Managing Student Behavior</p> <p><u>Elements of this Competency:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expectations - Monitoring of Student Behavior -Response to Student Misbehavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Standards of conduct have been established and internalized by the students so that teachers can often monitor behavior subtly through their presence, visual cues and other routines like signals that students know and understand <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher may have developed class rules/norms that are based on functional levels and are made accessible to all students (such as through the use of visual cues and prompts). As appropriate norms have been developed in collaboration with students ○ Teacher explained and modeled expectations of classroom behavior for the students including through the use of role plays ○ Teacher used transitional signals (non-verbal gestures, lights, bells) and/or reviewed rules with students, as necessary, when activities in the classroom change (such as before a group learning activity, before individual work while the teacher is working with a small group, or before a special program or speaker). ○ Students are prepared in advance for any expected disruptions (e.g. a student’s nurse visit) or changes to daily routines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ensure that all students are supported to self regulate their behavior in ways that support learning <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use recommended strategies in behavior intervention plans (BIPs), and relevant aspects of a student’s IEP, to support students ○ Employ best practices to support behavior intervention to such as mood meters, star or other individual behavior charts, marked spot on the rug, timed tracking chart, daily goals, tracking goals with teacher or paraprofessional, time-outs are allowed, emotional literacy, Therapeutic Crisis Intervention (TCI), yoga, discrete trials, token boards, task analysis and 	

NYCDOE Talent Management Pilot 2011-2012

	<p>timers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paraprofessionals, including crisis paraprofessionals or other support personnel are positioned to support classroom-wide routines, individual students' BIP and other strategies to promote student behavior, as appropriate ○ Students support each other to self regulate behavior 	
--	--	--

Competency	Students with Disabilities	Examples of <i>What this Looks Like in Your School</i>
<p>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</p> <p><u>Elements of this Competency:</u></p> <p>-Quality of Questions</p> <p>-Discussion Techniques</p> <p>-Student Participation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teacher includes verbal and non-verbal students in class discussions by providing access to and an understanding of how to use appropriate communication systems ✓ Teacher generates strategic questions to engage students throughout the lesson building off of prior knowledge to cognitively engage them in the lesson and generate higher order thinking. Questions are reflected in the lesson plan <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) ○ Instructional dialogue ○ Progressive journals ○ Quick writes ○ Using social and school vocabulary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Questions support students to work at appropriately high levels. <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Higher order thinking question starters such as "Can you see a possible solution to...?"; "What changes to ... would you recommend?"; "Can you defend your position about...?"; "How many ways can you...?"; "Can you compare your ... with that presented in...?"; "Can you explain what must have happened when...?"; "What questions would you ask of...?"; "What do you think could of happened next...?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teacher supports students to arrive at solutions independently <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher probes to seek clarification and to guide, but not direct students such as "explain", "try another example" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teacher and students establish norms for discussions that promote opportunities for interaction, including with peers, as appropriate ✓ Students have or are developing the pre-requisite skills to engage in peer interaction <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social Stories ○ Joint Action Routine Systems (JARS) ○ Give Me 20 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promoting expressive communication <p>✓ Students ask each other questions to support their own mastery of the objective as appropriate and with necessary supports and scaffolds (e.g. scripts)</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interactive editing ○ Text-based discussions or responses ○ Pair share ○ Word webs ○ Debates ○ Poetry slam ○ Blogs ○ Protocols (e.g. tuning protocol) and strategies (e.g. Framing the Question) <p>✓ Teacher provides structure for class or small group discussion that supports all students to participate, as appropriate</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students use hand-held manipulatives (such as balls, PECS, hand-raising, color-coded craft sticks) for turn-taking during conversations/class discussion ○ Teacher provides question stems ○ Teacher provides a discussion protocol or offers other visual cues and prompts to support some students ○ Total Physical Response (TPR) ○ Use of co-teaching models to support small groups or scaffolding; <p>✓ Teacher regularly invites students to respond to other students' comments or to pose questions in response to another student's comments, as appropriate</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jigsaw ○ Gallery walks ○ Think-pair-share ○ Reciprocal teaching <p>✓ Teacher supports students to generate their own questions</p>	
<p>Competency</p>	<p>Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>Examples of What this Looks Like in Your School</p>
<p>Engaging Students in Learning</p> <p><u>Elements of this</u></p>	<p>✓ Differentiated resources are used purposefully to support all students to meet IEP goals, lesson objectives and to offer cognitive challenge in ways that are accessible and appropriate to all students</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students are pursuing individual lesson plans or teachers have developed modified instructional materials that provide all students with access to the lesson. Possible examples include: 	

<p>Competency:</p> <p>-Activities and Assignments</p> <p>-Groupings of Students,</p> <p>Instructional Materials and Resources</p> <p>-Structure and Pacing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text at appropriate reading level • Highlighted passages to help draw out important content • Printed reminders of first/second steps to help students get started with the assignment • Using graph paper for writing • Sentence frames • Illustrations • Role-plays/dramatizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adapted books and audiobooks are made available across all levels and in multiple languages ○ PECS and visual aids, communication devices are used to provide access to all ○ Library is leveled, functional and/or color coded and includes age-appropriate texts relevant to the content area including graphic novels and non-fiction texts ○ Computer software and internet sources are used to access content ○ Adapted materials students need to do the work are accessible and provided to students as needed such as pencil grips, technology (switches, ipads, AAC devices) ○ Representative objects are used to support the need for concrete learning of concepts <p>✓ Teacher engages students in multiple ways to insure access for all</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <p>Activities are incorporated into the lesson that appeal to different learning styles (auditory, visual, kinesthetic/tactile) and multiple intelligences (spatial, linguistic, logical-mathematical, kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students use teacher-made "manipulatives" ○ Use of an interactive smartboard to access content ○ Incorporate sensory integration to the learning (tactile, auditory, gustatory, olfactory) ○ Work site assignments based on vocational level assessments and interest surveys ○ Employ sufficient wait time ○ Lesson includes strategies to promote engagement such as modeling a "think aloud" to engage students meta-cognitively <p>✓ Teacher incorporates authentic, real-world experiences and scenarios into the learning experience</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Opportunities to develop functional post-secondary skills such as work site preparation ○ Research on job skills and internships ○ Project-based learning <p>✓ Teacher purposely uses flexible grouping (whole-class, pairs, triads, quads, student-selected groups and models of co-teaching) to support lesson objectives and individual student needs according to assessment data, IEP goals and learning styles</p> <p>✓ Students indicate a desire to understand the content</p> <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When asked students can explain the lesson objective and how it connects to individual (or class) goals & interests 	
--	---	--

NYCDOE Talent Management Pilot 2011-2012

Competency	Students with Disabilities	Examples of What this Looks Like in Your School
<p>Using Assessment in Instruction</p> <p><u>Elements of this Competency:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assessment Criteria -Monitoring of Student Learning -Feedback to Students -Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teachers pose pre-planned questions to elicit evidence of student understanding or, as appropriate, set up a situation when students ask themselves or others questions to elicit understanding. ✓ Multiple checks for understanding are used to inform adjustments to instruction during the lesson for the whole group and for individual students. These methods are differentiated in format for individual students, as needed to challenge and engage all students <p>Possible examples of whole-class feedback systems include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thumbs up/down ○ Mini white boards ○ Quick writes ○ Direct questioning ○ Employing necessary communication devices and supports in any of these methods to capture assessment data for all students ○ Gestures ○ Dramatic Representations ○ Computer generated responses <p>Possible examples of individual feedback systems include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher circulates during small group or independent work asking clarifying and probing questions to support student’s discovery and learning through alternative means of communication, as appropriate. Purposeful use of ICT co-teaching models to execute these strategies, when relevant. ○ Conferring takes place regularly and in an organized way to provide individual feedback. Paraprofessionals and support personnel actively supports this work, where relevant and appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Para professionals and other support personnel are positioned to be an active participant in assessing individuals and small groups of students where relevant ✓ Feedback is provided in multiple ways <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job site observations as relevant ○ All supporting staff know assessment criteria and can assist students to independently meet their goals ○ Students are given an opportunity to self –assess or to provide peers with feedback using a rubric or exemplar, as feasible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ When asked, students can communicate learning goals (including their IEP goals) and their next steps in learning (both for the lesson and for progress towards IEP goals), through alternative communication systems as appropriate ✓ Assessment criteria are clear and accessible for all students <p>Possible examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visual rubric to support student assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Models that demonstrate expectations of the product are provides in all modalities students may employ to reach the lesson’s goals ✓ Teacher uses appropriate methods of alternative assessment for a student’s learning needs and when applicable the IEP goals and objectives (i.e. SANDI, EL SOL, Brigance, ABLLS 	

NYCDOE Talent Management Pilot 2011-2012

Appendix A: The Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Framework for Teaching 2011 Revised Edition

Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) is the next generation of this research-validated instrument for teacher observation, evaluation and development. Charlotte Danielson has selected Teachscape as the exclusive electronic provider of this refined instrument.

In the Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) all the domains, components, and elements are identical to the earlier version. Therefore, the pre-existing research foundation applies.

The Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) is specifically enhanced to be used as an evaluation instrument. The enhancements contained in the Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) are based on lessons learned from the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, a large scale research study funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation that used the Framework for Teaching to evaluate over 20,000 classroom lessons.

Based on her experience with the MET Project, Charlotte Danielson has enhanced her Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) to be even more effective, precise, and useful as a tool for teacher evaluation.

See below for a summary of the key changes from the old version to the newly updated Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition).

Old version of the Framework for Teaching	Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)
Rubrics for each component contain general language helpful for professional development but not well suited for precise evaluation.	Rubrics for each component have been revised to include more precise language enabling for better observer discernment between teacher performance at different levels.
Absence of Critical Attributes makes it difficult to identify instructional evidence tied to each component and performance level.	Critical Attributes have been added for each Component and performance level. Critical attributes are specific observable teacher and/or student behaviors or actions that are evidence of a teacher’s performance at a specific performance level relative to a particular Component.
Absence of possible teaching examples means that observers must generate their own examples without being sure they are accurate.	Possible teaching examples have been added for each level of performance, for each Component, to assist observer in determining examples of classroom practice that would observe as evidence for each Component.

With these new additions and adjustments, the Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) is now the best, most reliable instrument available for high-stakes evaluation of teaching.

Complete Framework for Teaching Instrument

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
<i>Ia: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</i>	<p>In order to guide student learning, teachers must have command of the subjects they teach. They must know which concepts and skills are central to a discipline, and which are peripheral; they must know how the discipline has evolved into the 21st century, incorporating such issues as global awareness and cultural diversity, as appropriate. Accomplished teachers understand the internal relationships within the disciplines they teach, knowing which concepts and skills are prerequisite to the understanding of others. They are also aware of typical student misconceptions in the discipline and work to dispel them. But knowledge of the content is not sufficient; in advancing student understanding, teachers are familiar with the particularly pedagogical approaches best suited to each discipline.</p> <p>The elements of component 1a are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline <i>Every discipline has a dominant structure, with smaller components or strands, central concepts and skills</i> • Knowledge of prerequisite relationships <i>Some disciplines, for example mathematics, have important prerequisites; experienced teachers know what these are and how to use them in designing lessons and units.</i> • Knowledge of content-related pedagogy <i>Different disciplines have "signature pedagogies" that have evolved over time and found to be most effective in teaching.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson and unit plans that reflect important concepts in the discipline • Lesson and unit plans that accommodate prerequisite relationships among concepts and skills • Clear and accurate classroom explanations • Accurate answers to student questions • Feedback to students that furthers learning • Inter-disciplinary connections in plans and practice

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Ia: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. Teacher's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content. Teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.	Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. Teacher's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.	Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts. Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.	Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. Teacher's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and a link to necessary cognitive structures by students to ensure understanding. Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher makes content errors. • Teacher does not consider prerequisite relationships when planning. • Teacher's plans use inappropriate strategies for the discipline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is familiar with the discipline but does not see conceptual relationships. • Teacher's knowledge of prerequisite relationships is inaccurate or incomplete. • Lesson and unit plans use limited instructional strategies and some are not be suitable to the content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher can identify important concepts of the discipline, and their relationships to one another. • The teacher consistently provides clear explanations of the content. • The teacher answers student questions accurately and provides feedback that furthers their learning. • The teacher seeks out content-related professional development. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher cites intra- and inter-disciplinary content relationships. • Teacher is proactive in uncovering student misconceptions and addressing them before proceeding.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher says, "The official language of Brazil is Spanish, just like other South American countries." • The teacher says, "I don't understand why the math book has decimals in the same unit as fractions." • The teacher has students copy dictionary definitions each week to help his students learn to spell difficult words. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher plans lessons on area and perimeter independently of one another, without linking the concepts together. • The teacher plans to forge ahead with a lesson on addition with regrouping, even though some students have not fully grasped place value. • The teacher always plans the same routine to study spelling: pre-test on Monday, copy the words 5 times each on Tuesday and Wednesday, test on Friday. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's plan for area and perimeter invites students to determine the shape that will yield the largest area for a given perimeter. • The teacher realized her students are not sure how to use a compass, so she plans to practice that before introducing the activity on angle measurement. • The teacher plans to expand a unit on civics by having students simulate a court trial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a unit on 19th century literature, the teacher incorporates information about the history of the same period. • Before beginning a unit on the solar system, the teacher surveys the class on their beliefs as to why it is hotter in the summer than in the winter.

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	<p>Teachers don't teach content in the abstract; they teach it to <i>students</i>. In order to ensure student learning, therefore, teachers must not only know their content and its related pedagogy, but the students to whom they wish to teach that content. In ensuring student learning, teachers must appreciate what recent research in cognitive psychology has confirmed: namely that students learn through active intellectual engagement with content. While there are patterns in cognitive, social, and emotional developmental stages typical of different age groups, students learn in their individual ways and may come with gaps or misconceptions that the teacher needs to uncover in order to plan appropriate learning activities. In addition, students have lives beyond school, lives that include athletic and musical pursuits, activities in their neighborhoods, and family and cultural traditions. Students whose first language is not English, as well as students with other special needs must be considered when planning lessons and identifying resources that will ensure their understanding.</p> <p>The elements of component 1b are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of child and adolescent development <i>Children learn differently at different stages of their lives</i> • Knowledge of the learning process <i>Learning requires active intellectual engagement</i> • Knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency <i>Children's lives beyond school influence their learning</i> • Knowledge of students' interest and cultural heritage <i>Children's backgrounds influence their learning</i> • Knowledge of students' special needs <i>Children do not all develop in a typical fashion</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher gathers formal and informal information about students for use in planning instruction • Teacher learns student interests and needs for use in planning • Teacher participation in community cultural events • Teacher-designed opportunities for families to share heritage • Database of students with special needs

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>Ib: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</i>	Teacher demonstrates little or no understanding of how students learn, and little knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding.	Teacher indicates the importance of understanding how students learn and the students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.	Teacher understands the active nature of student learning, and attains information about levels of development for groups of students. The teacher also purposefully seeks knowledge from several sources of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.	Teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' levels of development and their backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources. This information is acquired for individual students.
<i>Critical Attributes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher does not understand child development characteristics and has unrealistic expectations for students. • Teacher does not try to ascertain varied ability levels among students in the class. • Teacher is not aware of student interests or cultural heritages. • Teacher takes no responsibility to learn about students' medical or learning disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher cites developmental theory, but does not seek to integrate it into lesson planning. • Teacher is aware of the different ability levels in the class, but tends to teach to the "whole group." • The teacher recognizes that children have different interests and cultural backgrounds, but rarely draws on their contributions or differentiates materials to accommodate those differences. • The teacher is aware of medical issues and learning disabilities with some students, but does not seek to understand the implications of that knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher knows, for groups of students, their levels of cognitive development • The teacher is aware of the different cultural groups in the class. • The teacher has a good idea of the range of interests of students in the class. • The teacher has identified "high," "medium," and "low" groups of students within the class. • The teacher is well-informed about students' cultural heritage and incorporates this knowledge in lesson planning. • The teacher is aware of the special needs represented by students in the class. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher uses ongoing methods to assess students' skill levels and designs instruction accordingly. • The teacher seeks out information about their cultural heritage from all students. • The teacher maintains a system of updated student records and incorporates medical and/or learning needs into lesson plans.
<i>Possible Examples</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lesson plan includes a teacher presentation for an entire 30 minute period to a group of 7-year olds. • The teacher plans to give her ELL students the same writing assignment she gives the rest of the class. • The teacher plans to teach his class Christmas carols, despite the fact that he has four religions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's lesson plan has the same assignment for the entire class, in spite of the fact that one activity is beyond the reach of some students. • In the unit on Mexico, the teacher has not incorporated perspectives from the three Mexican-American children in the class. • Lesson plans make only peripheral reference to students' interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher creates an assessment of students' levels of cognitive development. • The teacher examines students' previous year's folders to ascertain the proficiency levels of groups of students in the class, • The teacher administers a student interest survey at the beginning of the school year. • The teacher plans activities based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher plans his lesson with three different follow-up activities, designed to meet the varied ability levels of his students. • The teacher plans to provide multiple project options; students will self-select the project that best meets their individual approach to learning. • The teacher encourages students to be aware of their individual reading

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
	<p><i>represented amongst his students.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher knows that some of her students have IEPs but they're so long, she hasn't read them yet.</i> 	<p><i>on student interests.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher knows that five of her students are in the Garden Club; she plans to have them discuss horticulture as part of the next biology lesson.</i> • <i>The teacher realizes that not all of his students are Christian, so he plans to read a Hanukah story in December.</i> • <i>The teacher plans to ask her Spanish-speaking students to discuss their ancestry as part of their Social Studies unit studying South America.</i> 	<p><i>levels and make independent reading choices that will be challenging, but not too difficult.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher attended the local Mexican heritage day, meeting several of his students' extended family members.</i> • <i>The teacher regularly creates adapted assessment materials for several students with learning disabilities.</i>

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
<i>Ic: Setting Instructional Outcomes</i>	<p>Teaching is a purposeful activity; even the most imaginative activities are directed towards certain desired learning. Therefore, establishing instructional outcomes entails identifying exactly what students will be expected to learn; the outcomes do not describe what students will <i>do</i>, but what they will <i>learn</i>. The instructional outcomes should reflect important learning and must lend themselves to various forms of assessment so that all students are able to demonstrate their understanding of the content. Insofar as the outcomes determine the instructional activities, the resources used, their suitability for diverse learners, and the methods of assessment employed, they hold a central place in Domain 1.</p> <p>Learning outcomes are of a number of different types: factual and procedural knowledge, conceptual understanding, thinking and reasoning skills, and collaborative and communication strategies. In addition, some learning outcomes refer to dispositions; it's important not only for students to learn to read, but educators also hope that they will <i>like</i> to read. In addition, experienced teachers are able to link their learning outcomes with others both within their discipline and in other disciplines.</p> <p>The elements of component 1c are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value, sequence, and alignment <i>Students must be able to build their understanding of important ideas from concept to concept</i> • Clarity <i>Outcomes must refer to what students will learn, not what they will do, and must permit viable methods of assessment</i> • Balance <i>Outcomes should reflect different types of learning: such as knowledge, conceptual understanding, and thinking skills</i> • Suitability for diverse students <i>Outcomes must be appropriate for all students in the class</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of a challenging cognitive level • Statements of student learning, not student activity • Outcomes central to the discipline and related to those in other disciplines • Permit assessment of student attainment • Differentiated for students of varied ability

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>Ic: Setting Instructional Outcomes</i>	Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor, nor do they all reflect important learning in the discipline. Outcomes are stated as activities, rather than as student learning. Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand, and are suitable for only some students.	Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the discipline, and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination or integration. Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class based on global assessments of student learning.	Most outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. All the instructional outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination. Outcomes take into account the varying needs of groups of students.	All outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. The outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent opportunities for both coordination and integration. Outcomes take into account the varying needs of individual students.
<i>Critical Attributes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes lack rigor. • Outcomes do not represent important learning in the discipline. • Outcomes are not clear or are stated as activities. • Outcomes are not suitable for many students in the class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes represent a mixture of low expectations and rigor. • Some outcomes reflect important learning in the discipline. • Outcomes are suitable for most of the class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes represent high expectations and rigor. • Outcomes are related to “big ideas” of the discipline. • Outcomes are written in terms of what students will learn rather than do. • Outcomes represent a range of outcomes: factual, conceptual understanding, reasoning, social, management, communication. • Outcomes are suitable to groups of students in the class, differentiated where necessary. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher plans reference curricular frameworks or blueprints to ensure accurate sequencing. • Teacher connects outcomes to previous and future learning • Outcomes are differentiated to encourage individual students to take educational risks.
<i>Possible Examples</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A learning outcome for a fourth grade class is to make a poster illustrating a poem. • All the outcomes for a ninth grade history class are factual knowledge. • The topic of the social studies unit involves the concept of “revolutions” but the teacher only expects his students to remember the important dates of battles. • Despite having a number of ELL students in the class, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes consist of understanding the relationship between addition and multiplication and memorizing facts. • The outcomes are written with the needs of the “middle” group in mind; however, the advanced students are bored, and some lower-level students struggle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the learning outcomes is for students to “appreciate the aesthetics of 18th century English poetry.” • The outcomes for the history unit include some factual information, as well as a comparison of the perspectives of different groups in the run-up to the Revolutionary War. • The teacher reviews the project expectations and modifies some goals to be in line with students’ IEP objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher encourages his students to set their own goals; he provides them a taxonomy of challenge verbs to help them strive for higher expectations. • Students will develop a concept map that links previous learning goals to those they are currently working on. • Some students identify additional learning .

