

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 1:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio,Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

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
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton 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	7
--------------------	----	---

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	4
Sub Total	100	96

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	10	9
------------------	----	---

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio, Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant indicates that this is a proposal for a second round of TIF funds to be used to address PBCS issues in additional urban, small town and rural schools across the state of Ohio.

All OTIF participants will use student achievement and teacher and principal evaluations as the primary means of differentiating PBCP levels. The proposed PBCS will include multiple measures and data sources to determine effectiveness including the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. The differentiated ratings that result from OTES including classroom observations will be key measures to determine enhanced compensation in the proposed PBCS. (Pg. 47-48).

Annual observations will be conducted at least twice per year by trained and credential evaluators. (Pg. 44). LEAs will work within the OTIF model including assessing required elements and selecting from additional multiple measures included in the model to determine who will receive the types and levels of awards and identifying weights for additional multiple measures including leadership responsibilities. As indicated in the model, student achievement will comprise 50% weight in determining PBCS compensation.

(Pgs. 51-52). The weight of other selected measures in terms of percentages will be determined during the planning period. (Pg. 51). The applicant indicates that it was determined that principals and core subject teachers will receive a potential award of \$4,000 which is considered to be substantial enough to improve student outcomes. Non-core subject teachers will receive a potential amount less than core subject teachers and instructional support personnel will qualify for awards if funds are available. (Pg. 52). The applicant's plan to provide differentiated levels of compensation for effective teachers and principals appears to be comprehensive and feasible.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has projected reasonable costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS. The applicant indicates that during the grant period, their proposal anticipates the need to assist LEAs with LEA-specific flexible planning toward assuming increasing portions of PBCS costs. Temporary financial assistance will be provided by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and corporate partners as the participating Ohio TIF (OTIF) Project LEAs begin to assume an increasing share (unspecified amount) of the responsibility for their PBCS awards over the five year period. (Pgs. 95 & 96), Pgs. (e1-e51). The projected plan reflects a commendable collaborative effort on the part of the ODE and corporate partners to help participating LEAs meet the financial requirements of the TIF program.

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 proposal indicates that PBCS will be a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce. OTIF funds will be used to help fund initiatives to strengthen the components of Ohio's Human Capital Management System (HCMS). Also,

funds will improve linkages and communication among key stakeholders to support a statewide effort to increase the recruitment and retention of effective teachers to serve high-needs students and hard-to-staff subjects. The applicant and its partners will provide professional development focused on the effective use of state-provided data tools and evaluate the effectiveness of professional development efforts statewide. The applicant indicates that educator evaluations will link to high-quality professional development activities that are targeted to areas of need and designed to increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement. The applicant indicates that OTIF will ensure that effectiveness data from teacher and principal evaluations drive decisions about professional development and support, promotion, retention, compensation, tenure, certification and removal of ineffective teachers. (Pgs. 64-65). The proposed plan includes effective measures to provide a comprehensive approach to performance-based compensation system. The applicant has identified eight key components which will be addressed in order to increase recruitment and retention of effective educators. Recruitment related components include: preparation, recruitment and hiring. Retention related components include: induction, professional development, compensation and incentives, working conditions and performance management. The applicant included information about the tenure for teachers in Ohio but it is unclear if it will apply to OTIF participating schools.

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 indicates that they will expand the implementation of PBCS compensation systems with differentiated pay based on leadership roles undertaken by teachers as well as pay for performance for both teachers and principals based on student gains. The four current TIF LEAs will share their models for differentiated pay applicable to leadership roles with the new participating LEAs. They will also share lessons learned to promote program success. (Pgs. 92-93). In this proposed model, new LEAs stand to benefit greatly from the experiences and support of current OTIF LEAs that are already implementing differentiated pay based on leadership roles.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 1. The applicant indicates that all participating schools must have in a plan in place for effectively communicating the components of the PBCS to teachers, administrators, school personnel and community; the involvement and support of teachers, principals and other personnel; and the involvement and support of unions (in LEAs where unions are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining). The applicant states that a key element of the planning year is the process of building stakeholder involvement in the planning and

delivery of PBCS compensation. (Pg. 39)

