

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education -- Louisiana Department of Education ,
Division of Educator Support and Evaluation (S385A100109)

Reader #1: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

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

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	107
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education -- Louisiana Department of Education ,Division of Educator Support and Evaluation (S385A100109)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

In order to have differentiated levels of compensation, the applicant lists that teachers and principals who demonstrate effectiveness by improving student achievement will receive compensation. Fifty percent will be based on student value-added growth and the other 50% on observation assessments (page e4).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

According to the applicant, each LEA partner submitted projected costs associated for PBCS implementation beyond the project period. Each districts planning to increase their share of the performance based pay for the teachers and principals over a period of time (page e5). The applicant provides a template which was given to each LEA to budget for the future with the project.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant believes that implementing a State wide TIF will balance the State's efforts to strengthen the educator workforce, by using data and evaluations of professional development as well as retention and tenure decisions beyond the duration of the grant. The goals of in this project are to complement the Louisiana Act 54 (page e 6). Teachers incentive money will vary based on their effectiveness (ranging from 0-\$6,800). Principals and assistant principals will also be judged on effectiveness and can receive \$10,000 and \$5000 respectively (page e 23).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant proposes significant pay incentive pools based on a \$2,500 per teacher allocation, \$5,000 per assistant principal, and \$10,000 per principal. The bonus money was selected bade on the relationship to the average salary in Louisiana (page e 25). In addition, to the performance pay amounts, teachers and principals can receive more money if they take on additional job responsibilities and leadership roles as master and mentor teachers. Combined opportunities could yield up to 20% or more above their base pay.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1:

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

General:

Communication of the components of the project for the teachers and administrators consist of field trips to practicing schools of TAP, overview of presentations about the project and state sponsored workshops. According to the applicant, a key component is that teachers and administrators can study TAP for one year. The applicant states that TAP workshops are held every January-March for the purpose of providing interesting educational leaders with an in-depth look at the TAP System (page e8).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant is requiring every TAP school to submit an application that documents (a teacher vote in support of the project; (2) a signed principal commitment form; (3) a signed district superintendent commitment form; and (4) partner district signed memorandums of agreement (page e8). The applicant believes this level of support will strengthen and expand their program.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

General:

The applicant proposes to have evaluations four times a year to be implemented by trained evaluators. The applicant has an objective evidenced based rubric to be used by the evaluators.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1.Core Element 4:

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

General:

Based on evidence of past performance with implementation of the TAP performance pay component in Louisiana, the applicant has a data management system that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resource systems (page e9). The data system is used in combination with SAS EVASS and a third party web-based application, the Comprehensive Online Data Entry System (CODE).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1.Core Element 5:

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

General:

In order to ensure communication: (1) the applicant proposes to host an eight day TAP Core Training required of leadership team members prior to TAP being implemented; (2) provide TAP evaluation and compensation guidance to all of the TAP schools; (3) host start up school workshops on TAP; (4) endorse master teacher and principal networking and support meeting throughout the year; and (5) hold weekly cluster meetings for all TAP educators (page e10).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1.High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS

has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

- (1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;
- (2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;
- (3) Provide --
 - (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
 - (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to
 - (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
 - (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
 - (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

According to the applicant, they will tailor the professional development to the individuals teacher, principal and school needs. The process begins with identification of a school goal based on the needs of the school. Then the professional development is carefully aligned to the educator evaluation in the TAP system. According to the applicant, the TAP evaluation structure will provide feedback for professional growth. Teacher will then engage in professional development based on the standards of performance that are applied to the evaluations (page e 40).

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

- 1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--
 - (i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and
 - (ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.
- (2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and
- (3) A definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purposes of paragraph (2) of this selection criterion is established.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to institute a performance based compensation system in 70 high need partner LEA schools which will impact over 2,800 educators and 33,500 students. In the appendix, the applicant provides a chart which includes statistics on the number of students to be served broken down by school, free and reduced lunch status, proficiency level, and ethnicity. According to the applicant, over one-third of the teachers have left their schools in the last three years; and more than one-fourth have less than five years teaching experience (page e11). The applicant states that the district does not have a policy in place to differentiate between effective and ineffective students, thus leaving a gap to be filled. Based on statistics presented by the applicant on the schools to be served, 41.43% of the students are scoring below Basic in English, 40.10% below Basic in Math, which is below the state scores (page e14).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the school year;