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
	<i>outcomes state that all writing must be grammatically correct.</i>			

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
<p><i>Id:</i> <i>Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</i></p>	<p>Student learning is enhanced by a teacher’s skillful use of resources; some of these are provided by the school as “official” materials; others are secured by teachers through their own initiative. Resources fall into several different categories: those used in the classroom by students, those available beyond the classroom walls to enhance student learning, resources for teachers to further their own professional knowledge and skill, and resources that can provide non-instructional assistance to students. Teachers recognize the importance of discretion in the selection of resources, selecting those that align directly with the learning outcomes and which will be of most use to the students. Accomplished teachers also ensure that the selection of materials and resources is appropriately challenging for every student; texts, for example, are available at various reading levels to make sure all students can access the content and successfully demonstrate understanding of the learning outcomes. Furthermore, expert teachers look beyond the school for resources to bring their subjects to life and to assist students who need help in both their academic and non-academic lives.</p> <p>The elements of component 1d are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources for classroom use <i>Materials that align with learning outcomes</i> • Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy <i>Those that can further teachers’ professional knowledge</i> • Resources for students: <i>Materials that are appropriately challenging</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District provided materials • Range of texts • Guest speakers • Internet resources • Materials provided by professional organizations • Teacher continuing professional education courses or professional groups • Community resources

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>Id: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</i>	Teacher is unaware of resources for classroom use, for expanding one’s own knowledge, or for students available through the school or district.	Teacher displays basic awareness of resources available for classroom use, for expanding one’s own knowledge, and for students through the school, but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources available for classroom use, for expanding one’s own knowledge, and for students through the school or district and external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher’s knowledge of resources for classroom use, for expanding one’s own knowledge, and for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet.
<i>Critical Attributes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher only uses district-provided materials, even when more variety would assist some students.</i> • <i>The teacher does not seek out resources available to expand his/her own skill.</i> • <i>Although aware of some student needs, the teacher does not inquire about possible resources.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher uses materials in the school library, but does not search beyond the school for resources.</i> • <i>The teacher participates in content-area workshops offered by the school, but does not pursue other professional development.</i> • <i>The teacher locates materials and resources for students that are available through the school, but does not pursue any other avenues.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Texts are at varied levels.</i> • <i>Texts are supplemented by guest speakers and field experiences.</i> • <i>Teacher facilitates Internet resources.</i> • <i>Resources are multi-disciplinary.</i> • <i>Teacher expands knowledge with professional learning groups and organizations.</i> • <i>Teacher pursues options offered by universities.</i> • <i>Teacher provides lists of resources outside the class for students to draw on.</i> 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Texts are matched to student skill level.</i> • <i>The teacher has ongoing relationship with colleges and universities that support student learning.</i> • <i>The teacher maintains log of resources for student reference.</i> • <i>The teacher pursues apprenticeships to increase discipline knowledge.</i> • <i>The teacher facilitates student contact with resources outside the classroom.</i>
<i>Possible Examples</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For their unit on China, the students accessed all of their information from the district-supplied textbook.</i> • <i>Mr. J is not sure how to teach fractions, but doesn’t know how he’s expected to learn it by himself.</i> • <i>A student says, “It’s too bad we can’t go to the nature center when we’re doing our unit on the environment.”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For a unit on ocean life; the teacher really needs more books, but the school library only has three for him to borrow.</i> • <i>The teacher knows she should learn more about teaching literacy, but the school only offered one professional development day last year.</i> • <i>The teacher thinks his students would benefit from hearing about health safety from a professional; he contacts the school nurse to visit</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher provides her 5th graders a range of non-fiction texts about the American Revolution; no matter their reading level, all students can participate in the discussion of important concepts.</i> • <i>The teacher took an online course on Literature to expand her knowledge of great American writers.</i> • <i>The teacher distributes a list of summer reading materials that would help prepare his 8th graders’</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher is not happy with the out-of-date textbook; his students will critique it and write their own text for social studies.</i> • <i>The teacher spends the summer at Dow Chemical learning more about current research so she can expand her knowledge base for teaching Chemistry.</i> • <i>The teacher matches students in her Family and Consumer Science class with local businesses; the students spend time shadowing employees to</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
		<i>his classroom.</i>	<i>transition to high school.</i>	<i>understand how their classroom skills might be used on the job.</i>

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
<i>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</i>	<p>Designing coherent instruction is the heart of planning, reflecting the teacher’s knowledge of content and the students in the class, the intended outcomes of instruction, and the available resources. Such planning requires that educators have a clear understanding of the state, district, and school expectations for student learning, and the skill to translate these into a coherent plan. It also requires that teachers understand the characteristics of the students they teach and the active nature of student learning. Educators must determine how best to sequence instruction in a way that will advance student learning through the required content. It requires the thoughtful construction of lessons that contain cognitively engaging learning activities, the incorporation of appropriate resources and materials, and the intentional grouping of students. Proficient practice in this component recognizes that a well-designed instruction plan addresses the learning needs of various groups of students; one size does not fit all. At the distinguished level the teacher plans instruction that takes into account the specific learning needs of each student and solicits ideas from students on how best to structure the learning. This plan is then implemented in Domain 3.</p> <p>The elements of component 1e are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning activities <i>Instruction designed to engage students and advance them through the content</i> • Instructional materials and resources <i>Appropriate to the learning needs of the students</i> • Instructional groups <i>Intentionally organized to support student learning</i> • Lesson and unit structure <i>Clear and sequenced to advance students’ learning</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons that support instructional outcomes and reflect important concepts • Instructional maps that indicate relationships to prior learning • Activities that represent high-level thinking • Opportunities for student choice • The use of varied resources • Thoughtfully planned learning groups • Structured lesson plan

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure. The activities and are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity and have unrealistic time allocations. Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety.	Some of the learning activities and materials are suitable to the instructional outcomes, and represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students. Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an effort at providing some variety. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; the progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.	Teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable to groups of students. The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure with appropriate and varied use of instructional groups.	Plans represent the coordination of in-depth content knowledge, understanding of different students' needs and available resources (including technology), resulting in a series of learning activities designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity. These are differentiated, as appropriate, for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied as appropriate, with some opportunity for student choice. The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning activities are boring and/or not well aligned to the instructional goals. • Materials are not engaging or do not meet instructional outcomes. • Instructional groups do not support learning. • Lesson plans are not structured or sequenced and are unrealistic in their expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning activities are moderately challenging. • Learning resources are suitable, but there is limited variety. • Instructional groups are random or only partially support objectives. • Lesson structure is uneven or may be unrealistic in terms of time expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning activities are matched to instructional outcomes. • Activities provide opportunity for higher-level thinking. • Teacher provides a variety of appropriately challenging materials and resources. • Instructional student groups are organized thoughtfully to maximize learning and build on student strengths. • The plan for the lesson or unit is well structured, with reasonable time allocations. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities permit student choice. • Learning experiences connect to other disciplines. • Teacher provides a variety of appropriately challenging resources that are differentiated for students in the class. • Lesson plans differentiate for individual student needs.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After memorizing the parts of the microscope, the teacher plans to have his 9th graders color in the worksheet. • Despite having a textbook that was 15 years old, the teacher plans to use that as the sole resource for his Communism unit. • The teacher organizes her class in rows, seating the students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the mini-lesson, the teacher plans to have the whole class play a game to reinforce the skill she taught. • The teacher found an atlas to use as a supplemental resource during the geography unit. • The teacher always lets students self-select their working groups because they behave better when 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher reviews her learning activities with a reference to high level "action verbs" and rewrites some of the activities to increase the challenge level. • The teacher creates a list of historical fiction titles that will expand her students' knowledge of the age of exploration. • The teacher plans for students to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's unit on ecosystems lists a variety of high level activities in a menu; students choose those that suit their approach to learning. • While completing their projects, the teacher's students will have access to a wide variety of resources that she has coded by reading level so they can make the best selections. • After the cooperative group lesson,

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
	<p><i>alphabetically; she plans to have students work all year in groups of four based on where they are sitting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher's lesson plans are written on sticky notes in his grade book; they indicate lecture, activity, or test.</i> 	<p><i>they can choose who they want to sit with.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher's lesson plans are nicely formatted, but the timing for many activities is too short to actually cover the concepts thoroughly.</i> 	<p><i>complete projects in small groups; he carefully selects group members based on their ability level and learning style.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher reviews lesson plans with her principal; they are well structured with pacing times and activities clearly indicated.</i> 	<p><i>students will reflect on their participation and make suggestions for new group arrangements in the future.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The lesson plan clearly indicates the concepts taught in the last few lessons; the teacher plans for his students to link the current lesson outcomes to those they previously learned.</i>

Domain 1:	Planning and Preparation
<i>If: Designing Student Assessments</i>	<p>Good teaching requires both assessment <i>of</i> learning and assessment <i>for</i> learning. Assessments <i>of</i> learning ensure that teachers know that students have learned the intended outcomes. These assessments must be designed in such a manner that they provide evidence of the full range of learning outcomes; that is, different methods are needed to assess reasoning skills than for factual knowledge. Furthermore, such assessments may need to be adapted to the particular needs of individual students; an ESL student, for example, may need an alternative method of assessment to allow demonstration of understanding. Assessment <i>for</i> learning enables a teacher to incorporate assessments directly into the instructional process, and to modify or adapt instruction as needed to ensure student understanding. Such assessments, although used during instruction, must be designed as part of the planning process. Such formative assessment strategies are ongoing and may be used by both teachers and students to monitor progress towards the understanding the learning outcomes.</p> <p>The elements of component 1e are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congruence with instructional outcomes <i>Assessments must match learning expectations</i> • Criteria and standards <i>Expectations must be clearly defined</i> • Design of formative assessments <i>Assessments for learning must be planned as part of the instructional process</i> • Use for planning <i>Results of assessment guide future planning</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans indicate correspondence between assessments and instructional outcomes • Assessment types are suitable to the style of outcome • Variety of performance opportunities for students • Modified assessments are available for individual students as needed • Expectations clearly written with descriptors for each level of performance • Formative assessments are designed to inform minute-to-minute decision-making by the teacher during instruction

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
If: Designing Student Assessments	Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards. Teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit, nor any plans to use assessment results in designing future instruction.	Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but others are not. Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear. Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	Teacher’s plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students. Assessment criteria and standards are clear. Teacher has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	Teacher’s plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed. The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments do not match instructional outcomes. • Assessments have no criteria. • No formative assessments have been designed. • Assessment results do not affect future plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only some of the instructional outcomes are addressed in the planned assessments. • Assessment criteria are vague. • Plans refer to the use of formative assessments, but they are not fully developed. • Assessment results are used to design lesson plans for the whole class, not individual students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the learning outcomes have a method for assessment. • Assessment types match learning expectations. • Plans indicate modified assessments for some students as needed. • Assessment criteria are clearly written. • Plans include formative assessments to use during instruction. • Lesson plans indicate possible adjustments based on formative assessment data. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments provide opportunities for student choice. • Students participate in designing assessments for their own work. • Teacher-designed assessments are authentic with real-world application, as appropriate. • Students develop rubrics according to teacher-specified learning objectives. • Students are actively involved in collecting information from formative assessments and provide input.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher marks papers on the foundation of the U.S. constitution based on grammar and punctuation; for every mistake, the grade drops from an A to a B, B to a C, etc. • After the students present their research on Globalization, the teacher tells them their letter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district goal for the Europe unit is for students to understand geo-political relationships; the teacher plans to have the students memorize all the country capitals and rivers. • The teacher’s students received their tests back; each one was simply marked with a letter grade at the top. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. K knows that his students will write a persuasive essay on the state assessment; he plans to provide them with experiences developing persuasive writing as preparation. • Ms. M worked on a writing rubric for her research assessment; she drew on multiple sources to be sure the levels of expectation were 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To teach persuasive writing, Ms. H plans to have her class research and write to the principal on an issue that is important to the students: the use of cell phones in class. • Mr. J’s students will write a rubric for their final project on the benefits of solar energy; Mr. J has shown

Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<p><i>grade; when students asked how he arrived at the grade, he responds, "After all these years in education, I just know what grade to give."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher says, "What's the difference between formative assessment and the test I give at the end of the unit?"</i> • <i>The teacher says, "The district gave me this entire curriculum to teach, so I just have to keep moving."</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The plan indicates that the teacher will pause to "check for understanding" but without a clear process of how that will be done.</i> • <i>A student says, "If half the class passed the test, why are we all reviewing the material again?"</i> 	<p><i>clearly defined.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mr. C creates a short questionnaire to distribute to his students at the end of class; based on their responses, he will organize them into different groups during the next lesson's activities.</i> • <i>Based on the previous morning's formative assessment, Ms. D plans to have five students to work on a more challenging project, while she works with 6 other students to reinforce the concept.</i> 	<p><i>them several sample rubrics and they will refer to those as they create a rubric of their own.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>After the lesson Mr. L asks students to rate their understanding on a scale of 1 to 5; the students know that their rating will indicate their activity for the next lesson.</i> • <i>Mrs. T has developed a routine for her class; students know that if they are struggling with a math concept, they sit in a small group with the teacher during workshop time.</i>

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Component	2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
<p><i>2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport</i></p>	<p>An essential skill of teaching is that of managing relationships with students and ensuring that those among students are positive and supportive. Teachers create an environment of respect and rapport in their classrooms by the ways they interact with students and by the interaction they encourage and cultivate among students. An important aspect of respect and rapport relates to how the teacher responds to students and how students are permitted to treat one another. Patterns of interactions are critical to the overall tone of the class. In a respectful environment, all students feel valued and safe.</p> <p>The elements of component 2a are listed below and are evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher interactions with students, including both words and actions <i>A teacher’s interactions with students set the tone for the classroom. Through their interactions, teachers convey that they are interested in and care about their students.</i> • Student interactions with other students, including both words and actions <i>As important as a teacher’s treatment of students is, how students are treated by their classmates is arguably even more important to students. At its worst, poor treatment causes students to feel rejected by their peers. At its best, positive interactions among students are mutually supportive and create an emotionally healthy school environment. Teachers model and teach students how to engage in respectful interactions with one another and acknowledge respectful interactions among students.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Respectful talk and turn taking</i> • <i>Respect for students’ background and lives outside of the classroom</i> • <i>Teacher and student body language</i> • <i>Physical proximity</i> • <i>Warmth and caring</i> • <i>Politeness</i> • <i>Encouragement</i> • <i>Active listening</i> • <i>Fairness</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport</i>	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict. Teacher does not deal with disrespectful behavior.	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels. Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another. Teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral: conveying neither warmth nor conflict.	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages of the students. Students exhibit respect for the teacher. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful. Teacher responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is polite and respectful, but impersonal.	Classroom interactions among the teacher and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to students as individuals. Students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. The net result of interactions is that of connections with students as individuals
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher uses disrespectful talk towards students. Student body language indicates feelings of hurt or insecurity.</i> • <i>Students use disrespectful talk towards one another with no response from the teacher.</i> • <i>Teacher displays no familiarity with or caring about individual students' interests or personalities.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The quality of interactions between teacher and students, or among students, is uneven, with occasional disrespect.</i> • <i>Teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior among students, with uneven results.</i> • <i>Teacher attempts to make connections with individual students, but student reactions indicate that the efforts are not completely successful or are unusual.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Talk between teacher and students and among students is uniformly respectful.</i> • <i>Teacher responds to disrespectful behavior among students.</i> • <i>Teacher makes superficial connections with individual students.</i> 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher demonstrates knowledge and caring about individual students' lives beyond school.</i> • <i>When necessary, students correct one another in their conduct towards classmates.</i> • <i>There is no disrespectful behavior among students.</i> • <i>The teacher's response to a student's incorrect response respects the student's dignity</i>
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A student slumps in his/her chair following a comment by the teacher.</i> • <i>Students roll their eyes at a classmate's idea; the teacher does not respond.</i> • <i>Many students talk when the teacher and other students are talking; the teacher does not correct them.</i> • <i>Some students refuse to work with other students.</i> • <i>Teacher does not call students by their names.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students attend passively to the teacher, but tend to talk, pass notes, etc. when other students are talking.</i> • <i>A few students do not engage with others in the classroom, even when put together in small groups.</i> • <i>Students applaud half-heartedly following a classmate's presentation to the class.</i> • <i>Teacher says "Don't talk that way to your classmates," but student shrugs his/her shoulders</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher greets students by name as they enter the class or during the lesson.</i> • <i>The teacher gets on the same level with students, such as kneeling beside a student working at a desk.</i> • <i>Students attend fully to what the teacher is saying.</i> • <i>Students wait for classmates to finish speaking before beginning to talk.</i> • <i>Students applaud politely following a classmate's presentation to the class.</i> • <i>Students help each other and accept help from each other.</i> • <i>Teacher and students use courtesies such as "please/thank you, excuse me."</i> • <i>Teacher says "Don't talk that way to your classmates," and the insults stop.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher inquires about a student's soccer game last weekend (or extracurricular activities or hobbies).</i> • <i>Students say "Shhh" to classmates while the teacher or another student is speaking.</i> • <i>Students clap enthusiastically for one another's presentations for a job well done.</i> • <i>The teacher says: "That's an interesting idea, Josh, but you're 'forgetting....'"</i>

Component	2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning
<p><i>2b: Establishing a culture for learning</i></p>	<p>“A culture for learning” refers to the atmosphere in the classroom that reflects the educational importance of the work undertaken by both students and teacher. It describes the norms that govern the interactions among individuals about the activities and assignments, the value of hard work and perseverance, and the general tone of the class. The classroom is characterized by high cognitive energy, by a sense that what is happening there is important, and that it is essential to get it right. There are high expectations for all students. The classroom is a place where the teacher and students value learning and hard work.</p> <p>Elements of component 2b are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of the content and of learning <i>In a classroom with a strong culture for learning, teachers convey the educational value of what the students are learning.</i> • Expectations for learning and achievement <i>In classrooms with robust cultures for learning, all students receive the message that, while the work is challenging, they are capable of achieving it if they are prepared to work hard.</i> • Student pride in work <i>When students are convinced of their capabilities, they are willing to devote energy to the task at hand, and they take pride in their accomplishments. This pride is reflected in their interactions with classmates and with the teacher.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Belief in the value of the work</i> • <i>Expectations are high and supported through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors</i> • <i>Quality is expected and recognized</i> • <i>Effort and persistence are expected and recognized</i> • <i>Confidence in ability is evidenced by teacher and students language and behaviors</i> • <i>Expectation for all students to participate</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>2b: Establishing a culture for learning</i>	The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of teacher or student commitment to learning, and/or little or no investment of student energy into the task at hand. Hard work is not expected or valued. Medium to low expectations for student achievement are the norm with high expectations for learning reserved for only one or two students.	The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by teacher or students. The teacher appears to be only “going through the motions,” and students indicate that they are interested in completion of a task, rather than quality. The teacher conveys that student success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work; high expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.	The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place where learning is valued by all with high expectations for learning the norm for most students. The teacher conveys that with hard work students can be successful; students understand their role as learners and consistently expend effort to learn. Classroom interactions support learning and hard work.	The classroom culture is a cognitively vibrant place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning. The teacher conveys high expectations for learning by all students and insists on hard work; students assume responsibility for high quality by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding detail and/or helping peers.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher conveys that the reasons for the work are external or trivializes the learning goals and assignments. • The teacher conveys to at least some students that the work is too challenging for them. • Students exhibit little or no pride in their work. • Class time is devoted more to socializing than to learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher’s energy for the work is neutral: indicating neither a high level of commitment nor “blowing it off.” • The teacher conveys high expectations for only some students. • Students comply with the teacher’s expectations for learning, but don’t indicate commitment on their own initiative for the work. • Many students indicate that they are looking for an “easy path.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher communicates the importance of learning, and that with hard work all students can be successful in it. • The teacher demonstrates a high regard for student abilities. • Teacher conveys an expectation of high levels of student effort. • Students expend good effort to complete work of high quality. 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of “Proficient,”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher communicates a genuine passion for the subject. • Students indicate that they are not satisfied unless they have complete understanding. • Student questions and comments indicate a desire to understand the content, rather than, for example, simply learning a procedure for getting the correct answer. • Students recognize the efforts of their classmates. • Students take initiative in improving the quality of their work.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher tells students that they’re doing a lesson because it’s on the test, in the book, or is district directed. • Teacher says to a student: “Why don’t you try this easier problem?” • Students turn in sloppy or incomplete work. • Students don’t engage in work and the teacher ignores it. • Students have not completed their homework and the teacher does not respond. • Almost all of the activities are “busy work.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher says: “Let’s get through this.” • Teacher says: “I think most of you will be able to do this.” • Students consult with one another to determine how to fill in a worksheet, without challenging classmates’ thinking. • Teacher does not encourage students who are struggling. • Some students get to work after an assignment is given or after entering the room. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher says: “This is important; you’ll need to speak grammatical English when you apply for a job.” • Teacher says: “This idea is really important! It’s central to our understanding of history.” • Teacher says: “Let’s work on this together: it’s hard, but you all will be able to do it well.” • Teacher hands a paper back to a student, saying “I know you can do a better job on this.” The student accepts it without complaint. • Students get right to work right away when an assignment is given or after entering the room. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher says “It’s really fun to find the patterns for factoring polynomials.” • Student asks a classmate to explain a concept or procedure since s/he didn’t quite follow the teacher’s explanation. • Students question one another on answers. • Student asks the teacher whether s/he can re-do a piece of work since s/he now sees how it could be strengthened. • Students work even when the teacher isn’t working with them or directing their efforts.

Component	2c: Managing Classroom Procedures
<p><i>2c: Managing classroom procedures</i></p>	<p>A smoothly functioning classroom is a prerequisite to good instruction and high levels of student engagement. Teachers establish and monitor routines and procedures for the smooth operation of the classroom and the efficient use of time. Hallmarks of a well-managed classroom are that instructional groups are used effectively, non-instructional tasks are completed efficiently, and transitions between activities and management of materials and supplies are skillfully done in order to maintain momentum and maximize instructional time. The establishment of efficient routines, and teaching students to employ them, may be inferred from the sense that the class “runs itself.”</p> <p>Elements of Component 2c are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of instructional groups <i>Teachers help students to develop the skills to work purposefully and cooperatively in groups, with little supervision from the teacher</i> • Management of transitions <i>Many lessons engage students in different types of activities – large group, small group, independent work. It’s important that little time is lost as students move from one activity to another; students know the “drill” and execute it seamlessly</i> • Management of materials and supplies <i>Experienced teachers have all necessary materials to hand, and have taught students to implement routines for distribution and collection of materials with a minimum of disruption to the flow of instruction</i> • Performance of non-instructional duties <i>Overall, little instructional time is lost in activities such as taking attendance, recording the lunch count, or the return of permission slips for a class trip.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Smooth functioning of all routines</i> • <i>Little or no loss of instructional time</i> • <i>Students playing an important role in carrying out the routines</i> • <i>Students know what to do, where to move</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>2c Managing classroom procedures</i>	Much instructional time is lost due to inefficient classroom routines and procedures. There is little or no evidence of the teacher managing instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies effectively. There is little evidence that students know or follow established routines.	Some instructional time is lost due to only partially effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher’s management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies is inconsistent, leading to some disruption of learning. With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines.	There is little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher’s management of instructional groups and/or the handling of materials and supplies are consistently successful. With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines.	Instructional time is maximized due to efficient classroom routines and procedures. Students contribute to the management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies. Routines are well understood and may be initiated by students.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students not working with the teacher are disruptive to the class.</i> • <i>There are no established procedures for distributing and collecting materials.</i> • <i>Procedures for other activities are confused or chaotic.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Small groups are only partially engaged while not working directly with the teacher.</i> • <i>Procedures for transitions, and distribution/collection of materials, seem to have been established, but their operation is rough.</i> • <i>Classroom routines function unevenly.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The students are productively engaged during small group work.</i> • <i>Transitions between large and small group activities are smooth.</i> • <i>Routines for distribution and collection of materials and supplies work efficiently.</i> • <i>Classroom routines function smoothly.</i> 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students take the initiative with their classmates to ensure that their time is used productively.</i> • <i>Students themselves ensure that transitions and other routines are accomplished smoothly.</i> • <i>Students take initiative in distributing and collecting materials efficiently.</i>
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>When moving into small groups, students are confused as to where they are supposed to go, whether they should take their chairs, etc.</i> • <i>There are long lines for materials and supplies or distributing supplies is time-consuming.</i> • <i>Students bump into one another lining up or sharpening pencils.</i> • <i>Roll-taking consumes much time at the beginning of the lesson and students are not working on anything.</i> • <i>Most students ask what they are to do or look around for clues from others.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some students not working with the teacher are not productively engaged in learning.</i> • <i>Transitions between large and small group activities are rough but they are accomplished.</i> • <i>Students are not sure what to do when materials are being distributed or collected.</i> • <i>Students ask some clarifying questions about procedures</i> • <i>The attendance or lunch count consumes more time than it would need if the procedure were more routinized.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students get started on an activity while the teacher takes attendance.</i> • <i>Students move smoothly between large and small group activities.</i> • <i>The teacher has an established timing device, such as counting down, to signal students to return to their desks.</i> • <i>Teacher has an established attention signal, such as raising a hand, or dimming the lights.</i> • <i>One member of each small group collects materials for the table.</i> • <i>There is an established color-coded system indicating where materials should be stored.</i> • <i>In small group work, students have established roles, they listen to one another, summarize g different views, etc.</i> • <i>Clean-up at the end of a lesson is fast and efficient.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students redirect classmates in small groups not working directly with the teacher to be more efficient in their work.</i> • <i>A student reminds classmates of the roles that they are to play within the group.</i> • <i>A student re-directs a classmate to the table s/he should be at following a transition.</i> • <i>Students propose an improved attention signal.</i> • <i>Students independently check themselves into class on the attendance board.</i>