By requiring that participating schools have a plan for effective communication with staff and community regarding the PBCS plan, the Ohio DOE makes it clear that communication is a high priority.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 2. As indicated in Core Element 1, the applicant provides a clear indication that stakeholder involvement and support including teachers, principals and other personnel and collective bargaining representatives will be a requirement for all participating schools. (Pg. 39). The applicant states that the success of the program will depend on collaborative efforts of key personnel whose roles and expectations will be defined during the planning year including: superintendents, teachers, teacher unions, Board of Education members, working groups and steering committees. The application includes a summary of expectations for timing and milestones for the planning year in chart format which include stakeholder involvement activities. (Pgs. 43-44). Key stakeholders including teachers, school and LEA leaders, unions and board members will participate in working groups and steering committees to help with PBCS planning, implementation and evaluation.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 3. The plan provides evidence of a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation process which will include annual evaluations of principals and teachers in accordance with recently revised state regulations, utilizing a system that is aligned with the state model, and conducted by specially

trained and credentialed evaluators. The applicant indicates that principal evaluations are currently being implemented (Ohio Principal Evaluation System) which are rigorous, transparent, fair and standards-based. Fifty percent (50%) of the OPES is based on student performance data including value-added scores and 50% on demonstrated knowledge and skills. A performance rubric tied to the Ohio Standards for Principals is used in the evaluation process which includes multiple rating categories (ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, highly effective, distinguished). Other forms of evidence will be provided including surveys, on-time promotion rates and other measures. (Pg. 49). In the planning year, the applicant stated, a high degree of inter-rater reliability will be incorporated into the evaluation system. A new teacher evaluation model that includes student growth as a significant factor and differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories and multiple measures is currently being developed for statewide use. The model will include a performance rubric and two observations will be required. (Pg. 55 - 62). The plan for the evaluation process is well-developed and reflects statewide development and integration.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 4. The applicant provides substantial evidence of plans to implement a data management system that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. The proposal seeks to ensure that participating LEAs and schools have access to needed data and that it is accessible when needed. The applicant indicates that OTIF is positioned to incorporate teacher and principal evaluation into the state's data system during the course of the grant. The applicant further indicates that the proposed project seeks to ensure that the highly effective data-management system which currently supports PBCSs in OTIP LEAs will integrate with existing state data systems thereby establishing the best overall data management system for use throughout the state of Ohio. (Pgs. 70-74). The applicant provides evidence of a well-designed data management system which is critical to the success of the PBCS.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 5. The proposal indicates that by the end of the planning year, each participating school will have in place a communication plan, with specific activities and timelines, targeted to result in teacher and principal understanding of the key elements of the PBCS and the specific measures of effectiveness. The proposal includes a timeline for the planning year which indicates that OTIP LEAs will conduct trainings for key lead staff and leadership teams in all components of the

PBCS who will, in turn, train all building staff throughout the year to ensure that teachers and principals understand the process and core elements of effectiveness and to enable them to use data to improve their practice. (Pgs. 42-43). The applicant presents a well-coordinated plan to ensure understanding of the PBCS components on the part of teachers and principals in participating LEAs.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant provides extensive evidence that its proposed PBCS has a professional development component which serves to enhance the existing model in which the ODE provides training focused on the needs assessed in its LEAs; targets teacher and principal needs identified in the evaluation process; includes the effective use of state provided data tools as part of an ongoing instructional improvement. The applicant indicates that the ODE uses feedback from its training sessions to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development efforts statewide. In addition, Battelle For Kids (BFK), an outside training provider in partnership with ODE, provides extensive professional development for all teachers, principals and building leaders in understanding the use of data to inform instructional practices, accelerate student achievement and inform ongoing professional growth and human capital management decisions. Professional development will include collaborative learning from highly effective practices of teachers and principals in the OTIF project which will provide a key resource to enhance current methods of targeted PD. To ensure that OTIP professional

development offerings are high quality and high impact, evidence will be collected from teachers and principals and continually reviewed for needed modifications. (Pgs. 64-68). The plan reflects a well-designed approach to ensuring that the effectiveness of the professional development component of the PBCS is proved on a continuing basis.

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 states that many of Ohio's needs mirror the national data which indicates that schools with high poverty and high proportions of minority students are most likely to have teachers who are inexperienced or not teaching in the field of certification. The applicant states further that the problems are acute in a number of schools in the current OTIF LEAs. All OTIF schools, from urban to rural, are high-need schools in which 50% or more of the students come from low-income families. Demographic data for current OTIF participants includes the average percentage of low income enrollment (61.98 %) and percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch (66.5%). Also included is data indicating that the average graduation rate was 46.9% in 2007-08 and that the average percentage of students with disabilities was 22.5% in 2008-09. The applicant provides demographic for USDOE school improvement grant eligible schools and states that these schools are in the lowest achieving 5% of schools in the state of Ohio. The applicant provides data from the Ohio Board of Regents which allows for a comparison between existing OTIF participants and the state average in terms of college entrance and remediation rates. The data indicates that OTIF LEAs fall well below the state average in both categories. (Pgs. 13-37) The proposal indicates that Ohio's rate of teacher attrition is 23% leaving the profession in five years which is lower than the national average and it suggests that the attrition rate in the state's low-performing schools is higher. It further indicates that the average retention statewide rate is 94% compared to 67% in comparison schools. (Pg. 37)