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposal is based on components of a proven PBCS system (TAP). This is a system for teacher and student advancement. For example, the applicant provides documentation on the success of TAP. In 2008-2009, in eight of the sixteen grade-subject combination's studied, TAP schools doubled the state rate of gains in the percent of students scoring Basic or above (page e 17). The program design allows for teachers to serve in advance capacities as master and mentors (page e 18). Under this design, master and mentor teachers would deliver weekly professional development through cluster groups, provide ongoing coaching of teachers, teach model lessons, observe classroom instruction, and analyze data to identify student and teacher needs (page e 18). The project design also includes ongoing applied professional development, instructionally focused accountability, performance based compensation which recognizes student learning growth, and a methodology that includes valid and reliable measures of student growth. The applicant proposes to use a statistical method (value added) to measure the contributions of teachers and schools to student achievement growth during the school year (pages 20-21). Classroom observations and student outcomes based on value-added analysis of student achievement is set to be conducted as part of the rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system put in place by the applicant for the project (page 3 31). The applicant plans to have the team participate in an eight day training and an annual one day training re-certification test in order to understand and use the TAP research based evaluation standards. The applicant also plans on using the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education and the TAP Annual Review to determine leadership effectiveness (page 36).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 60

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

(4) The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals

and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

Strengths:

The applicant provides several letters of reference in the appendix for the proposed project from a variety of sources. The applicant is seeking to create a PBCS that is sustainable at the district level. There are resumes included of key personnel for the project with brief job descriptions. The charts on pages e 49- e 52 aligns the goals with the responsible person, measurements to be used and the milestones to be accomplished. The key personnel have appropriate time commitments for the project. The applicant has identified support with funds provided from other federal, state and local sources for the project.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

On pages e 59-e 61, the applicant discusses the goals and performance objectives for the project in relation to outputs and activities. The applicant proposes to measure performance objectives which are related to the goals of the project. Each of the three goals listed in chart form provide insight into how the applicant plans on increasing teacher and principal effectiveness, build capacity of districts to successfully implement a PBCS and to improve student achievement. The applicant proposes to use an outside evaluator with high quality credentials for the project.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

According to the applicant, they have used a value-added program of student achievement (Williams Sanders) since 2004 for the differentiated compensation awards for the educators in the Louisiana (page e 6). They are also developing a statewide value-added measure system to extend to schools statewide.

Weaknesses:

Details on the level of successes that were achieved since 2004 is not included in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to utilize research based proven strategies to recruit and retain qualified teachers for their high need students. According to the applicant, they need more effective math teachers. The hard to staff subjects they identified are math, science and special education (page e12).

Weaknesses:

Information on the type of recruitment and retention strategies to be used is not described. The applicant simply states that it will be based on successful research (page e7). Although the applicant provide concrete examples as to why they need quality math teachers based on the low performance of students on test, they do not indicate examples for the other subject areas.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

1.Project Design	60	58
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	94

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	104
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education -- Louisiana Department of Education ,Division of Educator Support and Evaluation (S385A100109)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The proposal gave significant weight to student growth, includes observation-based assessments of teacher and principal performance at multiple points in the year, carried out by evaluators trained in using objective evidence-based rubrics for observation, aligned with professional teaching and leadership standards (ISLLC and VAL-ED that is based on ISLLC standards). The proposal explained the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments that will provide incentive amounts that are substantial (5-20%) and it provided justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen and these levels were likely high enough to create change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers and principals in order to ultimately improve student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

A strength of this proposal is the clearly articulated (and including projected costs) sustainability plan with matched funds that exceed the requested grant monies.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The proposal includes a coherent and integrated strategy for the use of value-added data and observation data to drive both incentive pay and recertification decisions. A strength of LA overarching reform plan is that teachers must reapply for certification every 5 years (no more lifetime certificates). This policy creates an environment that has the potential to make the PBCS even more effective (it augments the potential benefits of a PBCS). Further, LA adoption of SAS EVAAS model illustrates their commitment to using value-added models (in conjunction with other measures of teacher effectiveness such as observations).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The proposal was thorough in its description of how the PBCS will encourage educators to take on additional responsibilities. (see pages e 4, e 18 e 20, e 40, e 42, e 45 and elsewhere). For example, the TAP model allows teachers to serve in advanced capacities as master and mentor teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1.Core Element 1:

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

General:

The communication plan is outlines on pages e28-30, but they fail to clearly define the communication plan. They include numerous letters of support from various levels of the educational system. Teacher and leader input is described in detail. The required 80% buy-in is an adequate standard (see e 29).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1.Core Element 2:

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

General:

The application includes numerous letters of support and in the narrative the application describes multiple process to prepare schools for TAP, have faculty vote for its adoption, and other indicators of teacher buy-in. The unions were mentioned in several sections, but it was unclear just exactly how they were involved.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1.Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each

teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

General:

This element was strong and included detailed descriptions on how LA plans to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations (conducted 4 times during the school year) and ensures a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same) by utilizing teams of evaluators at the school level and data systems that flag potential inter-rater reliability problems.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1.Core Element 4:

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

General:

LA plans to use SAS's EVAAS model as a component of both the teacher and principal evaluation plans. The evaluations and accompanying data systems allow the evaluations and HR systems to be linked.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1.Core Element 5:

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

General:

The proposal includes a detailed plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1.High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

Because the professional development is tiered, customize, and in-school, the plan described in this proposal should create high-quality professional development opportunities for both teachers and administrators.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative clearly defines and identifies high-need that have difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified or effective leaders and teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education. Student achievement in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels. The charts in the appendix and on page e14 make a compelling case.

Weaknesses:

The proposal fails to include a clear definition of what it considers a "comparable" school.

Reader's Score: 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Includes rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice)

as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year;

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

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

Strengths:

LA's proposal is clearly a part of a comprehensive state strategy to improve student outcomes.

The proposals outlines process by which each participating LEA rewards teachers and principals, in high-need schools based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth. LA's PBCS includes valid and reliable measures of student growth.

The proposal includes incentives that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school (and range from 5% up to 20%).

The applicant provides a clear explanation of how teachers, principals are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS. LA's TAP includes input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs.

The strength of this proposal is in its clear explanation of the rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year (in LA they propose 4 evaluations a year conducted by rotating members of teams of evaluators who are trained and have a system to monitor inter-rater reliability (see e 19 and later sections). The system also rewards both at the school level and individual teacher level.

They include teachers in non-core areas through a differentiated system (see page 23). The proposal includes a robust data-management system, consistent with the LEA's proposed PBCS, that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

The proposal describes a high-quality, customized, tiered professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. A strength is that the PD is embedded into the regular school day and thus becomes a standard practice.

The use of ISLLC based VAL-ED is a strength as is the fact that the state has used the system for a number of years and had a Wallace Foundation grant to support their efforts. The inclusion of the TAP Annual Review is a strength (e 24). They included a good rationale for the proposed levels of compensation (5%+).

Weaknesses:

The narrative fails to fully explain how they gained or plan to gain support of unions in participating LEAs where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining that is needed to carry out the grant.

One concern is the additional duties placed on the Master teachers with only a few hours of release time each day (see page e18).

The additional leadership measures mentioned at the end of page 23 are not clearly

explained.

That educators only must meet a minimum effectiveness level to be eligible for the rewards seems to be a very low standard (see page e 25). The scoring seems complex.

The pool of monies for campus performance rewards described on e 27 is unclear and needs to be further explained.

The incentive money going only to proven teachers is both a strength and weakness. The school would be more assured of a high quality candidate, but since one purpose is to attract folks to the profession and hard-to-staff schools, the pool of proven teachers may not be very large.

On page e 31 they describe that teacher evaluations will take place four times a year, but they use the term evaluation and not observation. It is unclear if the 4 events will be observation-based evaluations.

Reader's Score: 58

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The TAP Training Portal and the Strategies Library are both strengths (e. 47).

The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed time lines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively. A strength under this section is LAs commitment of matching funds. This clearly indicates their commitment to the TAP plan. The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide sufficient details on the tasks to be completed and major milestones on the Management Plan Table that starts on page e 49.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes measurable performance objectives. The evaluation will produce evaluation data that are quantitative and qualitative. They will use the TAP Annual Review, annual principal interviews, annual focus group interviews, and observations of cluster group meetings for the qualitative data. The proposal includes descriptions of the analysis methods to be utilized and will measure fidelity of implementation.