<p>Domain 2:</p>	<p>The Classroom Environment</p>
<p>2d. Managing Student Behavior</p>	<p>In order for students to be able to engage deeply with content, the classroom environment must be orderly; the atmosphere must feel business-like and productive, without being authoritarian. In a productive classroom, standards of conduct are clear to students; they know what they are permitted to do, and what they can expect of their classmates. Even when their behavior is being corrected, students feel respected; their dignity is not undermined. Skilled teachers regard positive student behavior not as an end in itself, but as a prerequisite to high levels of engagement in content.</p> <p>Elements of Component 2d are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations <i>It is clear, either from what the teacher says, or by inference from student actions, that expectations for student conduct have been established and that they are being implemented</i> • Monitoring of student behavior <i>Experienced teachers seem to have eyes “in the backs of their heads;” they are attuned to what’s happening in the classroom and can move subtly to help students, when necessary, re-engage with the content being addressed in the lesson. At a high level, such monitoring is preventive and subtle, which makes it challenging to observe</i> • Response to student misbehavior <i>Even experienced teachers find that their students occasionally violate one or another of the agreed-upon standards of conduct; how the teacher responds to such infractions is an important mark of the teacher’s skill. Accomplished teachers try to understand why students are conducting themselves in such a manner (are they unsure of the content? Are they trying to impress their friends?) and respond in such a way that they respect the dignity of the student. The best responses are those that address misbehavior early in an episode, although this is not always possible.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted, and possibly referred to during a lesson</i> • <i>Absence of acrimony between teacher and students concerning behavior</i> • <i>Teacher awareness of student conduct</i> • <i>Preventive action when needed by the teacher</i> • <i>Fairness</i> • <i>Absence of misbehavior</i> • <i>Reinforcement of positive behavior</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>2d Managing Student Behavior</i>	There appear to be no established standards of conduct, and little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior. Students challenge the standards of conduct. Response to students' misbehavior is repressive, or disrespectful of student dignity.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established, but their implementation is inconsistent. Teacher tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior. There is inconsistent implementation of the standards of conduct.	Student behavior is generally appropriate. The teacher monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct. Teacher response to student misbehavior is consistent, proportionate and respectful to students and is effective.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate. Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against standards of conduct. Teachers' monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive. Teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students
<i>Critical Attributes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The classroom environment is chaotic, with no apparent standards of conduct.</i> • <i>The teacher does not monitor student behavior.</i> • <i>Some students violate classroom rules, without apparent teacher awareness.</i> • <i>When the teacher notices student misbehavior, s/he appears helpless to do anything about it.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher attempts to maintain order in the classroom but with uneven success; standards of conduct, if they exist, are not evident.</i> • <i>Teacher attempts to keep track of student behavior, but with no apparent system.</i> • <i>The teacher's response to student misbehavior is inconsistent: sometimes very harsh; other times lenient.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Standards of conduct appear to have been established.</i> • <i>Student behavior is generally appropriate.</i> • <i>The teacher frequently monitors student behavior.</i> • <i>Teacher's response to student misbehavior is effective.</i> • <i>Teacher acknowledges good behavior.</i> 	In addition to the characteristics of "proficient," <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student behavior is entirely appropriate; no evidence of student misbehavior.</i> • <i>The teacher monitors student behavior without speaking – just moving about.</i> • <i>Students respectfully intervene as appropriate with classmates to ensure compliance with standards of conduct.</i>
<i>Possible Examples</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students are talking among themselves, with no attempt by the teacher to silence them.</i> • <i>An object flies through the air without apparent teacher notice.</i> • <i>Students are running around the room, resulting in a chaotic environment.</i> • <i>Their phones and other electronics distract students and teacher doesn't do anything.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Classroom rules are posted, but neither teacher nor students refers to them.</i> • <i>The teacher repeatedly asks students to take their seats; they ignore him/her.</i> • <i>To one student: "Where's your late pass? Go to the office." To another: "You don't have a late pass? Come in and take your seat; you've missed enough already."</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Upon a non-verbal signal from the teacher, students correct their behavior.</i> • <i>The teacher moves to every section of the classroom, keeping a close eye on student behavior.</i> • <i>The teacher gives a student a "hard look," and the student stops talking to his/her neighbor.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A student suggests a revision in one of the classroom rules.</i> • <i>The teacher notices that some students are talking among themselves, and without a word, moves nearer to them; the talking stops.</i> • <i>The teacher asks to speak to a student privately about misbehavior.</i> • <i>A student reminds his/her classmates of the class rule about chewing gum.</i>

<p>Component</p>	<p>2e: Organizing Physical Space</p>
	<p>The use of the physical environment to promote student learning is a hallmark of an experienced teacher. Its use varies, of course, with the age of the students: in a primary classroom, centers and reading corners may structure class activities, while with older students, the position of chairs and desks can facilitate, or inhibit, rich discussion. Naturally, classrooms must be safe (no dangling wires or dangerous traffic patterns), and all students must be able to see and hear what’s going on so they can participate actively. Both the teacher and students make effective use of computer (and other) technology.</p> <p>Elements of this component are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and accessibility <i>Physical safety is a primary consideration of all teachers; no learning can occur if students are unsafe or if they don’t have access to the board or other learning resources.</i> • Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources. <i>Both the physical arrangement of a classroom and the available resources provide opportunities for teachers to advance learning; when these are skillfully used students can engage with the content in a productive manner. At the highest levels of performance, the students themselves contribute to the physical environment.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pleasant, inviting atmosphere</i> • <i>Safe environment</i> • <i>Accessibility for all students</i> • <i>Furniture arrangement suitable for the learning activities</i> • <i>Effective use of physical resources, including computer technology, by both teacher and students</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>2e: Organizing physical space</i>	The physical environment is unsafe, or many students don't have access to learning. There is poor alignment between the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology, and the lesson activities.	The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students. The teacher's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective. Teacher may attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.	The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.	The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students including those with special needs. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There are physical hazards in the classroom, endangering student safety.</i> • <i>Many students can't see or hear the teacher or the board.</i> • <i>Available technology is not being used, even if available and its use would enhance the lesson.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The physical environment is safe, and most students can see and hear.</i> • <i>The physical environment is not an impediment to learning, but does not enhance it.</i> • <i>The teacher makes limited use of available technology and other resources.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The classroom is safe, and all students are able to see and hear.</i> • <i>The classroom is arranged to support the instructional goals and learning activities.</i> • <i>The teacher makes appropriate use of available technology.</i> 	In addition to the characteristics of "proficient," <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Modifications are made to the physical environment to accommodate students with special needs.</i> • <i>There is total alignment between the goals of the lesson and the physical environment.</i> • <i>Students take the initiative to adjust the physical environment.</i> • <i>Teachers and students make extensive and imaginative use of available technology</i>
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There are electrical cords running around the classroom.</i> • <i>There is a pole in the middle of the room; some students can't see the board.</i> • <i>A white board is in the classroom, but it is facing the wall, indicating that it is rarely, if ever, used.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher ensures that dangerous chemicals are stored safely.</i> • <i>The classroom desks remains in two semicircles, even though the activity for small groups would be better served by moving the desks to make tables for a portion of the lesson.</i> • <i>The teacher tries to use a computer to illustrate a concept, but requires several attempts to make it work.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There are established guidelines concerning where backpacks are left during class to keep the pathways clear; students comply.</i> • <i>Desks are moved to make tables so students can work together, or in a circle for a class discussion.</i> • <i>The use of an Internet connection enriches the lesson.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students ask if they can shift the furniture to better suit small group work, or discussion.</i> • <i>A student closes the door to shut out noise in the corridor, or lowers a blind to block the sun from a classmate's eyes.</i> • <i>A student suggests an application of the white board for an activity.</i>

Domain 3: Instruction

<p>Component</p>	<p>3a: Communicating With Students</p>
	<p>Teachers communicate with students for several independent, but related, purposes. First, they convey that teaching and learning are purposeful activities; they make that purpose clear to students. They also provide clear directions for classroom activities, so students know what it is that they are to do. When they present concepts and information, those presentations are made with accuracy, clarity and imagination; where appropriate to the lesson, skilled teachers embellish their explanations with analogies or metaphors, linking them to students’ interests and prior knowledge. Teachers occasionally withhold information from students (for example in an inquiry science lesson) to encourage them to think on their own, but what information they do convey is accurate and reflects deep understanding. And the teacher’s use of language is vivid, rich, and error free, affording the opportunity for students to hear language well used and to extend their own vocabularies. Teacher presents complex concepts in ways that provide scaffolding and access to students.</p> <p>Elements of Component 3a are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for learning <i>The goals for learning are communicated clearly to students. Even if not conveyed at the outset of a lesson (for example, an inquiry lesson in science) by the end of the lesson students are clear about what they have been learning.</i> • Directions for activities <i>Students are clear about what they are expected to do during a lesson, particularly if students are working independently or with classmates without direct teacher supervision. These directions for the lesson activities may be provided orally, in writing, or in some combination of the two.</i> • Explanations of content <i>Skilled teachers, when explaining concepts to students, use vivid language and imaginative analogies and metaphors, connecting explanations to students’ interests and lives beyond school. The explanations are clear, with appropriate scaffolding, and, where appropriate, anticipate possible student misconceptions.</i> • Use of oral and written language <i>For many students, their teachers’ use of language represents their best model of both accurate syntax and a rich vocabulary; these models enable students to emulate such language, making their own more precise and expressive.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clarity of lesson purpose</i> • <i>Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities</i> • <i>Absence of content errors and clear explanations of concepts</i> • <i>Students understand the content</i> • <i>Correct and imaginative use of language</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>3a: Communicating with students</i>	The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students and the directions and procedures are confusing. Teacher's explanation of the content contains major errors. The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. Vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	Teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion. Teacher's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear; other portions are difficult to follow. Teacher's explanation consists of a monologue, with no invitation to the students for intellectual engagement. Teacher's spoken language is correct; however, vocabulary is limited, or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.	The instructional purpose of the lesson is clearly communicated to students, including where it is situated within broader learning; directions and procedures are explained clearly. Teacher's explanation of content is well scaffolded, clear and accurate, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. During the explanation of content, the teacher invites student intellectual engagement. Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests.	The teacher links the instructional purpose of the lesson to student interests; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. Teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding and connecting with students' interests. Students contribute to extending the content, and in explaining concepts to their classmates. Teacher's spoken and written language is expressive, and the teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At no time during the lesson does the teacher convey to the students what they will be learning. • Students indicate through their questions that they are confused as to the learning task. • The teacher makes a serious content error that will affect students' understanding of the lesson. • Students indicate through body language or questions that they don't understand the content being presented. • Teacher's communications include errors of vocabulary or usage. • Vocabulary is inappropriate to the age or culture of the students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher refers in passing to what the students will be learning, or it is written on the board with no elaboration or explanation. • Teacher must clarify the learning task so students can complete it. • The teacher makes no serious content errors, although may make a minor error. • The teacher's explanation of the content consists of a monologue or is purely procedural with minimal participation by students. • Vocabulary and usage are correct but unimaginative. • Vocabulary is too advanced or juvenile for the students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher states clearly, at some point during the lesson, what the students will be learning. • If appropriate, the teacher models the process to be followed in the task. • Students engage with the learning task, indicating that they understand what they are to do. • The teacher makes no content errors. • Teacher's explanation of content is clear, and invites student participation and thinking. • Vocabulary and usage are correct and completely suited to the lesson. • Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and levels of development. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher points out possible areas for misunderstanding. • Teacher explains content clearly and imaginatively, using metaphors and analogies to bring content to life. • All students seem to understand the presentation. • The teacher invites students to explain the content to the class, or to classmates. • Teacher uses rich language, offering brief vocabulary lessons where appropriate.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student asks: "What are we supposed to be doing?" but the teacher ignores the question. • The teacher states that to add fractions, they must have the same numerator. • Students have a quizzical look on their faces; some may withdraw from the lesson. • Students become disruptive, or talk among themselves in an effort to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher mis-pronounces "..." • The teacher says: "And oh, by the way, today we're going to factor polynomials." • A student asks: "What are we supposed to be doing?" and the teacher clarifies the task. • Students ask "What do I write here?" in order to complete a task. • The teacher says: "Watch me while I show you how to" with students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "By the end of today's lesson, you're all going to be able to factor different types of polynomials." • In the course of a presentation of content, the teacher asks of students: "Can anyone think of an example of that?" • The teacher uses a board or projection device so students can refer to it without requiring the teacher's attention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher says: "Here's a spot where some students have difficulty:...be sure to read it carefully." • The teacher asks a student to explain the task to other students. • When needed, a student offers clarification about the learning task to classmates. • The teacher explains passive solar energy by inviting students to think about the temperature in a closed car on a cold, but sunny, day, or by the water in a hose that has

	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory</p> <p><i>follow the lesson.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher uses technical terms with an elementary class without explaining their meanings.</i> • <i>The teacher says “ain’t.”</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Basic</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proficient</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Distinguished</p>
	<p><i>asked only to listen.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A number of students do not seem to be following the explanation.</i> • <i>Students are inattentive during the teacher’s explanation of content.</i> 		<p><i>been sitting in the sun.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher says: “Who would like to explain this idea to us?”</i> • <i>The teacher pauses during an explanation of the civil rights movement to remind students that the prefix “in” as in “inequality” means “not.” The prefix “un” also means the same thing.</i> 	

Component	3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
	<p>Questioning and discussion are the only instructional strategies specifically referred to in the framework for teaching; this reflects their central importance to teachers’ practice. But in the framework, it is important that questioning and discussion are used as techniques to deepen student understanding, rather than serving as recitation, or a verbal “quiz.” Good teachers use divergent as well as convergent questions, framed in such a way that they invite students to formulate hypotheses, make connections, or challenge previously held views. Students’ responses to questions are valued; effective teachers are especially adept at responding to and building on student responses and making use of their ideas. High quality questions encourage students to make connections among concepts or events previously believed to be unrelated, and arrive at new understandings of complex material. Effective teachers also pose questions for which they do not know the answers. Even when a question has a limited number of correct responses, the question, being non-formulaic, is likely to promote thinking by students. Class discussions are animated, engaging all students in important issues and in using their own language to deepen and extend their understanding. They may be based around questions formulated by the students themselves.</p> <p>Not all questions must be at a high cognitive level in order for a teacher’s performance to be rated at a high level; that is, when exploring a topic, a teacher might begin with a series of questions of low cognitive challenge to provide a review, or to ensure that everyone in the class is “on board.” Furthermore, if questions are at a high level, but only a few students participate in the discussion, the teacher’s performance on the component cannot be judged to be at a high level. In addition, in lessons involving students in small-group work, the quality of the students’ questions and discussion in their small groups may be considered as part of this component.</p> <p>In order for students to formulate high-level questions, they must have learned how to do this. Therefore, high-level questions from students, either in the full class, or in small group discussions, provide evidence that these skills have been taught.</p> <p>Elements of component 3b are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of questions/prompts <i>Questions of high quality cause students to think and reflect, to deepen their understanding, and to test their ideas against those of their classmates. When teachers ask questions of high quality, they ask only a few of them, and they provide students with sufficient time to think about their response, to reflect on the comments of their classmates, and to deepen their understanding. Occasionally, for the purposes of review, teachers ask students a series of (usually low-level) questions in a type of verbal quiz. This may be helpful for the purpose of establishing the facts of an historical event, for example, but they should not be confused with the use of questioning to deepen students’ understanding.</i> • Discussion techniques <i>Effective teachers promote learning through discussion. Some teachers report that “we discussed x” when what they mean is that “I said x.” That is, some teachers confuse discussion with explanation of content; as important as that is, it’s not discussion. Rather, in a true discussion, a teacher poses a question, and invites all students’ views to be heard, and enabling students to engage in discussion directly with one another, not always mediated by the teacher.</i> • Student participation <i>In some classes a few students tend to dominate the discussion, other students, recognizing this pattern, hold back their contributions. Teacher uses a range of techniques to ensure that all students contribute to the discussion, and enlist the assistance of students to ensure this outcome.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Questions of high cognitive challenge, formulated by both students and teacher</i> • <i>Questions with multiple correct answers, or multiple approaches even when there is a single correct response</i> • <i>Effective use of student responses and ideas</i> • <i>Discussion with the teacher stepping out of the central, mediating role</i> • <i>High levels of student participation in discussion</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>3b: Using questioning / prompts and discussion</i>	Teacher’s questions are of low cognitive challenge, single correct responses, and asked in rapid succession. Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers. A few students dominate the discussion.	Teacher’s questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance. Alternatively the teacher attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved. Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to one another, with uneven results.	While the teacher may use some low-level questions, he or she poses questions to students designed to promote student thinking and understanding. Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond, and stepping aside when appropriate. Teacher successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.	Teacher uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. Students formulate many questions, initiate topics and make unsolicited contributions. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are rapid-fire, and convergent, with a single correct answer. • Questions do not invite student thinking. • All discussion is between teacher and students; students are not invited to speak directly to one another. • A few students dominate the discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher frames some questions designed to promote student thinking, but only a few students are involved. • The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another’s ideas, but few students respond. • Teacher calls on many students, but only a small number actually participate in the discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher uses open-ended questions, inviting students to think and/or have multiple possible answers. • The teacher makes effective use of wait time. • The teacher builds on uses student responses to questions effectively. • Discussions enable students to talk to one another, without ongoing mediation by the teacher. • The teacher calls on most students, even those who don’t initially volunteer. • Many students actively engage in the discussion. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students initiate higher-order questions. • Students extend the discussion, enriching it. • Students invite comments from their classmates during a discussion.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All questions are of the “recitation” type, such as “What is 3 x 4?” • The teacher asks a question for which the answer is on the board; students respond by reading it. • The teacher only calls on students who have their hands up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many questions are of the “recitation” type, such as “How many members of the House of Representatives are there?” • The teacher asks: “Who has an idea about this?” but the same three students offer comments. • The teacher asks: “Michael, can you comment on Mary’s idea?” but Michael does not respond, or makes a comment directly to the teacher. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher asks: “What might have happened if the colonists had not prevailed in the American war for independence?” • The teacher uses plural the form in asking questions, such as: “What are some things you think might contribute to...?” • The teacher asks: “Michael, can you comment on Mary’s idea?” and Michael responds directly to Mary. • The teacher asks a question and asks every student to write a brief response, then share with a partner before 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student asks “How many ways are there to get this answer?” • A student says to a classmate: “I don’t think I agree with you on this, because....” • A student asks of other students: “Does anyone have another idea as to how we might figure this out?” • A student asks “What if...?”

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
			<i>inviting a few to offer their ideas to the entire class.</i>	

Component	3c: Engaging Students in Learning
	<p>Student engagement in learning is the centerpiece of the framework for teaching; all other components contribute to it. When students are engaged in learning, they are not merely “busy,” nor are they only “on task.” Rather, they are intellectually active in learning important and challenging content. The critical distinction between a classroom in which students are compliant and busy, and one in which they are engaged, is that in the latter students are developing their understanding through what they do. That is, they are engaged in discussion, debate, answering “what if?” questions, discovering patterns, and the like. They may be selecting their work from a range of (teacher arranged) choices, and making important contributions to the intellectual life of the class. Such activities don’t typically consume an entire lesson, but they are essential components of engagement.</p> <p>A lesson in which students are engaged usually has a discernible structure: a beginning, a middle, and an end, with scaffolding provided by the teacher or by the activities themselves. Student tasks are organized to provide cognitive challenge, and then students are encouraged to reflect on what they have done and what they have learned. That is, there is closure to the lesson, in which students derive the important learning from their own actions. A critical question for an observer in determining the degree of student engagement is “What are the students being asked to do?” If the answer to that question is that they are filling in blanks on a worksheet, or performing a rote procedure, they are unlikely to be cognitively engaged.</p> <p>In observing a lesson, it is essential not only to watch the teacher, but also to pay close attention to the students and what they are doing. The best evidence for student engagement is what students are saying and doing as a consequence of what the teacher does, or has done, or has planned.</p> <p>Elements of Component 3c are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and assignments <i>The activities and assignments are the centerpiece of student engagement, since they determine what it is that students are asked to do. Activities and assignments that promote learning are aligned with the goals of the lesson, and require student thinking that emphasizes depth over breadth, and that may allow students to exercise some choice.</i> • Grouping of students <i>How students are grouped for instruction is one of the many decisions teachers make every day. There are many options; students of similar background and skill may be clustered together, or the more advanced students may be spread around into the different groups. Alternatively, a teacher might permit students to select their own groups, or they could be formed randomly.</i> • Instructional materials and resources <i>The instructional materials a teacher selects to use in the classroom can have an enormous impact on students’ experience. While some teachers are obliged to use a school or district’s officially sanctioned materials, many teacher use these selectively or supplement them with others of their choosing that are better suited to engaging students in deep learning, for example, the use of primary source materials in social studies.</i> • Structure and pacing <i>No one, whether adults or students, likes to be either bored or rushed in completing a task. Keeping things moving, within a well-defined structure, is one of the marks of an experienced teacher. And since much of student learning results from their reflection on what they have done, a well-designed lesson includes time for reflection and closure.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Activities aligned with the goals of the lesson</i> • <i>Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem-solving, etc</i> • <i>Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and are aligned with lesson objectives</i> • <i>Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and are persistent even when the tasks are challenging</i> • <i>Students actively “working,” rather than watching while their teacher “works.”</i> • <i>Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragging nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>3c: Engaging students in learning</i>	The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses. The pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed. Few students are intellectually engaged or interested.	The learning tasks or prompts are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, resulting in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content, and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement. The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content, through well-designed learning tasks, and suitable scaffolding by the teacher, and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes. In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry, and student contributions to the exploration of important content. The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning, and to consolidate their understanding. Students may have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. • Learning tasks require only recall or have a single correct response or method. • The materials used ask students only to perform rote tasks. • Only one type of instructional group is used (whole group, small groups) when variety would better serve the instructional purpose. • Instructional materials used are unsuitable to the lesson and/or the students. • The lesson drags, or is rushed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. • Learning tasks are a mix of those requiring thinking and recall. • Student engagement with the content is largely passive, learning primarily facts or procedures. • Students have no choice in how they complete tasks. • The teacher uses different instructional groupings; these are partially successful in achieving the lesson objectives. • The materials and resources are partially aligned to the lesson objectives, only some of them demanding student thinking. • The pacing of the lesson is uneven; suitable in parts, but rushed or dragging in others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. • Learning tasks have multiple correct responses or approaches and/or demand higher-order thinking. • Students have some choice in how they complete learning tasks. • There is a mix of different types of groupings, suitable to the lesson objectives. • Materials and resources support the learning goals and require intellectual engagement, as appropriate. • The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to be intellectually engaged. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtually all students are highly engaged in the lesson. • Students take initiative to modify a learning task to make it more meaningful or relevant to their needs. • Students suggest modifications to the grouping patterns used. • Students have extensive choice in how they complete tasks. • Students suggest modifications or additions to the materials being used. • Students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are able to fill out the lesson worksheet without understanding what it’s asking them to do. • The lesson drags, or feels rushed. • Students complete “busy work” activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are asked to fill in a worksheet, following an established procedure. • There is a recognizable beginning, middle, and end to the lesson. • Parts of the lesson have a suitable pace; other parts drag or feel rushed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are asked to formulate a hypothesis about what might happen if the American voting system allowed for the direct election of presidents. • Students are given a task to do independently, then to discuss with a table group, followed by a report-out from each table. • There is a clear beginning, middle, and end to the lesson. • The lesson is neither rushed nor drags. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are asked to write an essay “in the style of Hemmingway.” • A student asks whether they might remain in their small groups to complete another section of the activity, rather than work independently. • Students identify or create their own learning materials. • Students summarize their learning from the lesson.