Weaknesses:

While the proposal includes abundant demographic and student achievement data for existing and proposed OTIP participants, it did not include specific data indicating that existing or proposed OTIF participants have difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and principals. (Pgs. 32-33). The applicant did not provide a clear definition of comparable schools.

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 provides significant evidence that the proposed PBCS is a high quality design which addresses the required project design components with respect to methodology used to determine effectiveness. A table with time-lines, milestones and responsible parties is found on pages 43-44 that explains activities that will take place to develop the PBCS plan for each school. These activities include involvement of all stakeholders (teachers, school and LEA leaders, unions and board members) in developing the plans, a system for teacher evaluation, eligibility requirements for PBCS compensation, data-

management systems that link to payroll and human resources, professional and communication plans. A new system for assessing teacher effectiveness which includes five levels will be initiated in the Fall 2010. The planning year will include the development of a data-management system that will allow educators to access data to inform instruction. (Pg. 70). ODE and BFK will provide professional development to train educators to use data to improve instructional practice and student achievement. (Pg. 65-67). In addition, they will develop plans to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development. Fifty-percent (50%) of the weight in determining PBCS compensation will be based on student growth. (Pgs. 47-51). Principals and teachers may earn a potential PBCS award of up to \$4,000. (Pgs. 53). In addition, the proposed project has the potential to serve as an effective model for PBCS implementation in high needs LEA's and schools throughout the state of Ohio.

Weaknesses:

There were 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 proposal indicates that project management will be the responsibility of the Ohio Department of Education and its current OTIF partners which have solid experience in managing large, complex projects and the demonstrated ability to deliver cost-effective results. (Pg. 100-103). Resumes for key personnel were provided in the Appendices and indicate that they are qualified for their respective positions. Outside financial support, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, was listed in the application on page 101. The amount requested in the budget is sufficient to support the implementation of the project. (Pgs. 100-103).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

The applicant indicates that it will procure an independent third-party evaluator to analyze the implementation and impact of the OTIF project. The evaluation will be required to utilize a mixed quantitative and qualitative research design which addresses the stated goals and competitive priorities of the proposed TIF project. The research design and deliverable requirements will emphasize both formative and summative feedback to ensure the project receives ongoing feedback and data for continuous improvement. (Pg. 103 -107)

Weaknesses:

The application did not include measurable performance objectives.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear evidence that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals and other personnel will include a value-added measure as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals and other personnel. The applicant indicated that The Educational Value-Added Assessment System model will be used and will focus on the use of multiple previous student scores as predictors of student growth. Teachers and principals will be trained in the use of student growth data to differentiate instruction, make informed curriculum choices and instructional strategies, develop intervention strategies and provide improvement support. The proposal includes extensive plans that show strong promise of the applicant's capacity to collect necessary data, ensure data quality and ensure that teachers understand the model and can use the data generated to improve classroom practice. (Pgs. 103-107)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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 includes significant evidence that the program is designed to assist high-needs schools improve the achievement level of high-needs students. The applicant indicates that while OTIF's primary focus will be the implementation of successful PBCS programs in participating LEAs, OTIF partners will consider, during the planning year, the degree to which the LEAs can begin to systematically address human capital issues. (Pgs. 98-101).

The applicant plans to fill vacancies in high-need schools and hard-to-staff subjects (math, science and special education) by moving effective principals and teachers to these schools and specialty areas. (Pg. 100). Through enhanced levels of compensation, the applicant plan to recruit and retain effective teachers. (Pg. 98).

Weaknesses:

In addition, the applicant did not demonstrate that participating LEAs and schools 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.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 1:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 11:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio,Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluaton 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	7
--------------------	----	---

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	3
Sub Total	100	95

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	105
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio, Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

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:

Based on previous experience and pilot efforts with PBCS, the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) proposes a model that focuses on value-added analysis to allow schools and educators to measure the impact of their curriculum, instruction, programs and practices on student academic performance and to make data based decisions for improvement (p. 5).