Weaknesses:

The proposal includes some general descriptions of feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project, but the plan is not clearly articulated.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

Under this priority, the applicant must also demonstrate that it has a plan to ensure

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

Strengths:

A strength is the use of a nationally recognized and user friendly system, SAS EVAAS. The teacher observation data is integrated into reports tied to HR system.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal meets all the criteria under this competitive preference by recruiting and retaining effective teachers and principals for high need schools and hard to staff subjects.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education -- Louisiana Department of Education ,
Division of Educator Support and Evaluation (S385A100109)

Reader #3: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	60
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	97

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	105
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education -- Louisiana Department of Education ,Division of Educator Support and Evaluation (S385A100109)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

Applicant successfully addresses and meets Absolute Priority 1 with demonstrated differentiated bonuses for effective teachers, principals and assistant principals. The applicant places a significant weight of 50% on student value-added growth as a portion of their compensation bonus (p. 4), with the remaining 50% to be determined through classroom observations.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

(a) The applicant builds upon prior experience in growing PBCS program schools using existing funds to create projections to sustain the program beyond the funding period (p. 5).

(b) Applicant increases non-TIF funds over the course of the project period as evidenced in its 5-year budget and in the template it provided participating LEAs as found in Appendix A-5.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant's strategy aligns with the State's Education Reform Plan, Blue Ribbon Panel Recommendations (Appendix A-8) and recent legislation (Appendix A-10) as coherent and complementary means to strengthen human capital using data and evaluations for professional development (p. 6).

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

Louisiana Dept of Ed (applicant) cites the TAP program as developed by the Milken Family Foundation and currently administered by NIET as its approach to inciting career educators into leadership roles as mentor and master teachers at the site level and as selected through a performance-based process.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1:

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

General:

The applicant's multi-tiered communication strategy meets the requirements of Core Element 1 completely. Through pre-TAP studies and investigations on-site with TAP practitioners, study tours and site visits to schools implementing TAP in the state, together with spring informational workshops, interested stakeholders have ample opportunity to explore the program as it is implemented in their community.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

Louisiana Department of Education fully meets the requirements for Core Element 2. Teacher approval votes of 75% follow the investigation and study year before implementation can begin. Memoranda Of Understanding Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) from participating principals and LEA superintendents indicating this element support the applicant's claim as evidenced in Appendix 3.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each

teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

General:

The applicant's partnership with National Institute for Excellence in Teaching and its full-scale adoption of the TAP evaluation protocols and rubrics indicate full compliance and meeting of requirements for Core Element 3.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant fully meets the extensive data management system with use of its extant SAS-EVASS system within the State system, and its integration of the 3rd-party web-based application of CODE (Comprehensive Online Data Entry).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant addresses this core element (especially as it pertains to professional development) throughout its narrative as evidenced in its adoption of National Institute for Excellence in Teaching's (NIET) Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), the 8-day Core Training for leadership team members the year before implementation, start-up workshops and network meetings (pp. 9 to 10).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

- (1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;
- (2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;
- (3) Provide --
 - (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
 - (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
- (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
- (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

General:

The TAP model for professional growth as driven by student performance data, informed by effective pedagogical strategies customized to maximize effectiveness for the local site and delivered/modeled locally by resident experts and coaches is a powerful and effective professional development model.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

- 1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--
 - (i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and
 - (ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.
- (2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and
- (3) A definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purposes of paragraph (2) of this selection criterion is established.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant justifies the need for the project with summary data on teacher turn-over (33% in the last 3 years), and limited teacher expertise (25% with less than 5 years of experience). Brief specific examples (St. Helena Central High; Donaldsonville High and Mansfield Elementary) further support the applicant's need for TIF support.

(2) The mini cases mentioned above in (1), together with 3 additional mini cases (p.15) strongly illustrate the high needs of participating schools with poverty rates ranging from 83% to 93% and student achievement ranging in the 53 to 58% below proficiency in math and 56 to 70% below proficiency in ELA. More extensive and compelling data substantiating high needs on an individual school and district-level basis are provided in Appendix A, pp. 1-5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide an explicit definition of what it considers to be a comparable school for the purposes of paragraph (2) above.

Reader's Score: 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), including input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant, and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs

where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining that is needed to carry out the grant;

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

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

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

Strengths:

(1) Strategy for process to award incentive funds

(i) The applicant's methodology to determine effectiveness using valid/reliable student growth measures is one it has adopted from the NIET (TAP) model and has proven to be a very influential approach for affecting Louisiana teacher behavior and practice with the incentive of specific compensation based on value-added student achievement (pp.20-22). Teachers and leadership teams have access to longitudinal student data and will be able to compare pre- and post-academic year student performance for each educator. In addition to rigorous teacher evaluations, the applicant proposes use of an intense and multi-tiered evaluation for site managers/principals - with primary focus on their instructional leadership skills (pp. 23 through 25 inclusive and Appendix A-11).