Component	3d: Using Assessment in Instruction
	<p>Assessment of student learning plays an important role in instruction; no longer does it signal the <i>end</i> of instruction; it is now recognized to be an integral part of instruction. While assessment <i>of</i> learning has always been and will continue to be an important aspect of teaching (it’s important for teachers to know whether students have learned what they intend) assessment <i>for</i> learning has increasingly come to play an important role in classroom practice. And in order to assess student learning for the purposes of instruction, teachers must have their finger on “the pulse” of a lesson, monitoring student understanding and, where appropriate, offering feedback to students.</p> <p>Of course, a teacher’s actions in monitoring student learning, while it may superficially look the same as monitoring student behavior, has a fundamentally different purpose. When a teacher is monitoring behavior, he/she is alert to students who may be passing notes, or bothering their neighbors; when teachers monitor student learning, they look carefully at what students are writing, or listen carefully to the questions students ask, in order to gauge whether they require additional activity or explanation in order to grasp the content. In each case, the teacher may be circulating in the room, but his/her purpose in doing so is quite different in the two situations.</p> <p>Similarly, on the surface, questions asked of students for the purpose of monitoring learning, are fundamentally different from those used to build understanding; in the former, teachers are alert to students’ revealed misconceptions, whereas in the latter the questions are designed to explore relationships, or deepen understanding. Indeed, for the purpose of monitoring, many teachers create questions specifically to elicit the extent of student understanding, and use techniques (such as exit tickets) to ascertain the degree of understanding of every student in the class. Indeed, encouraging students (and actually teaching them the necessary skills) of monitoring their own learning against clear standards is demonstrated by teachers at high levels of performance. In this component.</p> <p>But as important as monitoring of student learning and providing feedback to students are, however, they are greatly strengthened by a teacher’s skill in making mid-course corrections when needed, seizing on a “teachable moment.”</p> <p>Elements of Component 3d are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessment Criteria <i>It is essential that students know the criteria for assessment. At its highest level, students themselves have had a hand in articulating the criteria for, for example, a clear oral presentation.</i> ● Monitoring of student learning <i>A teacher’s skill in eliciting evidence of student understanding is one of the true marks of expertise. This is not a hit-or-miss effort, but is planned carefully in advance. But even after carefully planning, monitoring of student learning must be woven seamlessly into the lesson, using a variety of techniques.</i> ● Feedback to students <i>Feedback on learning is an essential element of a rich instructional environment; without it, students are constantly guessing as to how they are doing, and how their work can be improved. Valuable feedback must be timely, constructive, and substantive, and provide students the guidance they need to improve their performance.</i> ● Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress <i>The culmination of student assumption of responsibility for their learning is when they monitor their own learning, and take appropriate action. Of course, they can only do this if the criteria for learning are clear and if they have been taught the skills of checking their work against clear criteria.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Teacher paying close attention to evidence of student understanding</i> ● <i>Teacher posing specifically-created questions to elicit evidence of student understanding</i> ● <i>Teacher circulating to monitor student learning and to offer feedback</i>

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Students assessing their own work against established criteria</i>• <i>Teacher adjusting instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it)</i> |
|--|---|

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<i>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</i>	There is little or no assessment or monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent, or of poor quality. Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment.	Assessment is used sporadically to support instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by teacher and/or students. Feedback to students is general, and students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work but few assess their own work. Questions/prompts/assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning.	Assessment is regularly used during instruction, through monitoring of progress of learning by teacher and/or students, resulting in accurate, specific feedback that advances learning. Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria; some of them engage in self-assessment. Questions/prompts/assessments are used to diagnose evidence of learning.	Assessment is fully integrated into instruction, through extensive use of formative assessment. Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria. Students self-assess and monitor their progress. A variety of feedback, from both the teacher and peers, is accurate, specific, and advances learning. Questions/prompts/assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher gives no indication of what high quality work looks like. • The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the lesson. • Feedback is only global. • The teacher does not ask students to evaluate their own or classmates' work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little evidence that the students understand how their work will be evaluated. • Teacher monitors understanding through a single method, or without eliciting evidence of understanding from all students. • Teacher requests global indications of student understanding. • Feedback to students is not uniformly specific, not oriented towards future improvement of work. • The teacher makes only minor attempts to engage students in self- or peer-assessment. • The teacher's attempts to adjust the lesson are partially successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students indicate that they clearly understand the characteristics of high-quality work. • The teacher elicits evidence of student understanding during the lesson. Students are invited to assess their own work and make improvements. • Feedback includes specific and timely guidance for at least groups of students. • The teacher attempts to engage students in self- or peer-assessment. • When necessary, the teacher makes adjustments to the lesson to enhance understanding by groups of students. 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that students have helped establish the evaluation criteria. • Teacher monitoring of student understanding is sophisticated and continuous: the teacher is constantly "taking the pulse" of the class. • Teacher makes frequent use of strategies to elicit information about individual student understanding. • Feedback to students is specific and timely, and is provided from many sources, including other students. • Students monitor their own understanding, either on their own initiative or as a result of tasks set by the teacher. • The teacher's adjustments to the lesson are designed to assist individual students.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student asks: "How is this assignment going to be graded?" • A student asks "Does this quiz count towards my grade?" • The teacher forges ahead with a presentation without checking for understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher asks: "Does anyone have a question?" • When a student completes a problem on the board, the teacher corrects the student's work without explaining why. • The teacher, after receiving a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher circulates during small group or independent work, offering suggestions to groups of students. • The teacher uses a specifically-formulated question to elicit evidence of student understanding. • The teacher asks students to look over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher reminds students of the characteristics of high-quality work (the assessment criteria), suggesting that the students themselves helped develop them. • While students are working, the teacher circulates providing substantive feedback to individual students.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher says: "good job, everyone."</i> 	<p><i>correct response from one student, continues, without ascertaining whether all students understand the concept.</i></p>	<p><i>their papers to correct their errors.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher uses popsicle sticks or exit tickets to elicit evidence of individual student understanding.</i> • <i>Students offer feedback to their classmates on their work.</i> • <i>Students evaluate a piece of their writing against the writing rubric and confer with the teacher about how it could be improved.</i>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>Component</p>	<p>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p>
	<p>“Flexibility and responsiveness” refer to a teacher’s skill in making adjustments in a lesson to respond to changing conditions. When a lesson is well planned, there may be no need for changes during the course of the lesson itself. Shifting the approach in mid-stream is not always necessary; in fact, with experience comes skill in accurately predicting how a lesson will go, and being prepared for different possible scenarios. But even the most skilled, and best prepared, teachers will on occasion find that either a lesson is not going as they would like, or that a teachable moment has presented itself. They are ready for such situations. Furthermore, teachers who are committed to the learning of all students persist in their attempts to engage them in learning, even when confronted with initial setbacks.</p> <p>Elements of component 3e are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson adjustment <i>Experienced teachers are able to make both minor and (when needed) major adjustments to a lesson, a mid-course correction. Such adjustments depend on a teacher’s store of alternate instructional strategies, and the confidence to make a shift when needed.</i> • Response to students <i>Occasionally during a lesson an unexpected event will occur which presents a true “teachable moment.” It is a mark of considerable teacher skill to be able to capitalize on such opportunities.</i> • Persistence <i>Committed teachers don’t give up easily; when students encounter difficulty in learning (which all do at some point) these teachers seek alternate approaches to help their students be successful. In these efforts, teachers display a keen sense of efficacy.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Incorporation of student interests and events of the day into a lesson</i> • <i>Visible adjustment in the face of student lack of understanding</i> • <i>Teacher seizing on a “teachable moment”</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or students' lack of interest. Teacher ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.	Teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions and interests, with moderate success. Teacher accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.	Teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making minor adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs and interests. The teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies.	Teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings. Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher ignores indications of student boredom or lack of understanding. Teacher brushes aside student questions. Teacher makes no attempt to incorporate student interests into the lesson. The teacher conveys to students that when they have difficulty learning, it is their fault. In reflecting on practice, the teacher does not indicate that it is important to reach all students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher's efforts to modify the lesson are only partially successful. Teacher makes perfunctory attempts to incorporate student questions and interests into the lesson. The teacher conveys to students a level of responsibility for their learning, but uncertainty as to how to assist them. In reflecting on practice, the teacher indicates the desire to reach all students, but does not suggest strategies to do so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher successfully makes a minor modification to the lesson. Teacher incorporates students' interests and questions into the heart of the lesson. The teacher conveys to students that she has other approaches to try when the students experience difficulty. In reflecting on practice, the teacher cites multiple approaches undertaken to reach students having difficulty. 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher successfully executes a major lesson readjustment when needed. Teacher seizes on a teachable moment to enhance a lesson. The teacher conveys to students that he won't consider a lesson "finished" until every student understands, and that he has a broad range of approaches to use. In reflecting on practice, the teacher can cite others in the school and beyond who she has contacted for assistance in reaching some students.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher says: "We don't have time for that today." The teacher makes no attempt to adjust the lesson based on student confusion. The teacher says: "If you'd just pay attention, you could understand this." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher says: "I'll try to think of another way to come at this and get back to you." The teacher says: "I realize not everyone understands this, but we can't spend any more time on it." The teacher re-arranges the way the students are grouped in an attempt to help students understand the lesson. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher says: "That's an interesting idea; let's see how it fits." The teacher illustrates a principle of good writing to a student using his interest in basketball as context. The teacher says: "Let's try this way, and then uses another approach." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher stops in mid-stream in a lesson, and says: "This activity doesn't seem to be working! Here's another way I'd like you to try it." The teacher incorporates the school's upcoming championship game into an explanation of averages. The teacher says: "If we have to come back to this tomorrow, we will; it's really important that you understand it."

Domain 4:	Professional Responsibilities
4a: Reflecting on Teaching	<p>Reflecting on teaching encompasses the teacher’s thinking that follows any instructional event, an analysis of the many decisions made both in planning and implementation of a lesson. By considering these elements in light of the impact they had on student learning, teachers can determine where to focus their efforts in making revisions, and what aspects of the instruction they will continue in future lessons. Teachers may reflect on their practice through collegial conversations, journal writing, examining student work, informal observations and conversations with students, or simply thinking about their teaching. Reflecting with accuracy, specificity and ability to use what has been learned in future teaching is a learned skill; mentors, coaches and supervisors can help teachers acquire and develop the skill of reflecting on teaching through supportive and deep questioning. Over time, this way of thinking and analyzing instruction through the lens of student learning becomes a habit of mind, leading to improvement in teaching and learning.</p> <p>Elements of component 4a are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy <i>As teachers gain experience, their reflections on practice become more accurate, corresponding to the assessments that would be given by an external and unbiased observer. Not only are the reflections accurate, but teachers can provide specific examples from the lesson to support their judgments.</i> • Use in future teaching <i>In order for the potential of reflection to improve teaching to be fully realized, teachers must use their reflections to make adjustments in their practice. As their experience and expertise increases, teachers draw on an ever-increasing repertoire of strategies to inform these plans.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate reflections on a lesson • Citations of adjustments to practice, drawing on a repertoire of strategies

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
4a Reflecting on Teaching	Teacher does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or teacher profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson. Teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.	Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met. Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved.	Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment. Teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each. Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, teacher offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher considers the lesson but draws incorrect conclusions about its effectiveness. • The teacher makes no suggestions for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher has a general sense of whether or not instructional practices were effective. • The teacher offers general modifications for future instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher accurately assesses the effectiveness of instructional activities used. • The teacher identifies specific ways in which a lesson might be improved. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher’s assessment of the lesson is thoughtful, and includes specific indicators of effectiveness. • Teacher’s suggestions for improvement draw on an extensive repertoire.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite evidence to the contrary, the teachers says, “My students did great on that lesson!” • The teacher says: “That was awful; I wish I knew what to do!” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the end of the lesson the teacher says, “I guess that went okay.” • The teacher says: “I guess I’ll try x next time.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher says: “I wasn’t pleased with the level of engagement of the students.” • The teacher’s journal indicates several possible lesson improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher says: “I think that lesson worked pretty well, although I was disappointed in how the group at the back table performed.” • In conversation with colleagues, the teacher considers different group strategies for improving a lesson.

<p>Domain 4: <i>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</i></p>	<p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>An essential responsibility of professional educators is keeping accurate records of both instructional and non-instructional events. This includes student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and records of non-instructional activities that are part of the day-to-day functions in a school setting, including such things as the return of signed permission slips for a field trip and money for school pictures. Proficiency in this component is vital, as these records inform interactions with students and parents, and allow teachers to monitor learning and adjust instruction accordingly. The methods of keeping records vary as much as the type of information that is being recorded. For example, records of formal assessments may be recorded electronically, using spreadsheets and databases, allowing for item analysis and individualized instruction. A less formal means of keeping track of student progress may include anecdotal notes that are kept in student folders.</p> <p>Elements of component 4b are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student completion of assignments <i>Most teachers, particularly at the secondary level, need to keep track of student completion of assignments, including not only whether the assignments were actually completed, but students' success in completing them.</i> • Student progress in learning <i>In order to plan instruction, teachers need to know where each student "is" in his or her learning. This information may be collected formally or informally, but must be updated frequently.</i> • Non-instructional records <i>Non-instructional records encompass all the details of school life for which records must be maintained, particularly if they involve money. Examples are such things as knowing which students have returned their permissions slips for a field trip, or which students have paid for their school pictures.</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routines and systems that track student completion of assignments • Systems of information regarding student progress against instructional outcomes • Processes of maintaining accurate non-instructional records 			
<p><i>4b Maintaining Accurate Records</i></p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is nonexistent or in disarray. Teacher's records for non-instructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.</p>	<p>Basic</p> <p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective. Teacher's records for non-instructional activities are adequate, but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.</p>	<p>Proficient</p> <p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, is fully effective.</p>	<p>Distinguished</p> <p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, is fully effective. Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.</p>

<p>Critical Attributes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Absence of a system for either instructional or non-instructional records.</i> • <i>Record-keeping systems that are in disarray so as to provide incorrect or confusing information.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher has a process for recording student work completion. However, it may be out-of-date or does not permit students to access the information.</i> • <i>The teacher's process for tracking student progress is cumbersome to use.</i> • <i>The teacher has a process for tracking some non-instructional information, but not all, or it may contain some errors.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher's process for recording student work completion is efficient and effective; students have access to information about completed and/or missing assignments.</i> • <i>The teacher has an efficient and effective process for recording student attainment of learning goals; students are able to see how they're progressing.</i> • <i>The teacher's process for recording non-instructional information is both efficient and effective.</i> 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students contribute to and maintain records indicating completed and outstanding work assignments.</i> • <i>Students contribute to and maintain data files indicating their own progress in learning.</i> • <i>Students contribute to maintaining non-instructional records for the class.</i>
<p>Possible Examples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A student says, "I'm sure I turned in that assignment, but the teacher lost it!"</i> • <i>The teacher says, "I misplaced the writing samples for my class but it doesn't matter – I know what the students would have scored."</i> • <i>On the morning of the field trip, the teacher discovers that five students never turned in their permission slips.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A student says, "I wasn't in school today, and my teacher's website is out of date, so I don't know what the assignments are!"</i> • <i>The teacher says: "I've got all these notes about how the kids are doing; I should put them into the system but I just don't have time."</i> • <i>On the morning of the field trip, the teacher frantically searches all the drawers in the desk looking for the permission slips and finds them just before the bell rings.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher-creates a link on the class website which students can access to check on any missing assignments.</i> • <i>The teacher's grade book records student progress toward learning goals.</i> • <i>The teacher-creates a spreadsheet for tracking which students have paid for their school pictures.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A student from each team maintains the database of current and missing assignments for the team.</i> • <i>When asked about their progress in a class, a student proudly shows her data file and can explain how the documents indicate her progress toward learning goals.</i> • <i>When they bring in their permission slips for a field trip, students add their own information to the database.</i>

<p>Domain 4:</p> <p>4c:</p> <p><i>Communicating with Families</i></p>	<p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>Although the ability of families to participate in their child’s learning varies widely due to other family or job obligations, it is the responsibility of teachers to provide opportunities for them to both understand the instructional program and their child’s progress. Teachers establish relationships with families by communicating to them about the instructional program, about individual students and they invite them to be part of the educational process itself. The level of family participation and involvement tends to be greater at the elementary level, when young children are just beginning school. However, the importance of regular communication with families of adolescents cannot be overstated. A teacher’s effort to communicate with families conveys an essential caring on the part of the teacher, valued by families of students of all ages.</p> <p>Elements of component 4c are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the instructional program <i>Frequent information is provided to families, as appropriate, about the instructional program</i> • Information about individual students <i>Frequent information is provided to families, as appropriate, about students’ individual progress</i> • Engagement of families in the instructional program <i>Successful and frequent engagement opportunities are offered to families so they can participate in the learning activities</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent and culturally appropriate information sent home regarding the instructional program, and student progress • Two-way communication between the teacher and families • Frequent opportunities for families to engage in the learning process
--	--

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
4c: Communicating with Families	Teacher communication with families, about the instructional program, or about individual students, is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. Teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.	Teacher makes sporadic attempts to communicate with families about the instructional program and about the progress of individual students but does not attempt to engage families in the instructional program. But communications are one-way and not always appropriate to the cultural norms of those families.	Teacher communicates frequently with families about the instructional program and conveys information about individual student progress. Teacher makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program; as appropriate Information to families is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.	Teacher’s communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions, with students contributing to the communication. Response to family concerns is handled with professional and cultural sensitivity. Teacher’s efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or no information regarding instructional program available to parents. Families are unaware of their children’s progress. Lack of family engagement activities. Culturally inappropriate communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School or district-created materials about the instructional program are sent home. Infrequent or incomplete information sent home by teachers about the instructional program. Teacher maintains school-required grade book but does little else to inform families about student progress. Teacher communications are sometimes inappropriate to families’ cultural norms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about the instructional program is available on a regular basis. The teacher sends information about student progress home on a regular basis. Teacher develops activities designed to successfully engage families in their children’s learning, as appropriate. 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On a regular basis, students develop materials to inform their families about the instructional program. Students maintain accurate records about their individual learning progress and frequently share this information with families. Students contribute to regular and ongoing projects designed to engage families in the learning process.
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A parent says, “I’d like to know what my kid is working on at school!” A parent says, “I wish I knew something about my child’s progress before the report card comes out.” A parent says, “I wonder why we never see any school work come home.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A parent says, “I received the district pamphlet on the reading program, but I wonder how it’s being taught in my child’s class.” A parent says, “I emailed the teacher about my child’s struggles with math, but all I got back was a note saying that he’s doing fine.” Weekly quizzes are sent home for parent/guardian signature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher-sends weekly newsletter home to families, including information that precedes homework, current class activities, community and/or school projects, field trips, etc. The teacher-created monthly progress report sent home for each student. The teacher sends home a project that asks students to interview a family member about growing up during the 1950’s. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students-create materials for “Back to School” night that outline the approach for learning science. Student daily reflection log describes learning and go home each week for a response from a parent or guardian. Students-design a project on charting family use of plastics.

<p>Domain 4: 4d: Participating in a Professional Community</p>	<p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>Schools are, first of all, environments to promote the learning of students. But in promoting student learning, teachers must work with their colleagues to share strategies, plan joint efforts, and plan for the success of individual students. Schools are, in other words, professional organizations for teachers, with their full potential realized only when teachers regard themselves as members of a professional community. This community is characterized by mutual support and respect, and recognition of the responsibility of all teachers to be constantly seeking ways to improve their practice and to contribute to the life of the school. Inevitably, teachers' duties extend beyond the doors of their classrooms and include activities related to the entire school and/or larger district. These activities include such things as school and district curriculum committees, or engagement with the parent teacher organization. With experience, teachers assume leadership roles in these activities.</p> <p>Elements of component 4d are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships with colleagues <i>Teachers maintain a professional collegial relationship that encourages sharing, planning and working together toward improved instructional skill and student success</i> • Involvement in a culture of professional inquiry <i>Teachers contribute to and participate in a learning community that supports and respects its members' efforts to improve practice</i> • Service to the school <i>Teachers' efforts move beyond classroom duties by contributing to school initiatives and projects</i> • Participation in school and district projects <i>Teachers contribute to and support larger school and district projects designed to improve the professional community</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular teacher participation with colleagues to share and plan for student success • Regular teacher participation in professional courses or communities that emphasize improving practice • Regular teacher participation in school initiatives • Regular teacher participation and support of community initiatives 			
<p>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Teacher's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving. Teacher avoids participation in a professional culture of inquiry, resisting opportunities to become involved. Teacher avoids becoming involved in school events or school and district projects.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Basic</p> <p>Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill duties that the school or district requires. Teacher becomes involved in the school's culture of professional inquiry when invited to do so. Teacher participates in school events and school and district projects when specifically asked.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proficient</p> <p>Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation; teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and in school and district projects, making a substantial contribution.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Distinguished</p> <p>Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation, with the teacher taking initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty. Teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and district projects, making a substantial contribution, and assuming a leadership role in at least one aspect of school or district life.</p>

<p>Critical Attributes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher’s relationship with colleagues is characterized by negativity or combativeness. • The teacher purposefully avoids contributing to activities promoting professional inquiry. • The teacher avoids involvement in school activities and school district and community projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher has pleasant relationship with colleagues. • When invited, the teacher participates in activities related to professional inquiry. • When asked, the teacher participates in school activities, and school district and community projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher has supportive and collaborative relationships with colleagues. • The teacher regularly participates in activities related to professional inquiry. • The teacher frequently volunteers to participate in school events and school district and community projects. 	<p>In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher takes a leadership role in promoting activities related to professional inquiry. • The teacher regularly contributes to and leads events that positively impact school life. • The teacher regularly contributes to and leads significant school district and community projects.
<p>Possible Examples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher doesn’t share test-taking strategies with his colleagues. He figures that if his students do well, it will make him look good. • The teacher does not attend PLC meetings. • The teacher does not attend any school function after the dismissal bell. • The teacher says, “I work from 8:30 to 3:30 and not a minute more – I won’t serve on any district committee unless they get me a substitute to cover my class.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher is polite, but never shares any instructional materials with his grade partners. • The teacher only attends PLC meetings when reminded by her supervisor. • The principal says, “I wish I didn’t have to ask the teacher to ‘volunteer’ every time we need someone to chaperone the dance.” • The teacher only contributes to the district Literacy committee when requested by the principal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principal remarks that the teacher’s students have been noticeably successful since her teacher team has been focusing on instructional strategies during their team meetings. • The teacher has decided to take some of the free MIT courses online and to share his learning with colleagues. • The basketball coach is usually willing to chaperone the 9th grade dance because she knows all of her players will be there. • The teacher enthusiastically represents the school during the district Social Studies review and brings her substantial knowledge of U.S. history to the course writing team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher leads the “mentor” teacher group at school, devoted to supporting new teachers during their first years of teaching. • The teacher hosts a book study group that meets monthly; he guides the book choices so that the group can focus on topics that will enhance their skills. • The teacher leads the school’s annual “Olympics” day, involving all students and faculty in athletic events. • The teacher leads the school district wellness committee, involving healthcare and nutrition specialists from the community.