While the methodology to establish the PBCSs in the LEAs will be universal with a set of common requirements, each school will engage in thinking strategically to determine who will be eligible participants in the system, define what measures will be used to determine student growth and teacher and principal effectiveness, establish the design or model to be used to determine the amounts of enhanced compensation, and decide the basis for the amount of the compensation (p. 46). Student achievement and teacher evaluations are the primary means for differentiating levels for performance based compensation. SAS EVAAS value added analysis will be used to measure student growth and to improve teaching. Multiple sources of data to evidence achievement are identified, including state mandated tests, ACT scores, and measures of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (p

48). On pages 51 and 52, models of weights are presented for determining awards for teachers and principals followed by participating LEAs. Teacher effectiveness criteria include student growth with a weight of 50 percent. Taking into consideration the need to provide substantial awards to impact behavior of teachers and principals and the need to be fiscally reasonable, OTIF proposes that principals and core subject teachers will be able to earn up to \$4,000 awards (p. 53). The LEA leadership teams will be responsible for carrying out meetings and training for all building staff throughout the year for teachers and principals to understand the process and core elements as well as gather ongoing feedback.

The evaluation system to be established to make decisions on performance based compensation will be based on annual evaluations of teachers and principals which include at least two observations using instruments that are validated as being aligned to the state model. The reliability of the evaluation systems will be increased through training and credentialing evaluators (p. 55, 61). For each of the seven Ohio Teaching Standards, there is a performance rubric that has been developed with indicators that describe measurable, observable behaviors

(ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, accomplished/highly effective and distinguished performance).

In addition to student growth measures, this rubric will rate teacher performance based on evidence collected through structured observations conducted multiple times annually (p. 59). Compensation structures will also be designed specifically to encourage teachers to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles such as peer mentors, tutors, and developers of learning communities (p. 63).

An existing state data management system will be integrated with a tool already in place that tracks student academic achievement and links it to payroll systems (p. 70-75). Participating LEAs will be provided technical assistance in validating data necessary to produce accurate teacher/student linkage information for accountability. The system proposed by the applicant is well planned and contains all the elements for successful implementation.

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:

LEAs will contribute increasing amounts of non-TIF funds to the budget specifically allocated for compensation and fringe benefits. These increments seem to be sufficient to implement the project successfully and continue the PBCS once the grant funding period ends. Also, several strategies to seek out additional funding through various sources are proposed. On page 95 the applicant explains that LEAs will be assisted in specific flexible planning for assuming increasing portions of PBCS award costs over the grant period. A well thought out set of strategies on page 95 and a timeline for achieving fiscal sustainability is presented on page 97 that are convincing of the applicants capacity to carry out this aspect of the project.

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 State Department of Education of Ohio proposes the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (OTIF) as a key element of the state's commitment to create and sustain PBCS as a lever for change among a diverse group of 24 school districts statewide (p. 11) that will provide evidence of best practices for statewide implementation. It is evident that the proposal is an integral part of the state's plans and ongoing reforms to improve student achievement by ensuring all students have access to high quality teachers (p. 1-3, 7-10). OTIF builds on Ohio's new system of teacher licensure which provides coherent professional career paths and comprehensive evaluation systems. As explained on page 88, four key elements stand out in Ohio's comprehensive approach to linking evaluation data with decisions about professional development, licensure, and tenure: (1) develop teachers and principals by providing coaching, induction support, and/or professional development; (2) remove ineffective principals, non-tenured, and tenured teachers; (3) implement a newly legislated licensure system that includes student growth as one criterion of license eligibility; and (4) compensate, promote, and retain effective educators. The existing state level context of this overall reform to improve the workforce provides a solid foundation on which to establish successful PBCS, and the funding of the PBCS will enable the participating districts to implement these mandates successfully.

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 compensation structure proposed to provide incentives for teachers includes their performance in additional responsibilities and leadership roles such as peer mentors, tutors, and developers of learning communities (p. 63).

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:

It is stated that during the planning year (38-39) the applicant will focus on the process of building stakeholder involvement from all schools, including superintendents, teachers, teacher unions, and boards of education, and designating a person to serve as point of contact. A five year communication plan is presented on pages 75-83 to motivate engagement of all stakeholders and anticipate questions and concerns on the PBCS. The plan seeks to develop several user-friendly methods and vehicles that explain the PBCS, why it is being implemented and how it fits in with the overall school improvement efforts. The plan seems excellent for addressing this core element

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:

Collaborative Working Groups made up of teachers and principals will be developed during the planning year to promote involvement at the school and LEA levels (p. 40-42, 44). The involvement of unions will be sought in LEAs where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining (p. 39). A Steering Committee that will involve key decision makers, together with the working groups, will identify benchmarks for success, promote effective communications on the PBCS and strengthen organizational capacity to support and strengthen PBCS initiatives. These efforts evidence an effective approach by the applicant to address this core element.