(ii) Awards are sufficient in size (5% of teachers' and administrators' base salaries with the potential to increase compensation by 20% - p. 26) to affect educator behaviors as the applicant has already experienced in its pilot projects. The plan to expand the differentiated award amounts based on teacher performance (including the assumption of leadership roles) promises to provide career advancement and job satisfaction sufficient to address the issue of retention for hard-to-staff schools.

(iii) Multiple career paths, ongoing professional development, instructionally-focused accountability (and not just student performance data) along with performance-based compensation comprise an effective PBCS plan that has proven effective for LA schools that have participated since 2003.

(2) The applicant did an exemplary job of involving state and local level educators, leaders and policymakers in selecting, fine-tuning and adopting this innovation. Most importantly, teachers in local schools decided (by 75% faculty vote) on whether or not to undertake this initiative. As detailed in the narrative, several informational opportunities were afforded to prospective participants before letters of commitment and MOUs (Appendix A-3) were solicited.

(3) Differentiated bonus/incentive awards are documented in extensive narrative throughout pp.22-26. As cited above, teachers have the potential to earn 5-20% of their base salaries based on performance as assessed through multiple measures. Principals and assistant principals, likewise, have the ability to increase their salaries by 13% and 7.6% respectively. Evaluation components as described in pp. 31 - 37 are clearly articulated, very transparent, and reasonable. Supporting appendices further justify the applicant's choices for evaluating both teachers and site leaders.

(4) The applicant's data management system on student achievement is exemplary. As cited (p. 37), a longitudinal data management system is fully implemented and will be enhanced with the addition of the SAS-EVASS systems to measure and report value-added data.

(5) Professional development, as described throughout the project narrative, is consistent with effective practices for sustaining desired reforms (e.g., ongoing, specific to individual teacher and student needs). The TAP model's success in pilot districts is well documented and promises to be effective as it expands to additional LEAs.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses detected.

Reader's Score: 60

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

(1) The management plan is well developed and presents a thorough strategy for institutionalizing the PBCS program it has piloted since 2003-2004 and seeks to expand through this TIF award. Goals are clearly articulated, measurable quantitatively and qualitatively, and are well-supported with concrete deliverables as outlined on pp. 49-52. Timelines, activities, and responsible personnel as detailed in the management plan are reasonable and likely to ensure successful completion of all goals in a timely fashion. Detailed MOUs (Appendix A) guarantee clear expectations for all stakeholders and their responsibilities for program implementation.

(2) Key personnel appear to be well qualified for successful implementation of all proposed activities. Their collective and extensive experience as educators in several different capacities throughout their careers (84 years collectively) should engender great credibility and support among stakeholders undertaking this initiative. The process for LEA staff, as delineated in program narrative, suggests that the same high caliber of leadership and teacher-support will be consistent with leadership at the State level of the project.

(3) The applicant thoroughly describes in extensive detail its plans for increasing its fiscal share throughout the award period and for continuing the PBCS with non-Tif funds beyond the award period. In its Appendix: Louisiana Comprehensive Teacher Compensation Framework, the applicant identifies extant federal and state funding streams available to LEAs for use in the PBCS.

Weaknesses:

The only weakness detected was the applicant's failure to identify with specificity the process by which LEAs will select/determine which state/federal funds they will use to continue the project once the grant has ended..

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS:

Local evaluation plans seem reasonable and thorough. Strong performance objectives and supporting activities are clearly identified. The applicant consistently refers to its 3 over-arching goals (improving student achievement, increased principal/teacher effectiveness, building LEA capacity to build and sustain reform in educator compensation) and supports these goals with reasonable measures for assessing their success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses detected.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

Value-added growth is a cornerstone of this proposal as evidenced throughout project narrative. It is required for both teacher and administrator incentive awards. Furthermore, the integration of the SAS- data management system is strong indication of the applicant's commitment to this competitive priority

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses detected

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS:

The Applicant references its plan to provide differentiated incentives for recruitment pools (pp. 27) at the rate of \$6,000 for each campus for hard-to-staff areas. Retention incentives start at a base of 5% of teachers' base pay for a maximum of 20% of base pay. Additionally, career ladders (master and mentor teachers) provide ample opportunity for professional growth with added responsibilities and leadership.

Weaknesses:

Recruitment incentive pools are limited to the first two years of implementation (p. 27).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:07 PM