<p>Domain 4: <i>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</i></p>	<p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>As in other professions, the complexity of teaching requires continued growth and development, in order to remain current. Continuing to stay informed and increasing their skills allows teachers to become ever more effective and to exercise leadership among their colleagues. The academic disciplines themselves evolve, and educators constantly refine their understanding of how to engage students in learning; thus growth in content, pedagogy, and information technology are essential to good teaching. Networking with colleague through such activities as joint planning, study groups, and lesson study provide opportunities for teachers to learn from one another. These activities allow for job embedded professional development. In addition, professional educators increase their effectiveness in the classroom by belonging to professional organizations, reading professional journals, attending educational conferences, and taking university classes. As they gain experience and expertise, educators find ways to contribute to their colleagues and to the profession.</p> <p>Elements of component 4e are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill <i>Teachers remain current by taking courses, reading professional literature, and remaining current on the evolution of thinking regarding instruction</i> • Receptivity to feedback from colleagues <i>Teachers actively pursue networks that provide collegial support and feedback</i> • Service to the profession <i>Teachers are active in professional organizations serving to enhance their personal practice and so they can provide leadership and support to colleagues</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent teacher attendance in courses and workshops; regular academic reading • Participation in learning networks with colleagues; feedback freely shared • Participation in professional organizations supporting academic inquiry 			
<p><i>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</i></p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Teacher engages in no professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill. Teacher resists feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues. Teacher makes no effort to share knowledge with others or to assume professional responsibilities.</p>	<p>Basic</p> <p>Teacher participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient. Teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback on teaching performance from both supervisors and professional colleagues. Teacher finds limited ways to contribute to the profession</p>	<p>Proficient</p> <p>Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill. Teacher welcomes feedback from colleagues when made by supervisors or when opportunities arise through professional collaboration. Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators</p>	<p>Distinguished</p> <p>Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic effort to conduct action research. Teacher seeks out feedback on teaching from both supervisors and colleagues. Teacher initiates important activities to contribute to the profession.</p>
<p>Critical Attributes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher is not involved in any activity that might enhance knowledge or skill.</i> • <i>The teacher purposefully resists discussing performance with supervisors or colleagues.</i> • <i>The teacher ignores invitations to join professional organizations or attending conferences.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher participates in professional activities when required or when provided by the school district.</i> • <i>The teacher reluctantly accepts feedback from supervisors and colleagues.</i> • <i>The teacher contributes in a limited fashion to educational professional organizations.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher seeks regular opportunities for continued professional development.</i> • <i>The teacher welcomes colleagues and supervisors in the classroom for the purposes of gaining insight from their feedback.</i> • <i>The teacher actively participates in professional organizations designed to contribute to the profession.</i> 	<p><i>In addition to the characteristics of "proficient,"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher seeks regular opportunities for continued professional development, including initiating action research.</i> • <i>The teacher actively seeks feedback from supervisors and colleagues.</i> • <i>The teacher takes an active leadership role in professional organizations in order to contribute to the teaching profession.</i>

<p>Possible Examples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher never takes continuing education courses, even though the credits would increase his salary.</i> • <i>The teacher endures the principal's annual observations in her classroom, knowing that if she waits long enough, the principal will eventually leave and she can simply discard the feedback form.</i> • <i>Despite teaching high school honors mathematics, the teacher declines to join NCTM because it costs too much and makes too many demands on members' time.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher politely attends district workshops and professional development days, but doesn't make much use of the materials received.</i> • <i>The teacher listens to his principal's feedback after a lesson, but isn't sure that the recommendations really apply in his situation.</i> • <i>The teacher joins the local chapter of the American Library Association because she might benefit from the free books – but otherwise doesn't feel it's worth too much of her time.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher eagerly attends the school district optional summer workshops finding them to be a wealth of instructional strategies he can use during the school year.</i> • <i>The teacher enjoys her principal's weekly walk through visits because they always lead to a valuable informal discussion during lunch the next day.</i> • <i>The teacher joined a Science Education Partnership and finds that it provides him access to resources for his classroom that truly benefit his students' conceptual understanding.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher's principal rarely spends time observing in her classroom. Therefore, she has initiated an action research project in order to improve her own instruction.</i> • <i>The teacher is working on a particular instructional strategy and asks his colleagues to observe in his classroom in order to provide objective feedback on his progress.</i> • <i>The teacher founded a local organization devoted to Literacy Education; her leadership has inspired teachers in the community to work on several curriculum and instruction projects.</i>
---------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Domain 4:	Professional Responsibilities
4f: Showing Professionalism	<p>Expert teachers demonstrate professionalism in both service to students as well as to the profession. Teaching at the highest levels of performance in this component is student focused, putting students first, regardless of how this might challenge long-held assumptions, past practice or simply what is easier or more convenient for teachers. Accomplished teachers have a strong moral compass and are guided by what is in the best interest of students. Professionalism is displayed in a number of ways. For example, interactions with colleagues are conducted with honesty and integrity. Student needs are known and teachers access resources to step in and provide help that may extend beyond the classroom. Teachers advocate for their students in ways that might challenge traditional views and the educational establishment, seeking greater flexibility in the ways school rules and policies are applied. Professionalism is also displayed in the ways teachers approach problem solving and decision making, with student needs in mind. Finally, teachers consistently adhere to school and district policies and procedures, but are willing to work to improve those that may be outdated or ineffective.</p> <p>Elements of component 4f are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity and ethical conduct <i>Teachers act with integrity and honesty</i> • Service to students <i>Teachers put students first in all considerations of their practice</i> • Advocacy <i>Teachers support their students' best interests, even in the face of traditional practice or beliefs</i> • Decision-making <i>Teachers solve problems with students' needs as a priority</i> • Compliance with school and district regulations <i>Teachers adhere to policies and procedures</i> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher has a reputation as someone who can be trusted and is often sought as a sounding board • During committee or planning work, teacher frequently reminds participants that the students are the utmost priority • Teacher will support students, even in the face of difficult situations or conflicting policies • Teachers challenge existing practice in order to put students first • Teacher consistently fulfills school district mandates regarding policies and procedures

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
4f: Showing Professionalism	Teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher is not alert to students' needs and contributes to school practices that result in some students being ill served by the school. Teacher makes decisions and recommendations based on self-serving interests. Teacher does not comply with school and district regulations	Teacher is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher's attempts to serve students are inconsistent, and does not knowingly contribute to some students being ill served by the school. Teacher's decisions and recommendations are based on limited though genuinely professional considerations. Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.	Teacher displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher is active in serving students, working to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. Teacher maintains an open mind in team or departmental decision-making. Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations.	Teacher can be counted on to hold the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality and takes a leadership role with colleagues. Teacher is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school. Teacher takes a leadership role in team or departmental decision-making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards. Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.
Critical Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher is dishonest.</i> • <i>Teacher does not notice the needs of students.</i> • <i>The teacher engages in practices that are self-serving.</i> • <i>The teacher willfully rejects school district regulations.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher is honest.</i> • <i>Teacher notices the needs of students, but is inconsistent in addressing them.</i> • <i>Teacher does not notice that some school practices result in poor conditions for students.</i> • <i>Teacher makes decisions professionally, but on a limited basis.</i> • <i>Teacher complies with school district regulations.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher is honest and known for having high standards of integrity.</i> • <i>Teacher actively addresses student needs.</i> • <i>Teacher actively works to provide opportunities for student success.</i> • <i>Teacher willingly participates in team and departmental decision-making.</i> • <i>Teacher complies completely with school district regulations.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teacher is considered a leader in terms of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality.</i> • <i>Teacher is highly proactive in serving students.</i> • <i>Teacher makes a concerted effort to ensure opportunities are available for all students to be successful.</i> • <i>Teacher takes a leadership role in team and departmental decision-making.</i> • <i>Teacher takes a leadership role regarding school district regulations.</i>

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Possible Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher makes some errors when marking the last common assessment but doesn't tell his colleagues.</i> • <i>The teacher does not realize that three of her neediest students arrived at school an hour early every morning because their mother can't afford daycare.</i> • <i>The teacher fails to notice that one of her Kindergartners is often ill, looks malnourished, and frequently has bruises on her arms and legs.</i> • <i>When one his colleagues goes home suddenly due to illness, the teacher pretends to have a meeting so that he won't have to share in the coverage responsibilities.</i> • <i>The teacher does not file her students' writing samples in their district cum folders; it is time consuming and she wants to leave early for summer break.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher says, "I have always known my grade partner to be truthful. If she called in sick, then I believe her.</i> • <i>The teacher considers staying late to help some of her students in after-school daycare, but realizes it conflicts with her gym class so she decides against it.</i> • <i>The teacher notices a student struggling in his class and sends a quick e-mail to the counselor. When he doesn't get a response, he assumes it has been taken care of.</i> • <i>When her grade partner goes out on maternity leave, the teacher said, "Hello" and "Welcome" to her substitute, but does not offer any further assistance.</i> • <i>The teacher keeps his district-required grade book up to date, but enters exactly the minimum number of assignments specified by his department chair.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The teacher is trusted by his grade partners; they share information with him, confident it will not be repeated inappropriately.</i> • <i>Despite her lack of knowledge about dance the teacher forms a dance club at her high school to meet the high interest level of her minority students who cannot afford lessons.</i> • <i>The teacher notices some speech delays in a few of her young students; she calls in the speech therapist to do a few sessions in her classroom and provide feedback on further steps.</i> • <i>The English department chair says, "I appreciate when attends our after school meetings – he always contributes something meaningful to the discussion.</i> • <i>The teacher learns the district's new online curriculum mapping system and writes in all of her courses.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>When a young teacher has trouble understanding directions from the principal, she immediately goes to the teacher whom she knows can be relied on for expert advice and complete discretion.</i> • <i>After the school's intramural basketball program is discontinued, the teacher finds some former student athletes to come in and work with his students who have come to love the after-school sessions.</i> • <i>The teacher enlists the help of her principal when she realizes that a colleague was making disparaging comments about some disadvantaged students.</i> • <i>The math department looks forward to their weekly meetings; their leader, the teacher is always seeking new instructional strategies and resources for them to discuss.</i> • <i>When the district adopts a new web-based grading program, the teacher learned it inside and out so that she could assist her colleagues with implementation.</i>

SUBLICENSE AGREEMENT

Outcomes Associates, Inc. ("OAI"), through its licensee, Teachscape, Inc., grants to the individual ("You") accepting this Sublicense Agreement (the "Agreement") a non-exclusive license to use, for the purposes of the professional development of teachers in the school districts in Your state only, this Complete Framework for Teaching Instrument in PDF format (the "CFTI"). OAI shall own and retain all right, title and interest in and to the CFTI.

You shall not, and shall not permit any third party to: (i) copy, modify, adapt, alter, translate, or create derivative works from the CFTI, except You may make minor modifications for Your use that are required to meet the conditions in Your school, district or state; (ii) merge the CFTI with software or other content, whether online or otherwise, or integrate or incorporate any portions of the CFTI with any other publication, software, database or other content or work in respect of which a copyright could be sought; (iii) sell, lease, rent, loan, or otherwise transfer the CFTI (or access to the CFTI) to any third party for commercial use; (iv) remove or alter any notices in the CFTI; or (v) copy the CFTI except as expressly permitted.

You agree to indemnify and hold harmless OAI and its officers, employees, representatives, affiliates and successors from and against any loss, liability, expense or damage incurred by any of them as a result of Your use of the CFTI or your failure to comply with Your obligations in this Agreement.

THE CFTI IS PROVIDED ON AN "AS IS" BASIS. OAI MAKES NO WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, NONINFRINGEMENT, OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. OAI SHALL NOT BE LIABLE FOR ANY CLAIMS, LOSSES OR DAMAGES INCURRED BY YOU OR ANY OTHER INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY, INCLUDING CLAIMS FOR LOST PROFITS OR ANY SPECIAL, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES, EVEN IF IT HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES BEFOREHAND. Some jurisdictions do not allow the exclusion or limitation of liability for consequential or incidental damages. In such jurisdictions, our liability is limited to the greatest extent permitted by law, or \$10.00, whichever is less.

This Agreement shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York, without regard to any conflict of law provisions. OAI may assign its rights and delegate its obligations under this Agreement to any third party. None of the terms and conditions contained herein may be added to, modified, superseded or otherwise altered except by an instrument executed by OAI.

Action Plan Template

1. Launching the Teacher Effectiveness Program in Your School

Use this template to plan an overall approach to collaborative implementation and professional development from Day 1.

Establishing Shared Goals		
What are the key shared understandings you need to establish within your school to begin this work successfully?	Priority (number 1-4)	What structures can you use or will you need to establish to make sure these understandings are shared?
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
What will your school team do to maintain open and ongoing dialogue and feedback about the Teacher Effectiveness Program, including all members of the school community?		

Planning Professional Development	
What PD opportunities do you have in mind for your teachers, to meet the expectations of the TEP?	How can you align your PD offerings to the TEP rubric and expectations?

3. Build a Calendar for TEP Implementation

Use this calendar and other resources from today to plan out implementation for the fall.

2012-2013 NYC DOE Calendar						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

Month	Day	Day of Week	Event
August	27	Monday	APs and school-based supervisors report
	3	Monday	Labor Day (schools closed)
September	4	Tuesday	Classroom teachers report
	5	Wednesday	Chancellor's Conference Day for staff development
	6	Thursday	School sessions begin for all students
	17,18	Monday, Tuesday	Rosh Hashanah (schools closed)
	26	Wednesday	Yom Kippur (schools closed)
	October	8	Monday
17		Wednesday	Pre-K Non-Attendance Day
November	6	Tuesday	Election Day, Chancellor's Conference Day
	12	Monday	Veteran's Day (schools closed)
	22, 23	Thursday, Friday	Thanksgiving

July 26, 2012

Chancellor Dennis Walcott
New York City Department of Education
52 Chambers Street
New York, NY 10007

Dear Chancellor Walcott:

On behalf of TNTP, I am writing to express my support for the New York City Department of Education's application to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant competition. We are familiar with your plans to increase the rigor of teacher and school leader evaluations and believe that these new evaluation systems, along with the evaluation-based career lattice that you are proposing, are aligned with our organization's national research findings on best practices for developing, recognizing and retaining top talent.

TNTP is committed to working with the NYC DOE and providing you with any support and guidance we can offer in leveraging this work to improve the effectiveness of the schools to be served by the TIF grant over the course of the planning year and throughout the implementation period.

Our newest report, *The Irreplaceables*, to be released on July 30th, speaks to the need for school districts to address retention of outstanding teachers in new and more targeted ways. We commend your efforts to create a comprehensive human capital management system that goes beyond educator evaluation and takes into account the need to develop teacher talent. I believe that the TIF grant would indeed enable you to make a significant impact on educator practice and, by extension, student academic gains across New York City's public schools.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Daniel Weisberg
Executive Vice President and General Counsel
TNTP

VICKI BERNSTEIN

(b)(6)

EXPERIENCE

1996 - Present

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

New York, NY

Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Human Resources & Talent

- In conjunction with the CEO, oversee the continuum of human capital work including recruitment, staffing, evaluation, salary, benefits, analytics and employee services for the over 120,000 employees across 1,600 schools and central offices
- Manage divisional staff of 400 employees and \$100 million annual budget.

Executive Director, Teacher Recruitment and Quality

- Managed all teacher recruitment initiatives for the outreach, sourcing and screening of high quality candidates to fill 2,500 – 7,500 vacancies annually.
- Designed and implemented teacher portfolio efforts – including programs, incentives, policies, resource allocations, technical assistance and support – to ensure the optimal staffing of all 76,000 teachers across 1,500 schools with a focus on ensuring the highest need children and schools have access to the highest quality educators.
- Oversaw the design, implementation and continuous improvement of new candidate screening criteria, process and technological systems to optimize the selection of high potential teacher candidates for all 1,500 schools.
- Supervised team of 50 employees and consultants and manage \$50 million annual budget.

Director, Alternative Certification / Deputy Executive Director, Division of Human Resources

- Directed programs to provide an alternative route to teacher certification including candidate recruitment, selection, placement, training, support and Master's coursework. Programs recruited approximately 2,600 new teachers annually.
- Designed and initiated the innovative New York City Teaching Fellows Program to attract talented professionals into teaching in traditionally difficult to staff subject areas and schools.
- Managed relationships with universities, unions and state education department in all aspects of Teaching Fellows program design and management.
- Oversaw human resources initiatives for the staffing of school principals and assistant principals.
- Supervised staff of 35 employees and consultants and manage \$45 million annual budget.

Special Assistant to the Deputy Chancellor for Operations

- Chief of Staff for the senior operations officer in local education agency serving 1.1 million public school children with a \$10 billion annual budget.
- Coordinated activities of divisions and offices under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Chancellor including facilities, budget, financial operations, human resources, information technology, audit and school safety.
- Directed special projects including \$100 million early grade class size reduction program, low performing school turnaround initiative, summer school expansion planning and the Task Force on Teacher Recruitment, Selection and Retention.
- Served as the Deputy Chancellor's representative in labor negotiations.
- Prepared data analyses, memorandum, policy recommendations and briefings.

1995 - 1996

CITY OF BOSTON PUBLIC FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

Boston, MA

Executive Assistant – Director's Office

- Chief of Staff for the city's community development and capital construction department with 300 employees and annual budget of \$125 million.
- Directed strategic planning for departmental systems and operations including budget development, project selection and review, program design, financial systems, customer service, performance measurement, staffing plan and organizational structure.

- Managed special projects such as initiative to reduce insurance costs for urban homeowners.
- Oversaw human resources functions including labor relations, personnel recruitment and selection, union negotiations, policies and procedures, benefits and grievances.
- Represented the Director and Department with public, other agencies, private contractors and developers, advocacy groups and community and neighborhood organizations.

1994 -
1995

CHELSEA PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Chelsea, MA

Senior Project Manager

- Conducted policy analysis and development, devised and implemented comprehensive planning activities and managed special projects including federal and state grant applications.
- Coordinated planning for various city initiatives including the Capital Improvement Program and Community Schools Project.
- Managed all city open space planning and parks improvement projects, police station renovation, fire station disposition and school buildings reuse projects.

1993 -
1994

CONSERVATION SERVICES GROUP Boston, MA

Program Manager – Boston Gas Program, Fall River Conservation Evaluation Project

- Directed high volume conservation program with a weekly average of over 300 completed site visits.
- Supervised office and field staff, budget planning and management, reporting and invoicing.
- Managed design and implementation of evaluation study of municipal water conservation program.
- Wrote, developed and presented proposals for competitive contracts and new business.

1987 -
1993

CITY OF BOSTON PUBLIC FACILITIES DEPARTMENT Boston, MA

Assistant Director – Homeowner Services

- Directed all activities for five home rehabilitation and financing programs with a total annual caseload of over 500 projects.
- Managed annual program budget of \$5.5 million and staff of 21 program, project and construction management personnel.
- Represented department with housing advocacy organizations, lenders and other public agencies.
- Oversaw contracts with six non-profit organizations for minor repair services and homes management counseling.
- Designed and launched HomeWorks, a new \$16 million home improvement program.
- Wrote successful application for \$3.5 million grant for lead paint abatement program.

Senior Project Manger – Homeowners Assistance

- Oversaw five homeowner property rehabilitation programs with an average caseload of 200 projects.
- Supervised staff of seven.
- Developed new programs for Senior Homeowners and Lead Paint Abatement.

Program Manager – Buildable Lots Program, Non-Profits Program, Abutter Lots Program

- Directed program for the development and sale of affordable housing on city-owned vacant sites.
- Oversaw contracts for rehabilitation and sale of properties by non-profit community organizations.
- Designed and administered program to sell small city-owned vacant lots to neighboring property owners.
- Supervised staff of nine.

EDUCATION

1987 **Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government.** Master's in Public Policy.

1985 **University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School.** Bachelor of Science in Economics.

Kirsten Busch Johnson

(b)(6)

Education

Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York

Master of Arts (MA), International Education Development, 2006. Concentration in International Humanitarian Issues.

- 4.0/4.0 GPA; Masters Thesis on Reconstruction of Afghanistan Education Sector, 2003-2006.

Yale University, School of Management New Haven, Connecticut

Master of Business Administration (MBA), 1999. Concentration in Strategy.

- Distinctions (Top 5% of class) in *Designing & Managing Organizations* and *Leadership and Teams*.
- *President* of Entrepreneurship Club; *Founder and co-organizer*, Yale Venture Philanthropy Conference.

University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia

Bachelor of Arts (BA), English Language and Literature. Sociology Minor, 1994.

- *Vice President*, Street Academics Organization; *Multicultural Awareness Facilitator*.
- Spanish language study abroad program, **Universidad de St. Louis**. Madrid, Spain, 1993.

Experience

NYC Department of Education New York, New York

2009-Present

Executive Director, Office of Teacher Effectiveness, Division of Human Resources and Talent

Oversee all reform efforts related to teacher effectiveness, impacting 75,000 teachers across the City

- Lead office of 70+ staff responsible for design and implementation of teacher effectiveness initiatives.
- Piloted new teacher evaluation and development system to 20 schools in 2010-11 and 100+ schools in 2011-12; 88% of school leaders net agreed that implementing pilot at their school improved teacher practice.
- Scaling talent management model to 250 schools reaching 8,000+ teachers and 100K+ students in 2012-13.
- Led city reforms to teacher tenure process; 58% of 2010 teachers granted tenure, compared to 97% in 2007.
- Member, New York State Education Department *Regents Task Force on Teacher and Principal Effectiveness*.
- Member, New York State Education Department *Teaching Standards Work Group*.

Chief of Staff, Division of School Support

Managed divisional coordination for 2,000 staff/\$183MM operation

- Provided operational and strategic leadership for Chief Schools Officer and divisional leadership team.
- Oversaw performance management, strategic planning, private funding, and press for division.

Teach For America New York, New York

2006- 2009

Vice President, Learning & Development, Human Assets

Led learning & development function for the organization, reaching 1200 staff members across 31 locations

- Created organization-wide Onboarding program for all new hires; average evaluation 93/100 point scale.
- Designed Manager and Leadership Development Programs; average evaluation 95/100 point scale.
- Led communications rollout of organization's talent management system consisting of new performance review program and associated competency model; facilitated training for staff in use of new system.

Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York

2002- 2006

Executive Director, Cahn Fellows Program for Distinguished New York City Principals

Created and managed 15 month leadership development and mentoring program for urban school principals

- Built partnerships with diverse institutions to promote the study of leadership across perspectives.
- Crafted fundraising strategy, cultivated new board members, and raised \$2.5MM in private dollars.
- Formulated vision and design of leadership development curricula; average participant evaluation: 4.9/5.0.

The World Bank Group, Human Development Network Washington D.C.

2001-2002

Consultant, Latin American and Caribbean Region (Jamaica)

Responsible for distance education component of US\$65 million reform project with Ministry of Education

- Devised strategy to utilize technology in delivery of teacher training program.
- Organized and led series of consensus building activities with education, government and business stakeholders to finalize target group and technology components for training.

Consultant, Latin American and Caribbean Region (Nicaragua)

Led multiple aspects of primary education reform project on behalf of the World Bank Group

- Wrote Bank policy dialogue on educational strategy for presentation to Nicaragua's president.
- Developed efficiency frontier of school spending and student achievement through analysis and identification of performance-based indicators to gauge progress of autonomous schools.
- Led six missions to Nicaragua to carry out school and community-based assessments in Spanish.

marchFIRST (legacy Mitchell Madison Group) London, United Kingdom

1999–2001

Senior Associate, Management Consulting Practice

U.K. Internet Start-Up (payment system) – Strategy Development and Implementation

Formulated and executed the strategy for an Internet venture to market and sell product

- Managed client sales and marketing staff of 20, overseeing five-country product rollout.
- Led development of branding strategy creation, and launch of customer and partner acquisition strategies.
- Collaborated with investment bank in writing of offering memorandum and supported CEO in private placement round, which resulted in funding of £25 million.

Private Equity Division of a Global Investment Bank – Strategic Due Diligence

Conducted due diligence assessment to evaluate company's attractiveness as an acquisition target

- Conducted competitor-benchmarking exercise including review of ISP and portal pricing strategies, service offerings, and growth strategies. Assessed regulatory developments.
- Performed comparable deal analysis and valuation.

U.S. Internet Start-Up (verification/authentication technology) – Strategy Development

Developed business strategy and implementation plan to bring new technology to market

- Developed economic models to evaluate relative attractiveness of customer segments.
- Conducted customer segmentation analyses and competitor benchmarking exercise to identify features and functionality for the product that would appeal to selected target segments. Created marketing strategy.

Microsoft Corporation, Latin American Headquarters Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Summer 1998

Summer Associate, Education and Emerging Markets Groups

- Negotiated partnerships with telecommunications and media conglomerates, government entities, Internet service providers, and OEMs in 4 countries, resulting in investments of \$2+MM.
- Organized technology training program for Latin American governments to train over 450,000 teachers.

Fairfax County Public Schools Alexandria, Virginia

1996-1997

English Teacher, Grade 7, Walt Whitman Middle School

- Taught 150 students fundamentals of English language and literature.
- Increased student achievement levels by 70% through development of extended day program.

Teach For America Corps Member/Oakland Unified School District Oakland, California

1994-1996

One of 400 out of 2500 applicants selected to join a national service corps of teachers committed to teaching for two years in under-resourced communities and becoming lifelong advocates for educational equity.

- Served as a Bilingual Spanish/English Special Education Teacher & Resource Specialist, Grades K-6.
- Chaired Student Consultation Team; Served on School Leadership Team (Elected Positions).
- Realized 200% increase in student achievement levels over 10 months by redesigning curriculum.

Select Publications & Presentations

- Busch, J. (2005). Turkey's emergency education response to Iraqi refugees and Kurdish returnees: Politics and provisions. Education in Emergencies and Post-Conflict Situations: Problems, Responses, and Possibilities, Volume 2. Society for International Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Busch, J. (2002). The Use of Technology to Inform Teacher Education in Jamaica: Reform of Secondary Education (ROSE). World Bank Document 37586. The World Bank Group.
- *Speaker*: Measuring Effective Teaching. City University of New York Education Conference, 2011.
- *Panelist*: Leading for Change. Forté Foundation MBA Women's Conference, 2011.
- *Speaker*: The Role of Education Leaders in Meeting the Public School Crisis, Columbia Business School Social Enterprise Conference, 2005.

Joanna Cannon, Ph.D.

(b)(6)

EDUCATION

Chancellor's Leadership Fellowship, NYC Department of Education , New York, NY	2009-2010
Postdoctoral Fellowship, University of Chicago , Chicago, IL	2005-2007
Ph.D. Developmental Psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University , New York, NY	2005
B.A. Honors Psychology, Magna Cum Laude, Scripps College , Claremont, CA	1999

EXPERIENCE

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, New York, NY 2007-present

Chief Strategic Officer, Division of Talent, Labor, and Innovation

- Strategic, financial and organizational planning and execution for NYCDOE's Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, which oversees NYC's human resources operations, human capital policies, and innovation instructional and organizational models

Executive Director, Office of Research and Data, Division of Human Resources and Talent

- Lead Office of Research and Data: manage team of ~15, staffing and budget decisions, long-term vision and planning
- Co-design the new NYC teacher and principal evaluation systems: member of NY State Task Force on evaluation design, responsible for overall approach to scoring of NYC's evaluation system and selection and implementation of the preferred assessments and methodology for calculation student growth, collaborate with IT Office to identify data management and infrastructure needs to support work
- Manage NYC Teacher Data Reports (value-added): Coordinate relationship with Wisconsin Value-Added Research Center, oversee communications to schools and public, manage teacher-student linkage verification process
- Design, conduct, and disseminate research on human capital to inform educational policies

Deputy Executive Director, Research and Policy Support Group (RPSG), Division of Performance and Accountability

Prior Positions: Chief of Staff & Director of Policy Research, RPSG; Associate Director of Policy Research, Office of Accountability

- Oversee DOE's Research Office: manage team of ~15, staffing and budget decisions, long-term vision and planning
- Design, conduct, and disseminate research to inform educational policies
- Manage Research Office's relationship with senior DOE leadership, external researchers, funders, Press Office, Legal Office
- Responsible for technical and statistical calculations and data required to generate NYC's teacher value-added calculations
- Sample projects & research: Oversee college readiness research agenda and manage associated data archiving projects (NSC, College Board, CUNY-NYCDOE data sharing); annual reporting of all NYC achievement data (e.g., graduation rates, state and NAEP test performance); design and conduct evaluation of the School of One; conduct annual HLM analysis of middle and high schools that beat-the-odds; design and manage team of analysts to conduct research on promotion policy, teacher and principal effectiveness, evaluation of NYC Common Core State Standards pilots

SPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEARNING CENTER, NSF SCIENCE OF

- LEARNING CENTER, Chicago, IL 2006-2007
Education Director
- Research focused on understanding the role of early experience in young children's math development. Studies included longitudinal investigation of the relation between, on the one hand, early math activity participation and parental math language, and on the other hand, children's math comprehension and use of math language; interventions designed to improve young children's math abilities
 - Extensive interpretive reporting on research findings to NSF, co-authoring Strategic Implementation Plan and Annual Report.
 - Trained, supervised, and set goals for seven-member research team
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (CPS)/ ERIKSON INSTITUTE, Chicago, IL 2005-2007
Consultant
- Created survey of teachers' math beliefs, knowledge, and classroom practices; presented analysis of survey results to CPS and Erikson Institute
 - Consulted on CPS early mathematics professional development initiative
- UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago, IL 2005-2006
Postdoctoral Research Fellow
(Mentors: Janellen Huttenlocher & Susan C. Levine)
- Research focused on individual and group differences in the early development of mathematics concepts and skills
- TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, New York, NY 1999-2004
Graduate Research Scientist
(Mentors: Herbert P. Ginsburg & Clea Fernandez)
- Research focused on parental involved in education, cross-cultural differences in math teaching, and teacher professional development (Japanese lesson study)
- PEARSON LEARNING, New York, NY 2002-2003
Curricular Researcher
- Created measures to evaluate teachers' use of a mathematics curriculum
 - Revised curriculum and assessment framework. Coach to first-year curriculum users

PUBLICATIONS

Levine, S.C., Ratliff, K.R., Huttenlocher, J., & Cannon, J. (under review). Early puzzle play: A predictor of preschoolers' mental rotation skill.

Cannon, J., & Ginsburg, H. P. (2008). "Doing the math": Maternal beliefs about early mathematics versus language learning. *Early Education and Development*, 19, 238-260.

Fernandez, C., & Cannon, J. (2005). What Japanese and U.S. teachers think about when constructing mathematics lessons: A preliminary investigation. *Elementary School Journal*, 105, 481-498.

Ginsburg, H. P., Cannon, J., Eisenband, J., & Pappas, S. (2005). Mathematical thinking and learning. In K. McCartney & D. Phillips (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of early childhood development*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Ginsburg, H. P., Kaplan, R. G., Cannon, J., et al. (2005). Helping early childhood educators to teach mathematics. In M. Zaslow & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Professional development for early childhood education*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.

Fernandez, C., Cannon, J., & Chokshi, S. (2003). A U.S.-Japan lesson study collaboration reveals critical lenses for examining practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 171-185.

Fernandez, C., Chokshi, S., Cannon, J., & Yoshida, M. (2001). Learning about lesson study in the United States. In M. Beauchamp (Ed.), *New and old voices on Japanese education*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Cannon, J., Paley, I., & Adeboye, T. (2010). *Variation in high school contribution to students' college readiness* and its impact for school accountability. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO. Symposium chair.

Cannon, J., Levine, S. C., & Huttenlocher, J. (2007). Sex differences in the relation between early puzzle play and mental transformation skill. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston, MA.

Fernandez, C., & **Cannon, J.** (2003). Lesson study in New York City: Developing content knowledge for engaging in rich discussions about teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Cannon, J., Fernandez, C., & Yoshida, M. (2001). Teacher planning and reflection: A cross-cultural examination of Japanese and American teachers' thinking and practice outside of the classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Cannon, J., & Chokshi, S. (2001). The story of a lesson study exploration in a New Jersey school. Roundtable presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Cannon, J., Galin, O., & Oppenheim, A. (1999). The Scripps teaching and learning assessment project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Newport Beach, CA.

SELECTED AWARDS & HONORS

US DOE Technical Advisory Group , Research on Teacher Evaluation Systems	2010-present
Spencer Dissertation Research Training Grant , Teachers College, Columbia University	2004
Rose Fellowship , Teachers College, Columbia University	2001
Phi Beta Kappa , Scripps College	1999

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Development of Mathematical Thinking , Adjunct Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University	2008
Cognitive Development , The University of Chicago	2006
Practicum in Developmental Research , Teachers College, Columbia University	2002-2004
Cognitive Development , Teachers College, Columbia University	2001-2002
Psychological Research Methods , Scripps College	1999
Social Psychology , Scripps College	1998
Psychological Statistics , Scripps College	1997

AD HOC MANUSCRIPT REVIEWER

Cognitive Development, Educational Researcher, Mathematical Thinking and Learning, Early Childhood Research Quarterly, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly

TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY

- Extensive knowledge of wide range of statistical analyses (e.g., hierarchical linear modeling, confirmatory factor analysis, multiple regression analysis)
- Demonstrated hands-on mastery of software technology including SPSS, SAS, LISREL, HLM, FileMakerPro, Microsoft Office suite, Endnote, NVIVO

Izaak Orlansky

(b)(6)

206 Park Place, Brooklyn, NY 11238

301-642-3387

Work Experience

Program Associate/Manager for Strategic Incentives, Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, NYC Department of Education

May 2011-present

Teacher Selection and Research

- Designed and managed selection processes for Master, Turnaround, and Lead Teacher programs (200-600 teacher applicants per process; 100-200 accepted candidates)
- Conducted central pre-screening and interviews to evaluate and identify qualified teacher leaders
- Analyzed and created teacher and school data systems for program selection and implementation purposes
- Interviewed and evaluated prospective and current teachers for additional TRQ programs

Professional Development (PD) Design and Delivery

- Collaborated with the UFT Teacher Center to design and present monthly PD workshops
- Developed resources and communications for teacher leaders, including an online portal and e-mail newsletter (250 recipients with an 83% average open rate)
- Coordinated planning of Teacher Leader Summit, a citywide PD conference day to develop leadership skills

Management and Consulting

- Managed Leadership for Educational Equity Fellow conducting teacher leadership research (Summer 2012)
- Managed college and high school interns conducting administrative work during selection processes
- Served as designated Recruitment Consultant for four Bronx high school principals going through proposed closure and re-hiring process; provided candidate search, selection, and hiring support

Acting Director of Portfolio Engagement, Office of Portfolio Management, NYC Department of Education

March 2011-May 2011

- Managed Portfolio Engagement team (2 direct reports) responsible for compliance and communication duties for significant changes in school utilization (e.g., school openings and closings, grade changes, etc.)
- Interfaced with Planning, School Safety, Public Affairs, Press, Legal and Translation team members
- Continued to perform all duties and responsibilities of Portfolio Engagement Specialist (see below)

Portfolio Engagement Specialist

Sept. 2010-May 2011

- Managed legally-mandated documents and hearings related to significant changes in school utilization
- Managed coordination of internal partners with external school and community stakeholders across the City
- Led logistics teams at public meetings, including preparation for the Superintendent/Chancellor's Designee
- Organized and facilitated cross-functional borough engagement team meetings

New York City Teaching Fellow, JHS 22 Jordan L. Mott, Bronx, NY

2008-2010

- Taught 5th and 6th grade language arts and 6th grade social studies in high-needs public school
- Participated in Teachers' College Reading and Writing Project (Columbia University)
- Managed all classroom and instructional tasks (lesson planning, all reading and writing evaluations)

Staff Member/Senior Interviewer, Office of Admissions, Wesleyan University

2007-2008

- Managed caseload of prospective students and biweekly information sessions
- Conducted interviews, produced written evaluations of candidates

Head Counselor, Camp Shohola for Boys, Greeley, PA

Summer 2007

- Supervised 70 staff members and 17 cabins; directed day-to-day operations of summer camp
- Worked closely with Director and Assistant Director to resolve personnel and operational issues

Education

- Fordham University, Graduate School of Education, New York, NY** May 2010
- Master of Science in Teaching: Childhood Education, Grades 1-6
 - Master's Portfolio: In The Life of a Child, exceeded in all INTASC standards
- Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT** June 2008
- Bachelor of Arts with Honors in the College of Social Studies, an interdisciplinary program in government, economics, history, and philosophy
 - Honors Thesis: *'Revolution of the Pingüinos': The Collective Action of Chilean High School Students*
- Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile (study-abroad)** Fall 2006
- Directly enrolled in university courses, lived with host family

Leadership and Community Involvement

- Coordinator, Wesleyan Student Assembly, Wesleyan University** 2007-2008
- Elected (2007); managed, organized and moderated 37-member student government meetings
 - Member of Executive Committee; directed community outreach for meetings and elections
- Panelist, Wesleyan Presidential Search Committee, Wesleyan University** 2006-2007
- Elected (2006); organized community outreach efforts to identify student priorities
 - Interviewed final candidates for position; helped produce written recommendation for Board of Trustees
- Resident Advisor, Office of Residential Life, Wesleyan University** 2005-2006
- Supervised two floors of 30 students, responsible for safety and well-being of residential community
 - Served as resource for student problems/concerns, organized and coordinated resident programs
- Student Leader, Environmental Organizers' Network, Wesleyan University** 2004-2008
- Coordinated WESTUFF, inaugural on-campus recycling and tag sale initiative to reduce waste
 - Served as a student representative on first Sustainability Advisory Group for Environmental Stewardship

Other Skills

- Language:** Spanish proficiency; 10 years of study with immersion experience
- Computer:** Word, Excel, PowerPoint, SharePoint, Microsoft CMS (for creating/authoring DOE websites)

EXPERIENCE

- 2008 – Present **NYC DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION** New York, NY
Chancellor's Fellowship, Spring 2012 Cohort
Director of Strategic Incentives, Office of Teacher Recruitment & Quality
 - Lead a team responsible for policy and programs relating to teacher leadership and incentives, central and school-level strategic staffing, and development of a teacher career lattice for the DOE.
 - Create and refine the recruitment, selection, hiring and professional development support processes for all teacher leadership programs, such as Lead Teacher or Master & Turnaround Teachers.
 - Manage cross-office team supporting staffing of 24 new schools opening at full-scale in six months.
 - Conduct analyses to evaluate and understand teacher movement and incentives, to explore policy issues including impact on equitable distribution of teacher quality, retention, and resource allocation.
 - Direct design and execution of Middle School Leader Internship pilot program.
 - Oversee implementation of \$15.0M state Teachers of Tomorrow (TOT) grant for teacher recruitment and retention, and identify additional grant funding to support teacher leadership and incentive programs.**Director of Bronx K-8 Planning, Division of Portfolio Planning (2008-2011)**
 - Analyzed school enrollment, facilities and performance data to identify problems with the portfolio of educational offerings in each community school district of the Bronx (e.g. overcrowding, quality, etc.)
 - Developed short- and long-term strategies (e.g. new schools, rezoning, closure, etc.) aligned with DOE's reform agenda to address district issues, and ensured high quality educational options for all students.
 - Led cross-functional District Planning Committee to refine and prioritize strategies for implementation.
 - Engaged school leaders, Community Education Councils, parents, elected officials and others throughout the process of problem identification, strategy development, public review, and execution.
 - Evaluated existing space and facilities, housing and enrollment projections, planned school construction, and portfolio plans, to inform prioritization of funds in the five-year capital plan.
- 2007 – 2008 **THE MCGRAW-HILL COMPANIES** New York, NY
Program Manager, The Grow Network
 - Oversaw relationship and assessment reporting program for Florida Department of Education (FDOE).
 - Led internal cross-functional team to ensure on-time delivery of high quality reports.
 - Managed costs and resources for FDOE contract (over \$4mm in revenue for Grow per contract year).
- 2004 – 2007 **NYC DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION** New York, NY
Deputy Director, Alternative Certification Operations
Program Manager, Office of Alternative Certification
 - Directed strategy and day-to-day implementation of the NYC Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) program.
 - Managed relationships with partner universities to monitor quality of Fellows' educational experience.
 - Coordinated with regional and school personnel regarding placement & training of new teachers.
 - Oversaw \$40 million budget and managed financial operations for Office of Alternative Certification.
- Summer 2003 **YAHOO! INC.** New York, NY
Summer Associate, Sales Strategy – Finance & Technology
- 1998 – 2002 **PRUDENTIAL FINANCIAL** New York, NY
Assistant Vice President, eBusiness Development Group
 - Created and implemented e-channel marketing strategy for interactive tools on prudential.com.
 - Managed cross-functional project teams ensuring consistent online experience for consumers.**Associate, Advanced Management Development Program** Newark, NJ
 - Coordinated sales reporting and prepared strategy documents for President of Prudential Investments.
 - Researched and evaluated potential acquisition targets and prepared recommendations to CEO.
- EDUCATION**
- 2002 – 2004 **COLUMBIA BUSINESS SCHOOL** New York, NY
MBA, Management and Marketing, May 2004
Elected: Columbia Univ. Senator; VP of Events, Graduate Business Assoc & Columbia Women in Business
Awarded: Columbia Business School Service Award
- 1993 – 1997 **PRINCETON UNIVERSITY** Princeton, NJ
AB, East Asian Studies, June 1997; NJ Teaching Certificate, Secondary Mathematics, January 1998
- OTHER**
The Princeton Charter Club (1997 – Present): Board of Governors, various committees.
Princeton University Class of 1997 15th Reunion Co-Chair (2012)
Princeton Alumni Association of New York City (2002 – 2007): President
PR/Award # S374A120083

AMY KRISTINA WAY

(b)(6)

EXPERIENCE

New York City Department of Education, Division of Talent, Labor, and Innovation, Brooklyn, NY Executive Director, Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, (March 2012 – present)

- Lead vision, strategy, and management of all teacher recruitment initiatives for the outreach, sourcing and screening of high quality candidates to fill 2,500 – 7,500 vacancies annually.
- Design and implement teacher portfolio efforts – including programs, incentives, policies, resource allocations, structures and supports – to ensure the optimal staffing of all 75,000 teachers across 1,700 schools with a focus on ensuring the highest need children and schools have access to the highest quality educators.
- Forge and foster relationships with key external stakeholder groups to advance recruitment and talent distribution strategies including local unions, schools of education and related organizations.
- Oversee the design, implementation and continuous improvement of screening criteria, process and systems to optimize the selection of high potential teacher candidates for all 1,700 schools.
- Oversee the design and implementation of strategy to support principals and other hiring managers with tools, resources, and information to make best hiring decisions to staff their schools.
- Supervise team of 50 employees and consultants and manage \$38 million annual budget.

Deputy Executive Director, Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, (September 2010 – February 2012)

- Managed all aspects of teacher recruitment and quality work including policy and program development, implementation, and evaluation.
- Managed the senior staff of the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality: the Directors of the six units.
- Led key policy and program initiatives in the areas of teacher recruitment, hiring support, and teacher portfolio work.
- Identify, develop and adapt teacher recruitment, incentive, and hiring support programs and strategies, particularly for hard to staff subject and geographic areas, to help ensure all schools are staffed with high quality teachers.
- Managed relationships with key external partners including colleges and universities, non-profits, and the State Education Department.
- Collaborated with other DOE offices and senior staff including other offices in the Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, as well as the Division of School Support and Instruction, and the Division of Portfolio Planning.
- Directed office strategic planning and budgeting, and help oversee office operations including staffing, contracts, procurements, purchasing, compliance, and reporting.
- Worked as part of senior team for Office of Recruitment Programs and Teacher Quality and provides high level guidance to the Executive Director.

Teach For All, New York, NY

Vice President, Program Resources/Managing Director, Teacher Development, Impact, and Alumni Resources (September 2008 – August 2010)

- Led in developing strategy and approach to support program development in newly launched initiatives across network
- Built relationships and supported the professional development of key players across global network in 12+ countries
- Captured best practices from Teach For America and Teach First and served as subject matter expert to network in the areas of teacher development, impact measurement, and alumni strategy
- Key contributor to the design of the Country Support team and service delivery strategy for start-up organization phase
- Managed a team that create resources and learning opportunities for network, including conferences, trainings, and virtual portal
- Served on the core values committee for the organization

New York City Department of Education, Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality Brooklyn, NY

Director, Recruitment Programs and Teacher Quality (September 2007 – present)/Deputy Director, Center of Expertise on Recruitment Strategy (February 2007 – August 2007)

- Led a team of six program managers charged with driving strategy and implementation of the recruitment, training, certification, and retention of alternative route teachers, program development, and internal teacher quality research.
- Led teacher recruitment program development including the design of pathways into teaching and incentives to attract high quality teaching professionals to work in New York City public schools.
- Oversaw collaborative relationships with local universities, The New Teacher Project, and NYCDOE offices in the implementation of the NYC Teaching Fellows program.
- Developed and drove strategy for improving the quality of teacher preparation programs funded by the NYCDOE.
- Oversaw the expansion of the Student Teaching Initiative, which involves establishing programs to cultivate and recruit student teachers and facilitate partnerships between local education schools and high need schools.
- Collaborated with senior leadership of the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality to reform teacher recruitment strategy and process.
- Managed the development of teacher quality metrics and provide high level policy advisement to Executive Director of Teacher Recruitment and Quality.
- Advised and collaborate with external research teams engaged in teacher quality research focused on NYC public schools.

Program Manager, Office of Alternative Certification (January 2004-January 2007)

- Provided strategic input and fostered innovation as a part of the leadership planning team for the NYC Teaching Fellows program.
- Directed a portfolio of collaborative relationships with local universities, The New Teacher Project, and NYCDOE offices in the implementation of the NYC Teaching Fellows program in the areas of training and support, placement, and research.
- Provided technical assistance to other alternate route teaching programs in New York City, including Teach For America and Peace Corps Fellows.
- Developed the Science Immersion initiative, raising the number of qualified NYC Teaching Fellow science teachers by 20%.
- Utilized complex data systems in generating NYCDOE staffing projections for teachers from alternate route sources.
- Partnered with graduate schools of education to develop teacher certification programs for NYC Teaching Fellows in compliance with New York City, NY State, and federal regulations.

Office of the President at Columbia University, Teachers College, New York, NY

Research Assistant for Harold Levy, former chancellor of New York City public schools (October 2002—May 2003)

- Researched key topics in educational policy including teacher quality, student achievement, high stakes testing, and school leadership.
- Evaluated information, formulated recommendations, and wrote topic briefs for Mr. Levy's publications.
- Developed and executed qualitative research project on standardized testing in a New York City elementary school.
- Gathered data through focus groups, site visits, participant observation, and interviews.
- Wrote detailed report and delivered policy recommendations at academic conferences.

Children's Environmental Trust, Iquitos, Peru

Workshop Director (June 2000—August 2000; June 1999—August 1999)

- Managed workshop site for nonprofit dedicated to community development and education in the Peruvian Amazon.
- Supervised workshop staff and oversaw approximately 250 participants.
- Oversaw budget, cultivated and managed relationships with local contacts, and maintained communications with the American office of Children's Environmental Trust.

English as a Foreign Language Instructor, Various Locations Abroad

Instructor (March 2001—May 2002)

- Certified Teacher of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) with teaching experience in Spain, France, and Ecuador.
- Designed curriculum and grammar, writing, speaking, and listening lessons to support English language development.
- Taught beginning, intermediate, and advanced English classes to adults and children.

Teach For America, Washington, D.C.

Corps Member and 5th/6th Grade Teacher at Garnet Patterson Middle School (June 1998—June 2000)

- Designed lessons and taught within a standards-based curriculum to meet various learning abilities and needs; initiated and supervised extra-curricular activities.

- Completed 20+ credits of graduate coursework towards teacher certification at Trinity College, Washington, DC.
- Member of comprehensive school reform leadership team that designed and implemented school change initiatives; led parent involvement initiative.
- Participated in network of regional corps members and provided instructional support to colleagues as grade team leader.

EDUCATION

Columbia University, Teachers College, New York, NY, December 2003

Master of Arts in International Educational Development; Concentration in Policy Studies

Completed coursework in economics of education, education policy, issues in international development, policy analysis, comparative education, cost-benefit analysis, grant writing, and research methods

Trinity College, Washington, DC 1998 – 1999

coursework/requirements for teacher certification in Secondary Science education

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, May 1998

Bachelor of Arts in Biology, Dean's List, 1996-1998

School for International Training, Belém, Brazil January 1997—May 1997

Coursework in Portuguese, Ecology, Sustainable Development

PRESENTATIONS

Education Across the Americas Conference, Teachers College Columbia University, New York, NY (April 14, 2003)

Ethnography in Education Research Forum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA (February 27, 2004)

NCAC Best Practices Panel on Alternative Certification, Orlando, FL (February 5, 2005)

NCAC Conference, "From Skepticism to Enthusiasm: How to get schools to be eager partners in hiring and training alternative route teachers" San Diego, CA (February 11, 2006)

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE

- Proficient Spanish speaker, basic use of Portuguese, strong cross-cultural communication skills.
- 2005 Team for Kids member: NYC Marathon runner and raised over \$2,000 in support of the New York Road Runners Foundation, an organization that initiates and funds running programs in NYC public schools.
- ESL tutor/volunteer at the Arab American Family Center
- Interests include skiing, surfing, international travel, and cooking. Finished 15 marathons, Boston marathon qualifier.

Kelly Weatherby

Experience

June 2011-present

New York City Department of Education

New York, NY

Senior Manager, Strategic Incentives (March 2012-present)

- Train and support internal Department of Education (DOE) and external United Federation of Teachers (UFT) staff members around screening applications and conducting interviews for candidates for the Lead Teacher Program, a select pool of teachers from which principals can hire for key teacher leadership positions at their schools.
- Foster relationships with other offices across DOE as well as the UFT to ensure that Lead Teacher interviewers are normed and interview events are fully staffed.
- Draft policy and operations proposals for the administration of Teachers of Tomorrow (TOT), a \$15 million grant from the New York State Education Department that DOE receives annually and which is used to incentivize teachers to work in the city's most high-need schools.
- Collaborate with the Office of Scholarships and Incentives around TOT grant administration to ensure smooth operational processes and excellent customer service to applicants.
- Provide high-level advice and assistance to the Director of the Strategic Incentives around other projects, including staff hiring and grant reports.

Senior Manager, Office of School Leader Effectiveness (June 2011-March 2012)

- Supported development and implementation of principal evaluation pilot in approximately 20 schools across the DOE, with a particular focus on bringing DOE's principal evaluation process into alignment with New York State Education Law 3012-c.
- Created Assistant Principal Tenure Toolkit, which included guidance and resources around assistant principal tenure aligned with expectations and tools previously developed for principal and teacher tenure, in order to support system-wide strategic move toward more rigorous, evidence-based tenure decisions for all educators.
- Actively solicited input from superintendents, network leaders, and principals around talent management for school leaders so that policy initiatives would be informed by the realities of the work happening in schools.
- Built support for policy initiatives by collaborating with other central offices (e.g., Division of Academics, Performance and Support, Office of Research and Data) in order to advance the priorities of the Office of School Leader Effectiveness.

June 2008-May 2011

The New Teacher Project

**Austin, TX
and Brooklyn, NY**

Senior Program Operations Manager, Texas Teaching Fellows - Austin (August 2010-May 2011)

- Ensured high-quality operational processes, applicant communications, and data management across the new teacher continuum—i.e., from the point of application through selection, enrollment, training, district hiring, and certification—for the most selective and rigorous alternative certification program in the state.
- Achieved 93.6% customer service satisfaction among applicants who eventually enrolled in Texas Teaching Fellows –Austin's 2011 cohort.
- Trained, managed, and provided ongoing development to a team of approximately 35 part-time Selectors who interviewed and evaluated applicants for the Teaching Fellows Program.
- Cultivated specific client relationships at the district and school level with the dual goal of developing new

partnerships and sustaining existing partnerships.

- Contributed to ongoing work to support the organization's pivot toward evaluating Fellows and making certification decisions based on student outcomes, not only for the Austin contract but across The New Teacher Project more broadly.

Site Advisor, Operations, Teaching Fellows Programs (June 2008-August 2010)

- Led development and advancement of operational models for Teaching Fellows Programs business line (TFP), which included nearly 20 sites nationwide, and served as a thought partner for sites facing operational challenges.
- Analyzed TFP recruitment, selection, enrollment, training, district hiring, and retention data for both internal and external reports using SPSS statistical software.
- Liaised with the Technology Team to ensure that TeacherTrack, TFP's proprietary applicant/Fellow data platform, was maintained and continually enhanced so that it met the needs of the business line.
- Facilitated TeacherTrack orientation and ongoing training calls, responded to one-off user questions, and developed training resources, including documents, presentations and videos, so that staff had the support they need to use TeacherTrack effectively.
- Realized a 33% improvement in staff satisfaction around TeacherTrack support during the 2010 fiscal year, exceeding goal by 10 percentage points.

June 2006-July 2008

Achievement First: Elm City College Preparatory School

New Haven, CT

School Manager

- Served as on-site operational coordinator to oversee all major functions of school that are not directly related to student achievement and behavior: coordinated meal service, transportation and standardized testing, ordered furniture, curricular materials and other supplies, tracked campus expenditures, maintained inventory of assets and supplies, monitored usage of audio-visual equipment and mobile computer lab, planned logistics for field experiences and off-site professional development, supervised facility maintenance, etc.
- Managed one staff member (Registrar), who was responsible for maintaining student attendance and academic records.
- Partnered with various stakeholders, including students' families and several offices within the New Haven Public School District, in order to ensure that communication was clear, all involved parties felt valued, and students were well served.
- Supported teachers who were working to obtain Connecticut teacher certificates and tracked their progress through the certification process.
- Provided as-needed support to teachers and administrators for special projects and events.

June 2004-May 2006

Teach for America/Jackson Middle School

Houston, TX

Teacher, Social Studies (8th grade 2004-2005, 6th grade 2005-2006)

- Served as member of national service corps of outstanding recent college graduates of all academic majors who commit two years to teach in under-resourced urban and rural public schools.
- Designed lessons to make learning meaningful to students with a wide range of needs, including gifted and talented students, students with special education needs, and students with limited English proficiency.
- Made significant gains (defined as greater than 80% student mastery and based on the statewide social studies assessment) with students during first year teaching; made substantial gains (i.e., 78% student mastery based on teacher-created assessments, as there was no statewide assessment for 6th grade) during second year teaching.

Education

August 2005

University of St. Thomas School of Education – Graduate Level

Houston, TX

Texas Teacher Certificate: Generalist 4-8

May 2004

Central Connecticut State University

New Britain, CT

Bachelor of Arts, *Summa Cum Laude*: History with minor in Women's Studies



July 27, 2012

Chancellor Dennis Walcott
New York City Department of Education
52 Chambers Street
New York, NY 10007

Dear Chancellor Walcott:

On behalf of the New York State Department of Education, I am writing to express my support for the New York City Department of Education's application to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant competition. I am familiar with your plans to increase the rigor of teacher and school leader evaluations and believe that these new evaluation systems, along with the evaluation-based career lattice that you are proposing, will advance the Board of Regents' goal of ensuring high-quality educational opportunities for all students in the City and State, regardless of race or socioeconomic status.

As Commissioner, I look forward to receiving New York City's proposed Annual Professional Performance Review Plan for teachers and school leaders citywide. I know you and the UFT and CSA unions are committed to reaching agreement and submitting your APPR well in advance of the January 2013 deadline for APPR approval so that NYC is eligible for an increase in State aid.

I commend your efforts, described in your TIF proposal, to create a comprehensive human capital management system that includes educator evaluation and goes beyond that to recruit, develop and retain the best teachers. I will work to build support of teachers, school leaders, and other personnel in the schools to be served by your innovative TIF grant as well as our teacher and principal unions over the course of the planning year and throughout the implementation period I believe that the TIF grant would indeed enable you to engage in work that would make a significant impact on educator practice and, by extension, student academic gains across New York City's public schools.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

PROPOSED CAREER LATTICE FOR TIF SCHOOLS

Position Title	Target Teacher Groups Being Supported	Key Skills/Knowledge Required	Key Responsibilities Likely to Improve Teaching Practice and Student Outcomes	Proposed Selection and Compensation
Peer Instructional Coach	Teachers of varying levels of practice and experience (school-based position)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others ✓ Motivation, coaching, and listening skills ✓ Ability to deliver effective PD (individual and group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Supports teachers to improve instruction and student learning aligned to Danielson Framework ➤ Deepens connections between formative classroom visits, debriefs and professional learning experiences ➤ Coordinates school based support activities ➤ Plays role on school teacher teams ➤ Minimum of teaching one period a day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Eligibility – Effective or Highly Effective (or proxy) ➤ Selection – Centralized selection process designed in partnership with local union ➤ Compensation - \$15,000/year
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	Peer Instructional Coaches at 5-7 schools (centrally-based position)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Extensive command of the Danielson Framework ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others ✓ Ability to design and deliver effective PD (group-focused) ✓ Strategic and organizational skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Works across participating schools with principals, Peer Instructional Coaches, and Network support staff to provide peer feedback and support teacher development ➤ Provides regular support to Peer Instructional Coaches ➤ Conducts non-evaluative rigorous and consistent observations aligned with the Danielson Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Eligibility – Effective or Highly Effective (or proxy) ➤ Selection – Centralized selection process designed in partnership with local union ➤ Compensation - \$20,000/year
Demonstration Teacher	Teachers of varying levels of practice and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Ability to collaborate and communicate with others ✓ Ability to deconstruct one’s own teaching practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Builds laboratory classroom for teachers to visit ➤ Responsibilities may include: modeling lessons; exploring emerging instructional practices tools/techniques; reflecting on and debriefing own lessons with colleagues; creating classroom videos to share, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Eligibility – Highly Effective (or proxy) ➤ Selection – Centralized selection process designed in partnership with local union ➤ Compensation - \$6,000/year
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	Pre-service teachers that are part of NYCDOE pipeline programs (Apprentices)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exemplary teaching practice ✓ Motivation, coaching, and listening skills ✓ Induction and mentoring knowledge and skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Models best practices in the classroom ➤ Cultivates, mentors, and develops Apprentices ➤ Provides feedback as pre -service teachers lead segments of classroom instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Eligibility – Effective or Highly Effective (or proxy) ➤ Selection – Centralized selection process designed in partnership with local union (driven by programmatic needs) ➤ Compensation - \$6,000/year

Application Reference Charts

Instructions: These charts are provided to help applicants ensure that their applications address all of the priorities and requirements – as any application that does not do so is ineligible for funding for the 2012 competitions. These charts will be used by Department staff when screening applications.

Applicants should complete and include these charts as an attachment with their application. Go to <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherincentive/applicant.html> to download a Microsoft Word version of this template. Fill out the Word document and submit it as a PDF attachment with your application.

Please indicate your eligibility classification

Instructions: Check the eligibility classification that applies to your application.

Applications from a single entity:

In the case of a single applicant that is an LEA, check this box.

LEA

Group Applications:

Group applications involve two or more eligible entities. In the case of a group application, check the box that describes the eligibility classification of all of the applicants. Select only one box.

2 or more LEAs

One or more SEAs and one or more LEAs

One or more nonprofit organizations and one or more LEAs (no SEA)

One or more nonprofit organizations and one or more LEAs and one or more SEAs

Instructions

Instructions: In each column of the table below, please specify where your application discusses each priority or requirement -- including each provision that applies to each priority or requirement. For information, descriptions, or assurances included in the project narrative, please complete both 1) the Title of the Section(s) or Subsection(s) and 2) the relevant Page Number(s) where this matter is discussed. Otherwise, please indicate the Attachment in which it is discussed.

Please identify every section, page, and/or attachment in which the priority or requirement is discussed. More than one section, subsection, page, or attachment may appear in each cell.

Absolute Priority 1

Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Absolute Priority 1: HCMS To meet this priority, the applicant must include, in its application, a description of its LEA-wide HCMS, as it exists currently and with any modifications proposed for implementation during the project period of the grant.</p>	Part A: Human Capital Management System (HCMS)	p. 2-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Full_Danielson_Rubric •Proposed Career Lattice for TIF schools
(1) How the HCMS is or will be aligned with the LEA’s vision of instructional improvement;	Vision of Instructional Improvement; HCMS; Project Plan Summary; Focus on Middle Schools	p. 2-9	•201213CitywideInstructionalExpectationsFINAL

(2) How the LEA uses or will use the information generated by the evaluation systems it describes in its application to inform key human capital decisions, such as decisions on recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, compensation, professional development, tenure, and promotion;	Range of Human Capital Decisions ; Competitive Priority 5	p. 10-11; p. 62-67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Full_Danielson_Rubric •Proposed Career Lattice for TIF schools
(3) The human capital strategies the LEA uses or will use to ensure that high-need schools are able to attract and retain effective educators	Commitment of NYCDOE Leadership; Adequacy of Incentives	p. 13 - 16	

<p>(4) Whether or not modifications are needed to an existing HCMS to ensure that it includes the features described in response to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this priority, and a timeline for implementing the described features, provided that the use of evaluation information to inform the design and delivery of professional development and the award of performance-based compensation under the applicant’s proposed PBCS in high-need schools begins no later than the third year of the grant’s project period in the high-need schools listed in response to paragraph (a) of <u>Requirement 3-- Documentation of High-Need Schools.</u></p>	<p>Part A: Human Capital Management System (HCMS); Part E: Project Management; Competitive Priority5;</p>	<p>p. 2-16; p. 47-56; 62-67</p>	<p>•NYCDOE TIF 4 Schools List</p>
--	---	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Absolute Priority 2			
Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Absolute Priority 2: Educator Evaluation Systems</p> <p>To meet this priority, an applicant must include, as part of its application, a plan describing how it will develop and implement its proposed LEA-wide educator evaluation systems. The plan must describe-</p>	Part B: Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable Educator Evaluation Systems	p. 16-29	•Full_Danielson_Rubric
(1) The frequency of evaluations, which must be at least annually;	Implementation of New Evaluation Systems; Plan for Multiple Teacher Observations; Principal Evaluation	p. 18- 21; p. 26-28	•Full_Danielson_Rubric
(2) The evaluation rubric for educators that includes at least three performance levels and the following--	High-Quality Evaluation Systems; Plan for Multiple Teacher Observations; Student Growth; Principal Evaluation Addressing the Needs of Special	p. 16-18; 20-29	•Full_Danielson_Rubric •NYCDOE TIF4 Examples of Effective Evidence_SpEdELL
(i) Two or more observations during each evaluation period;	Plan for Multiple Teacher Observations	p. 20-21	•Full_Danielson_Rubric
(ii) Student growth, which for the evaluation of teachers with regular instructional responsibilities must be growth at the classroom level; and	Student Growth; Principal Evaluation	p. 21- 28	
(iii) Additional factors determined by the	Student Growth; Principal	p. 21-29	

LEA;	Evaluation; Addressing the Needs of Special Populations		
(3) How the evaluation systems will generate an overall evaluation rating that is based, in significant part, on student growth; and	High-Quality Evaluation Systems; Student Growth; Principal Evaluation	p. 16-18; p. 21-28	
(4) The applicant’s timeline for implementing its proposed LEA-wide educator evaluation systems.	Implementation of New Evaluation Systems; Plan for Multiple Teacher Observations; Principal Evaluation	p. 18-21; p. 26-28	•NYCDOE TIF4 TEP Action Planning Template

Absolute Priority 3 N/A			
Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
Absolute Priority 3: STEM Plan (if applicable) To meet this priority, an applicant must include a plan in its application that describes the applicant’s strategies for improving instruction in STEM subjects through various components of each participating LEA’s HCMS, including its professional development, evaluation systems, and PBCS. At a minimum, the plan must describe—	N/A		
(1) How each LEA will develop a corps of STEM master teachers who are skilled at modeling for peer teachers pedagogical methods for teaching STEM skills and content at the appropriate grade level by providing	N/A		

<p>additional compensation to teachers who—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Receive an overall evaluation rating of effective or higher under the evaluation system described in the application; (ii) Are selected based on criteria that are predictive of the ability to lead other teachers; (iii) Demonstrate effectiveness in one or more STEM subjects; and (iv) Accept STEM-focused career ladder positions; 			
(2) How each LEA will identify and develop the unique competencies that, based on evaluation information or other evidence, characterize effective STEM teachers;	N/A		
(3) How each LEA will identify hard-to-staff STEM subjects, and use the HCMS to attract effective teachers to positions providing instruction in those subjects;	N/A		
(4) How each LEA will leverage community support, resources, and expertise to inform the implementation of its plan;	N/A		
(5) How each LEA will ensure that financial and nonfinancial incentives, including performance-based compensation, offered to reward or promote effective STEM teachers are adequate to attract and retain persons with strong STEM skills in high-need schools; and	N/A		
(6) How each LEA will ensure that students have access to and participate in rigorous and engaging STEM coursework.	N/A		

Competitive Preference Priority 4

Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Competitive Preference Priority 4: New and Rural Applicants (if applicable) To meet this priority, an applicant must provide at least one of the two following assurances, which the Department accepts:</p>			
(a) An assurance that each LEA to be served by the project has not previously participated in a TIF-supported project.	Competitive Preference Priority 4	p. 62	
(b) An assurance that each LEA to be served by the project is a rural local educational agency (as defined in the NIA).	N/A		

Competitive Preference Priority 5

Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Competitive Preference Priority 5: An Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness (if applicable) 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</p>	Competitive Preference Priority 5	p. 62-67	

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;	Competitive Preference Priority 5	p. 62-67	
(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	Competitive Preference Priority 5	p. 62-67	
(c) The extent to which the proposed implementation is feasible, given that implementation will depend upon stakeholder support and applicable LEA-level policies.	Competitive Preference Priority 5	p. 62-67	

Requirement 1			
Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Requirement 1: Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers, Principals, and Other Personnel.</p> <p>In its application, an applicant must describe, for each participating LEA, how its proposed PBCS will meet the definition of a PBCS set forth in the NIA.</p>	Part A: Human Capital Management System (HCMS)	p. 2-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_1 Background Ppal Financial Incentives • NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_2 Sample Progress Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Model 1 or 2 	Role of Teacher Incentive Fund	p. 9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Proposed Career Lattice for TIF schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBCS Optional Features 	Adequacy of Incentives	p. 14	

Requirement 2			
Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Requirement 2: Involvement and Support of Teachers and Principals In its application, the applicant must include--</p> <p>(a) Evidence that educators in each participating LEA have been involved, and will continue to be involved, in the development and implementation of the PBCS and evaluation systems described in the application;</p>	Part D: Involvement of Educator; Part E: Project Management; Part F: Sustainability	p. 39 – 61	
<p>(b) A description of the extent to which the applicant has educator support for the proposed PBCS and educator evaluation systems; and</p>	Part D: Involvement of Educators	p. 39 - 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NYCDOE TIF4 Letter of Support NYSED •NYCDOE TIF4 Letter of Support TNTP
<p>(c) A statement indicating whether a union is the exclusive representative of either teachers or principals in each participating LEA.</p>	Part A: HCMS; Part D: Involvement of Educators; Competitive Preference Priority 5	p. 26; p. 39-40; p. 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NYCDOE TIF4 Letter of Support UFT

Requirement 3			
Requirement or Priority	Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed	Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed	Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed
<p>Requirement 3: Documentation of High-Need Schools Each applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the schools participating in the implementation of the TIF-funded PBCS are high-need schools (as defined in the NIA), including high-poverty schools (as defined in the NIA), priority schools (as defined in the NIA), or persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA). Each applicant must provide, in its application--</p>	Vision of Instructional Improvement; Focus on Middle Schools	p. 2 (narrative); see attachment for school list documenting need; p. 7-9	•NYCDOE TIF 4 Schools List
(a) A list of high-need schools in which the proposed TIF-supported PBCS would be implemented;	N/A	N/A	•NYCDOE TIF 4 Schools List
(b) For each high-poverty school listed, the most current data on the percentage of students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or are considered students from low-income families based on another poverty measure that the LEA uses (see section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) (20 U.S.C. 6313(a)(5))). [Data provided to demonstrate eligibility as a high-poverty school must be school-level data; the Department will	N/A	N/A	•NYCDOE TIF 4 Schools List

not accept LEA- or State-level data for purposes of documenting whether a school is a high-poverty school; and			
(c) For any priority schools listed, documentation verifying that the State has received approval of a request for ESEA flexibility, and that the schools have been identified by the State as priority schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A

New York City Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund Grant Program

Table of Contents for Additional Attachments

<p>Title of Document</p> <p><i>Table of Contents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOC_for_Additional_Attachments
<p><i>Application Reference Chart</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIF_Reference_Chart
<p><i>High Need Documentation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYCDOE TIF4 Schools List 2012.07.25 (attached as mandatory attachment)
<p><i>Letters of Support</i> (3 attachments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYCDOE Letter of Support TIF4 UFT 2012.07.25 (Michael Mulgrew, United Federation of Teachers President) • NYCDOE Letter of Support TIF 4 NYSED 2012.07.27 (Daniel Weisberg, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, The New Teacher Project) • NYCDOE Letter of Support TIF4 TNTP 2012.07.27 (John King, New York State Education Commissioner)
<p><i>Indirect Cost Rate Agreement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012 Indirect Cost Rate Agreement NYCDOE
<p><i>Individual Resumes for Project Directors and Key Personnel</i> (7 attachments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bernstein_Vicki resume_2012 • BuschJohnson_Kirsten resume_2012 • Cannon_Joanna resume_2012 • Orlansky_Izaak resume_2012 • Shinkawa_Tania resume_2012 • Way_Amy_Kristina resume_2012 • Weatherby_Kelly resume_2012
<p><i>Additional Documents Cited</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 201213CitywideInstructionalExpectationsFINAL • Proposed_Career_Lattice_for_TIF • Full_Danielson_Framework • NYCDOE TIF4 TEP Action Planning Template 20120627 • NYCDOE TIF4 Examples of Effective Evidence_SpEdELL • NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_1 Background Ppal Financial Incentives • NYCDOE TIF4 Ppal PBCS_2 Sample Progress Report

Budget Narrative File(s)

* Mandatory Budget Narrative Filename:

To add more Budget Narrative attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

I. TIF Grant Funds Budget Narrative

NYCDOE TIF Year 1 - Planning Year Budget	\$1,243,432
---	--------------------

CATEGORY

PERSONNEL	<i>Personnel: The following requested personnel will be hired as an employee of the project.</i>	% FTE	Base Salary (per; pro-rated based on anticipated hire date)	Total
	Project Director: A Project Director will be hired to oversee the day to day management of the TIF project, including all planning year activities. The Project Director will work under the supervision of the Director of Strategic Incentives and the Executive Director of the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality. Anticipate hire date in or around December 2012.	100%	\$75,000	\$75,000
	Project Managers: The Project Managers will be hired to support the day-to-day planning and implementation of TIF grant activities. Anticipate hire date in or around December 2012.	100%	\$63,750	\$127,500
	Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors: A Director will be hired to oversee the management of the Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors as described within our proposed career lattice. This person will need to be hired in the planning year to support preparation for Year 1 of implementation. The Project Director will work under the supervision of the Director of Strategic Incentives and the Executive Director of the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality, and will also work closely with the Director of the Office of Teacher Effectiveness, which manages work around the pilot and implementation of NYCDOE's new teacher evaluation system. Anticipate hire date in or around December 2012.	100%	\$75,000	\$75,000
	Subtotal Program Staff Salary			\$277,500

<i>Personnel: Pedagogue Per Session</i>	# staff	Annual PS	Total
<p><i>*Principals, teachers, and other pedagogues participating in summer professional development (PD) in preparation for Year 1 implementation are entitled to per session payment per their contracts.</i></p>			
Principals/Supervisors - summer PD	70	\$618	\$43,277
<p><i>*We plan to have 70 principals participate in 14 hours of PD for this year</i> <i>*Principals' hourly per session rate is \$43.94</i></p>			
Teachers/Coaches - summer PD	210	\$268	\$56,213
<p><i>*We plan to have approximately 210 teachers participate in 14 hours of PD for this year</i> <i>*Teachers' hourly per session rate is \$19.12.</i></p>			
Subtotal			\$99,489

<i>Personnel: Differentiated Compensation & Incentives</i>	# staff	Average Annual Salary Amount	Total
<p>Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador: Works across schools with principals and Peer Instructional Coaches to provide peer feedback and support teacher development.</p> <p><i>*\$262,500 represents salary for 10 Ambassadors (\$26,250 each), based on NYCDOE salary scale with an additional \$20,000 per year based on the rationale that they will spend additional time over the summer and after regular teacher hours in performing duties and prorated for 25% of the year, as we anticipate summer hire dates for these employees.</i></p>	10	\$26,250	\$262,500
Subtotal Pedagogue Salary			\$262,500

FRINGE	Salary Cost (pro-rated)	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Fringe: The following are the corresponding fringe benefit costs associated with the Program Management positions.			
Project Director	\$75,000	36.84%	\$27,630
Project Managers	\$127,500	36.84%	\$46,971
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	\$75,000	36.84%	\$27,630
Subtotal			\$102,231

Pedagogical Per Session Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Principals/Supervisors - summer PD	\$43,277	7.65%	\$3,311
Teachers/Coaches - summer PD	\$56,213	7.65%	\$4,300
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Per Session Fringe Benefits			\$7,611

Pedagogical Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	\$262,500	34.31%	\$90,064
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Fringe Benefits			\$90,064

PR/Award # S374A120083

<i>Travel: Travel expenses for</i>						
	Air	Local	Hotel	Per Diem	\$ per Trip	
Travel for TIF Grantee Meeting: Assumes 3 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,350	\$300	\$900	\$639	\$3,189	
Travel for TIF Topical Meeting: Assumes 2 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$900	\$200	\$600	\$426	\$2,126	
Subtotal					\$	5,315

<i>Consultants: Support screening of pool and professional development</i>		
	Total	Notes
<i>Figures based on experience with similar projects/vendors</i>		
Application data system	\$25,000	
Marketing and recruitment	\$20,000	
Screening / visits / selection	\$50,000	
Summer and school year support	\$15,000	
Evaluation and best practices platform	\$25,000	
Licenses for Teachscape technology	\$2,500	Assumes 10 licenses (4 Program staff + 6 Ambassadors) at a negotiated rate of \$250 per license.
Professional Development Services (logistics and contract)	\$161,500	Assumes 2 sessions with 3 groups each Printed material per group: \$2,500 Supplies: \$500 Location costs: \$3,500 Breakfast and lunch for up to 120 participants: \$2,500 PD Consultants (e.g. Danielson, NTC, Eskolta, etc.): \$95,000 •Prep/wrap days: 1 •Facilitation days: 3 •Daily rate: \$5,000 •Design costs: \$75,000 DOE School Professionals (to hire video team, etc.): \$15,000
Equipment (lap tops, flip cameras)	\$60,000	
	\$359,000	

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS \$1,203,710

INDIRECT \$38,519

Indirect Costs: As per the negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the NYCDOE charges 3.2% on all direct costs, minus equipment.

Subtotal Indirect

TOTAL DIRECT +INDIRECT COSTS \$1,242,229

NYCDOE TIF Year 2 Budget	\$13,059,174
---------------------------------	---------------------

CATEGORY

PERSONNEL	<i>Personnel: Program Staff</i>	% FTE	Base Salary (per)	Total
	Project Director	100%	\$100,000	\$100,000
	Project Managers	100%	\$85,000	\$170,000
	Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	100%	\$100,000	\$100,000
	Subtotal			\$370,000

<i>Personnel: Pedagogue Per Session</i>	# staff	Annual PS	Total
<i>*Principals, teachers, and other pedagogues participating in activities or professional development (PD) beyond their normal duties are entitled to per session payment per their contracts.</i>			
Lab Site Principal Assumes 70 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	10	\$3,076	\$30,758
Participating Principal Assumes 50 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	60	\$2,197	\$131,820
Subtotal			\$162,578

<i>Personnel: Differentiated Compensation & Incentives</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor: High performing teacher who mentors and develops individuals who are part of NYCDOE pre-service teacher pipeline programs. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that Pre-service Apprentice Mentor may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year or semester doing related duties.	80	\$6,000	\$480,000
Peer Instructional Coach: High performing teacher who works with teachers to improve teacher effectiveness and student learning in alignment with the teacher effectiveness program. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming PICs will attend regular monthly professional development and allocate time out of school hours to support teacher development; includes approximately 10 additional hours/month outside of the school day, plus 2 – 3 summer professional development sessions.	130	\$15,000	\$1,950,000
Demonstration Teacher: Highest performing teachers who agree to have classroom serve as a lab in own school and other activities to disseminate best practices. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that a demonstration teacher may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year doing related duties.	230	\$6,000	\$1,380,000
	PR/Award # S374A120083		

Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador: High performing teachers who work across schools with principals and Peer Coach/Evaluators to provide peer feedback and support teacher development. Salary shown includes \$20,000 increment.	10	\$105,000	\$1,050,000
<i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming TEAs will spend additional time over the summer and after regular teacher hours in performing duties. Likely teacher assigned structure plus additional hours attending and delivering PD.			
Subtotal			\$4,860,000

<i>Personnel: Relief Time for Peer Observers</i>	# staff	Cost of Relief Time	Total
Peer Instructional Coach: Relief from teaching duties for an average of 40% of time to serve as developer of other teachers and support teacher effectiveness implementation in school. Relief time cost based on contractually negotiated rate.	130	\$28,000	\$3,640,000
Subtotal			\$3,640,000

Subtotal Pedagogical Personnel	\$8,662,578
---------------------------------------	--------------------

FRINGE

Program Staff Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Project Director	\$100,000	36.84%	\$36,840
Project Managers	\$170,000	36.84%	\$62,628
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	\$100,000	36.84%	\$36,840
Subtotal Program Staff Fringe Benefits			\$136,308

Pedagogical Per Session Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Lab Site Principal	\$30,758	7.65%	\$2,353
Participating Principal	\$131,820	7.65%	\$10,084
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Per Session Fringe Benefits			\$12,437

Pedagogical Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	\$480,000	34.31%	\$164,688
Peer Instructional Coach	\$1,950,000	34.31%	\$669,045
Demonstration Teacher	\$1,380,000	34.31%	\$473,478
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	\$1,050,000	34.31%	\$360,255
Peer Instructional Coach Relief Time	\$3,640,000	34.31%	\$1,248,884
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Fringe Benefits			\$2,916,350

TRAVEL

Travel: Travel expenses for	Air	Local	Hotel	Per Diem	\$ per Trip
Travel for TIF Grantee Meeting: Assumes 3 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,350	\$300	\$900	\$639	\$3,189
Travel for TIF Topical Meeting: Assumes 2 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$900	\$200	\$600	\$426	\$2,126
Subtotal					\$5,315

PR/Award # S374A120083

CONTRACTS		
Consultants: Support screening of pool and professional development	Total	Notes
<i>Figures based on experience with similar projects/vendors</i>		
Application data system	\$15,000	
Marketing and recruitment	\$20,000	
Screening / visits / selection	\$50,000	
Summer and school year support	\$25,000	
Evaluation and best practices platform	\$50,000	
Licenses for Teachscape technology	\$113,500	Assumes 454 licenses (4 Program staff, 10 Ambassadors, 80 Apprentice Mentors, 130 Peer Instructional Coaches, and 230 Demonstration Teachers) at a negotiated rate of \$250 per license.
Professional Development Services (logistics and contract)	\$250,500	Assumes 10 sessions with 3 groups each Printed material per group: \$2,500 Supplies: \$500 Location costs: \$3,500 Breakfast and lunch for up to 120 participants: \$2,500 PD Consultants (e.g. Danielson, NTC, Eskolta, etc.): \$115,000 •Prep/wrap days: 3 •Facilitation days: 10 •Daily rate: \$5,000 •Design costs: \$50,000 DOE School Professionals (to hire video team, etc.): \$50,000
Equipment (lap tops, flip cameras)	\$15,000	
Subtotal	\$539,000	

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS **\$12,641,988**

INDIRECT	Indirect Costs: As per the negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the NYCDOE charges 3.2% on all direct costs, minus equipment.
	Subtotal Indirect \$404,544

TOTAL DIRECT +INDIRECT COSTS **\$13,046,532**

NYCDOE TIF Year 3 Budget	\$13,084,765
--------------------------	--------------

CATEGORY

PERSONNEL

<i>Personnel: Program Staff</i>	% FTE	Base Salary (per)	Total
Project Director	100%	\$103,000	\$103,000
Project Managers	100%	\$87,550	\$175,100
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	100%	\$103,000	\$103,000
Subtotal			\$381,100

<i>Personnel: Pedagogue Per Session</i>	# staff	Annual PS	Total
<i>*Principals, teachers, and other pedagogues participating in activities or professional development (PD) beyond their normal duties are entitled to per session payment per their contracts.</i>			
Lab Site Principal Assumes 70 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	10	\$3,076	\$30,758
Participating Principal Assumes 50 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	60	\$2,197	\$131,820
Subtotal			\$162,578

<i>Personnel: Differentiated Compensation & Incentives</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor: High performing teacher who mentors and develops individuals who are part of NYCDOE pre-service teacher pipeline programs. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that Pre-service Apprentice Mentor may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year or semester doing related duties.	80	\$6,000	\$480,000
Peer Instructional Coach: High performing teacher who works with teachers to improve teacher effectiveness and student learning in alignment with the teacher effectiveness program. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming PICs will attend regular monthly professional development and allocate time out of school hours to support teacher development; includes approximately 10 additional hours/month outside of the school day, plus 2 – 3 summer professional development sessions.	130	\$15,000	\$1,950,000
Demonstration Teacher: Highest performing teachers who agree to have classroom serve as a lab in own school and other activities to disseminate best practices. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that a demonstration teacher may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year doing related duties.	230	\$6,000	\$1,380,000

Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador: High performing teachers who work across schools with principals and Peer Coach/Evaluators to provide peer feedback and support teacher development. Salary shown includes \$20,000 increment.	10	\$107,550	\$1,075,500
<i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming TEAs will spend additional time over the summer and after regular teacher hours in performing duties. Likely teacher assigned structure plus additional hours attending and delivering PD.			
Subtotal			\$4,885,500

<i>Personnel: Relief Time for Peer Instructional Coaches</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Peer Instructional Coach: Relief from teaching duties for an average of 40% of time to serve as developer of other teachers and support teacher effectiveness implementation in school.	130	\$28,000	\$3,640,000
Relief time cost based on contractually negotiated rate.			
Subtotal			\$3,640,000

Subtotal Pedagogical Personnel	\$8,688,078
---------------------------------------	--------------------

FRINGE

Program Staff Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Project Director	\$103,000	36.84%	\$37,945
Project Managers	\$175,100	36.84%	\$64,507
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	\$103,000	36.84%	\$37,945
Subtotal Program Staff Fringe Benefits			\$140,397

Pedagogical Per Session Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Lab Site Principal	\$30,758	7.65%	\$2,353
Participating Principal	\$131,820	7.65%	\$10,084
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Per Session Fringe Benefits			\$12,437

Pedagogical Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	\$480,000	34.31%	\$164,688
Peer Instructional Coach	\$1,950,000	34.31%	\$669,045
Demonstration Teacher	\$1,380,000	34.31%	\$473,478
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	\$1,075,500	34.31%	\$369,004
Peer Instructional Coach Relief Time	\$3,640,000	34.31%	\$1,248,884
Subtotal Fringe Benefits			\$2,925,099

TRAVEL

Travel: Travel expenses for	Air	Local	Hotel	Per Diem	\$ per Trip
Travel for TIF Grantee Meeting: Assumes 3 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,425	\$330	\$960	\$675	\$3,390
Travel for TIF Topical Meeting: Assumes 2 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days			\$640	\$450	\$2,260
Subtotal					\$6,650

PR/Award # S3748120083

CONTRACTS

<i>Consultants: Support screening of pool and professional development</i>	Total	Notes
<i>Figures based on experience with similar projects/vendors</i>		
Application data system	\$15,000	
Marketing and recruitment	\$20,000	
Screening / visits / selection	\$50,000	
Summer and school year support	\$25,000	
Evaluation and best practices platform	\$50,000	
Licenses for Teachscape technology	\$113,500	Assumes 454 licenses (4 Program staff, 10 Ambassadors, 80 Apprentice Mentors, 130 Peer Instructional Coaches, and 230 Demonstration Teachers) at a negotiated rate of \$250 per license.
Professional Development Services (logistics and contract)	\$225,500	Assumes 10 sessions with 3 groups each Printed material per group: \$2,500 Supplies: \$500 Location costs: \$3,500 Breakfast and lunch for up to 120 participants: \$2,500 PD Consultants (e.g. Danielson, NTC, Eskolta, etc.): \$90,000 •Prep/wrap days: 3 •Facilitation days: 10 •Daily rate: \$5,000 •Design costs: \$25,000 DOE School Professionals (to hire video team, etc.): \$50,000
Equipment (lap tops, flip cameras)	\$15,000	
	\$514,000	

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

\$12,666,762

INDIRECT

Indirect Costs: As per the negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the NYCDOE charges 3.2% on all direct costs, minus equipment.	
Subtotal Indirect	\$405,336

TOTAL DIRECT +INDIRECT COSTS

\$13,072,098

NYCDOE TIF Year 4 Budget	\$13,084,765
---------------------------------	---------------------

CATEGORY

PERSONNEL

<i>Personnel: Program Staff</i>	% FTE	Base Salary (per)	Total
Project Director	100%	\$103,000	\$103,000
Project Managers	100%	\$87,550	\$175,100
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	100%	\$103,000	\$103,000
Subtotal			\$381,100

<i>Personnel: Pedagogue Per Session</i>	# staff	Annual PS	Total
<i>*Principals, teachers, and other pedagogues participating in activities or professional development (PD) beyond their normal duties are entitled to per session payment per their contracts.</i>			
Lab Site Principal Assumes 70 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	10	\$3,076	\$30,758
Participating Principal Assumes 50 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	60	\$2,197	\$131,820
Subtotal			\$162,578

<i>Personnel: Differentiated Compensation & Incentives</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor: High performing teacher who mentors and develops individuals who are part of NYCDOE pre-service teacher pipeline programs. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that Pre-service Apprentice Mentor may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year or semester doing related duties.	80	\$6,000	\$480,000
Peer Instructional Coach: High performing teacher who works with teachers to improve teacher effectiveness and student learning in alignment with the teacher effectiveness program. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming PICs will attend regular monthly professional development and allocate time out of school hours to support teacher development; includes approximately 10 additional hours/month outside of the school day, plus 2 – 3 summer professional development sessions.	130	\$15,000	\$1,950,000
Demonstration Teacher: Highest performing teachers who agree to have classroom serve as a lab in own school and other activities to disseminate best practices. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that a demonstration teacher may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year doing related duties.	230	\$6,000	\$1,380,000

Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador: High performing teachers who work across schools with principals and Peer Coach/Evaluators to provide peer feedback and support teacher development. Salary shown includes \$20,000 increment.	10	\$107,550	\$1,075,500
<i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming TEAs will spend additional time over the summer and after regular teacher hours in performing duties. Likely teacher assigned structure plus additional hours attending and delivering PD.			
Subtotal			\$4,885,500

<i>Personnel: Relief Time for Peer Instructional Coaches</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Peer Instructional Coach: Relief from teaching duties for an average of 40% of time to serve as developer of other teachers and support teacher effectiveness implementation in school. Relief time cost based on contractually negotiated rate.	130	\$28,000	\$3,640,000
Subtotal			\$3,640,000

Subtotal Pedagogical Personnel \$8,688,078

FRINGE

Program Staff Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Project Director	\$103,000	36.84%	\$37,945
Project Managers	\$175,100	36.84%	\$64,507
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	\$103,000	36.84%	\$37,945
Subtotal Program Staff Fringe Benefits			\$140,397

Pedagogical Per Session Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Lab Site Principal	\$30,758	7.65%	\$2,353
Participating Principal	\$131,820	7.65%	\$10,084
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Per Session Fringe Benefits			\$12,437

Pedagogical Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	\$480,000	34.31%	\$164,688
Peer Instructional Coach	\$1,950,000	34.31%	\$669,045
Demonstration Teacher	\$1,380,000	34.31%	\$473,478
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	\$1,075,500	34.31%	\$369,004
Peer Instructional Coach Relief Time	\$3,640,000	34.31%	\$1,248,884
Subtotal Fringe Benefits			\$2,925,099

TRAVEL

Travel: Travel expenses for	Air	Local	Hotel	Per Diem	\$ per Trip
Travel for TIF Grantee Meeting: Assumes 3 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,425	\$330	\$960	\$675	\$3,390
Travel for TIF Topical Meeting: Assumes 2 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	PR/Award # S374A120083		\$640	\$450	\$2,260
Subtotal					\$5,650

CONTRACTS		
Consultants: Support screening of pool and professional development	Total	Notes
<i>Figures based on experience with similar projects/vendors</i>		
Application data system	\$15,000	
Marketing and recruitment	\$20,000	
Screening / visits / selection	\$50,000	
Summer and school year support	\$25,000	
Evaluation and best practices platform	\$50,000	
Licenses for Teachscape technology	\$113,500	Assumes 454 licenses (4 Program staff, 10 Ambassadors, 80 Apprentice Mentors, 130 Peer Instructional Coaches, and 230 Demonstration Teachers) at a negotiated rate of \$250 per license.
Professional Development Services (logistics and contract)	\$225,500	Assumes 10 sessions with 3 groups each Printed material per group: \$2,500 Supplies: \$500 Location costs: \$3,500 Breakfast and lunch for up to 120 participants: \$2,500 PD Consultants (e.g. Danielson, NTC, Eskolta, etc.): \$90,000 •Prep/wrap days: 3 •Facilitation days: 10 •Daily rate: \$5,000 •Design costs: \$25,000 DOE School Professionals (to hire video team, etc.): \$50,000
Equipment (lap tops, flip cameras)	\$15,000	
Subtotal	\$514,000	

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS **\$12,666,762**

INDIRECT	Indirect Costs: As per the negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the NYCDOE charges 3.2% on all direct costs, minus equipment.
	Subtotal Indirect \$405,336

TOTAL DIRECT +INDIRECT COSTS **\$13,072,098**

NYCDOE TIF Year 5 Budget	\$12,949,244
---------------------------------	---------------------

CATEGORY

PERSONNEL

<i>Personnel: Program Staff</i>	% FTE	Base Salary (per)	Total
Project Director	100%	\$106,090	\$106,090
Project Managers	100%	\$90,177	\$180,353
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	100%	\$106,090	\$106,090
Subtotal			\$392,533

<i>Personnel: Pedagogue Per Session</i>	# staff	Annual PS	Total
<i>*Principals, teachers, and other pedagogues participating in activities or professional development (PD) beyond their normal duties are entitled to per session payment per their contracts.</i>			
Lab Site Principal Assumes 35 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	10	\$1,538	\$15,379
Participating Principal Assumes 25 hours at a rate of \$43.94/hour	60	\$1,099	\$65,910
Subtotal			\$81,289

<i>Personnel: Differentiated Compensation & Incentives</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor: High performing teacher who mentors and develops individuals who are part of NYCDOE pre-service teacher pipeline programs. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that Pre-service Apprentice Mentor may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year or semester doing related duties.	80	\$6,000	\$480,000
Peer Instructional Coach: High performing teacher who works with teachers to improve teacher effectiveness and student learning in alignment with the teacher effectiveness program. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming PICs will attend regular monthly professional development and allocate time out of school hours to support teacher development; includes approximately 10 additional hours/month outside of the school day plus 2 – 3 summer professional development sessions.	130	\$15,000	\$1,950,000
Demonstration Teacher: Highest performing teachers who agree to have classroom serve as a lab in own school and other activities to disseminate best practices. <i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming that a demonstration teacher may spend classroom time and 2 professional/prep periods a week per year doing related duties.	230	\$6,000	\$1,380,000

Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador: High performing teachers who work across schools with principals and Peer Coach/Evaluators to provide peer feedback and support teacher development. Salary shown includes \$20,000 increment.	10	\$110,177	\$1,101,765
<i>Rationale for salary increment:</i> Based on contractually negotiated rate, assuming TEAs will spend additional time over the summer and after regular teacher hours in performing duties. Likely teacher assigned structure plus additional hours attending and delivering PD.			
Subtotal			\$4,911,765

<i>Personnel: Relief Time for Peer Instructional Coaches</i>	# staff	Average Amount Salary Increment	Total
Peer Instructional Coach: Relief from teaching duties for an average of 40% of time to serve as developer of other teachers and support teacher effectiveness implementation in school.	130	\$28,000	\$3,640,000
Relief time cost based on contractually negotiated rate.			
Subtotal			\$3,640,000

Subtotal Pedagogical Personnel	\$8,633,054		
---------------------------------------	--------------------	--	--

FRINGE

Program Staff Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Project Director	\$106,090	36.84%	\$39,084
Project Managers	\$180,353	36.84%	\$66,442
Director, Teacher Effectiveness Ambassadors	\$106,090	36.84%	\$39,084
Subtotal Program Staff Fringe Benefits			\$144,609

Pedagogical Per Session Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Lab Site Principal	\$15,379	7.65%	\$1,176
Participating Principal	\$65,910	7.65%	\$5,042
Principals/Supervisors - PD	\$0	7.65%	\$0
Teachers/Coaches - PD	\$0	7.65%	\$0
Subtotal Pedagogical Staff Per Session Fringe Benefits			\$6,219

Pedagogical Fringe	Salary Cost	Fringe Rate	Fringe
Pre-Service Apprentice Mentor	\$480,000	34.31%	\$164,688
Peer Instructional Coach	\$1,950,000	34.31%	\$669,045
Demonstration Teacher	\$1,380,000	34.31%	\$473,478
Teacher Effectiveness Ambassador	\$1,101,765	34.31%	\$378,016
Peer Instructional Coach Relief Time	\$3,640,000	34.31%	\$1,248,884
Subtotal Fringe Benefits			\$2,934,111

TRAVEL

<i>Travel: Travel expenses for</i>	Air	Local	Hotel	Per Diem	\$ per Trip
Travel for TIF Grantee Meeting: Assumes 3 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,500	\$360	\$1,020	\$747	\$3,627
Travel for TIF Topical Meeting: Assumes 2 travelers for 2 nights and 3 days	\$1,000	\$240	\$680	\$498	\$2,418
Subtotal					\$6,045

CONTRACTS

<i>Consultants: Support screening of pool and professional development</i>	Total	Notes
<i>Figures based on experience with similar projects/vendors</i>		
Application data system	\$0	
Marketing and recruitment	\$0	
Screening / visits / selection	\$0	
Summer and school year support	\$15,000	
Evaluation and best practices platform	\$50,000	
Licenses for Teachscape technology	\$113,500	Assumes 454 licenses (4 Program staff, 10 Ambassadors, 80 Apprentice Mentors, 130 Peer Instructional Coaches, and 230 Demonstration Teachers) at a negotiated rate of \$250 per license.
Professional Development Services (logistics and contract)	\$225,500	Assumes 10 sessions with 3 groups each Printed material per group: \$2,500 Supplies: \$500 Location costs: \$3,500 Breakfast and lunch for up to 120 participants: \$2,500 PD Consultants (e.g. Danielson, NTC, Eskolta, etc.): \$90,000 •Prep/wrap days: 3 •Facilitation days: 10 •Daily rate: \$5,000 •Design costs: \$25,000 DOE School Professionals (to hire video team, etc.): \$50,000
Equipment (lap tops, flip cameras)	\$15,000	
Subtotal	\$419,000	

II. Applicant Funds Budget Narrative

Budget Category	Rationale	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
		(b)(4)				
1. Personnel	Personnel costs include an increasing staff allocation over the grant period. Equivalent to (b)(4) FTE time dedicated for project including program management, data analysis, supervision. Approximately 3 Program Managers, 1 - 2 Directors, 1- 2 Executive Directors.					
2. Fringe	Fringe rate is (b)(7) and accounts for the fringe costs of staff dedicated to project outside of the staffing funds requested.					

Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity For Applicants

OMB No. 1890-0014 Exp. 2/28/2009

Purpose:

The Federal government is committed to ensuring that all qualified applicants, small or large, non-religious or faith-based, have an equal opportunity to compete for Federal funding. In order for us to better understand the population of applicants for Federal funds, we are asking nonprofit private organizations (not including private universities) to fill out this survey.

Upon receipt, the survey will be separated from the application. Information provided on the survey will not be considered in any way in making funding decisions and will not be included in the Federal grants database. While your help in this data collection process is greatly appreciated, completion of this survey is voluntary.

Instructions for Submitting the Survey

If you are applying using a hard copy application, please place the completed survey in an envelope labeled "Applicant Survey." Seal the envelope and include it along with your application package. If you are applying electronically, please submit this survey along with your application.

Applicant's (Organization) Name:	New York City Department of Education
Applicant's DUNS Name:	1036692890000
Federal Program:	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE): Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF):
CFDA Number:	84.374

1. Has the applicant ever received a grant or contract from the Federal government?

Yes No

2. Is the applicant a faith-based organization?

Yes No

3. Is the applicant a secular organization?

Yes No

4. Does the applicant have 501(c)(3) status?

Yes No

5. Is the applicant a local affiliate of a national organization?

Yes No

6. How many full-time equivalent employees does the applicant have? (Check only one box).

3 or Fewer 15-50

4-5 51-100

6-14 over 100

7. What is the size of the applicant's annual budget? (Check only one box.)

Less Than \$150,000

\$150,000 - \$299,999

\$300,000 - \$499,999

\$500,000 - \$999,999

\$1,000,000 - \$4,999,999

\$5,000,000 or more

Survey Instructions on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants

OMB No. 1890-0014 Exp. 2/28/2009

Provide the applicant's (organization) name and DUNS number and the grant name and CFDA number.

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Self-identify.
3. Self-identify.
4. 501(c)(3) status is a legal designation provided on application to the Internal Revenue Service by eligible organizations. Some grant programs may require nonprofit applicants to have 501(c)(3) status. Other grant programs do not.
5. Self-explanatory.
6. For example, two part-time employees who each work half-time equal one full-time equivalent employee. If the applicant is a local affiliate of a national organization, the responses to survey questions 2 and 3 should reflect the staff and budget size of the local affiliate.
7. Annual budget means the amount of money your organization spends each year on all of its activities.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this

information collection is **1890-0014**. The time required

to complete this information collection is estimated to average five (5) minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.

If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: The Agency Contact listed in this grant application package.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS**

OMB Number: 1894-0008
Expiration Date: 02/28/2011

Name of Institution/Organization

New York City Department of Education

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

**SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	639,489.31	9,032,578.00	9,069,178.00	9,069,178.00	9,025,587.00	36,836,010.31
2. Fringe Benefits	199,905.68	3,065,095.22	3,077,933.51	3,077,933.51	3,084,938.34	12,505,806.26
3. Travel	5,315.00	5,315.00	5,650.00	5,650.00	6,045.00	27,975.00
4. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6. Contractual	359,000.00	539,000.00	514,000.00	514,000.00	419,000.00	2,345,000.00
7. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8. Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,203,709.99	12,641,988.22	12,666,761.51	12,666,761.51	12,535,570.34	51,714,791.57
10. Indirect Costs*	38,518.72	404,543.62	405,336.37	405,336.37	401,138.25	1,654,873.33
11. Training Stipends		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	1,242,228.71	13,046,531.84	13,072,097.88	13,072,097.88	12,936,708.59	53,369,664.90

***Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? Yes No

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07/01/2012 To: 06/30/2013 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ED Other (please specify):

The Indirect Cost Rate is 3.20 %.

(3) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)? The Restricted Indirect Cost Rate is %.

Name of Institution/Organization New York City Department of Education	Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.	
---	---	--

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	(b)(4)					
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

SECTION C - BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)