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 addresses this core element well. The evaluation system to be established to make decisions on performance based compensation will be based on annual evaluations of teachers and principals which include at least two observations and use evidence based instruments that are validated and aligned to the state model. Although it is mentioned that additional forms of evidence will be used to evaluate performance effectiveness, it was not clear which these were (p. 44). The reliability of the evaluation systems will be increased through training and credentialing evaluators (p. 55, 61).

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:

An existing state data management system will be integrated with a tool that tracks student academic achievement and links it to payroll systems (p. 70-75). Participating LEAs will be provided technical assistance in validating data necessary to produce accurate teacher/student linkage information for accountability. This core element is very well addressed by the applicant.

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:

Numerous means for professional development, many of them job-embedded, will be drawn upon to design the specific professional development programs for participating LEAs, supported and enhanced by the central coordinating team (64-68). One of the major focuses of training will be building educator's capacity to use the data generated by the evaluation systems to inform the selection and development of instructional practices for the classroom. The applicant addresses this core element through a sound strategy.

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:

Pages 65 through 69 contain the detailed description of the applicant's plans to develop a comprehensive and thorough professional development program and coaching component for all teachers and principals to increase their effectiveness to impact student achievement, integrating the use of results of the evaluation system as a basis to address the specific needs of individuals and schools. The PBCS will build on the state standards for high-quality professional development which call for meaningful experiences that are job-embedded, content-rich, and connected to LEAs' and schools' continuous improvement plans. The professional development strategy will prepare an OTIF lead staff person in each LEA and a leadership team that will have the responsibility for leading the PD and PBCS implementation. A blended professional development approach for adult learners (i.e., face to-face training, guided practice, online courses, access to experts for modeling and coaching and tool kits) will be central to achieving the goal of providing targeted professional development to teachers and principals to dramatically improve student achievement and growth and help them better understand the measures of effectiveness. As part of the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems, specific methodologies will be developed for any educator who demonstrates ineffective practice. Educators who are rated as ineffective will be placed on an individual growth plan. To ensure that OTIF professional development offerings are high quality and high impact, evidence will be collected and continually reviewed to inform ongoing professional development trainings.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal addresses the needs of a diverse group of 24 school districts statewide (p. 11). All OTIF schools, from urban to rural, are high needs schools in which 50% or more of the students come from low income families (p. 13). Data on students income level by school and LEA are presented on pages 13 to 28 as evidence that they qualify as high need, along with data on academic achievement, high school graduation rates, transition to college (p. 30 to 36) as compared with similar LEAs. The method used by the applicant to select comparable schools uses LEAs that are most similar according to criteria such as rates of poverty, size, number of minority students and median income (p. 35).

Weaknesses:

Student achievement levels on measures such as standardized tests are not presented to support evidence of need other than the percent of students who take the ACT and their scores, which do not seem to be significantly lower than the rates of comparable schools. Data on difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is not provided.

Reader's Score: 7

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:

On pages 51 and 52 models of weights are presented for determining awards for teachers and principals followed by participating LEAs. Teacher effectiveness criteria include student growth with a weight of 50 percent. The applicant proposes that principals and core subject teachers will be able to earn up to \$4,000 awards (p. 53), which is a sufficient size to affect behavior. LEA leadership teams will be responsible for carrying out meetings and training for all staff throughout the year for teachers and principals to understand the process and core elements and for gathering ongoing feedback. The evaluation system to be established to make decisions on performance based compensation will be based on annual evaluations of teachers and principals which include a minimum of two observations and use instruments that are validated as being aligned to the state model. The reliability of the evaluation systems will be increased through training and credentialing evaluators (p. 55, 61). Compensation structures will also be designed specifically to encourage teachers to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles such as peer mentors, tutors, and developers of learning communities (p. 63). An existing state data management system will track student academic achievement and links it to payroll systems (p. 70-75). Participating LEAs will be provided technical assistance in validating data necessary to produce accurate teacher/student linkage information for accountability.

Effectiveness data from teacher and principal evaluations will drive decisions about professional development and support promotion, retention, compensation, tenure, certification and removal of ineffective teachers (p. 65). One of the major focuses of training will be building educator's capacity to use data to inform instructional practices. Major efforts will be dedicated to communications among participants (p. 75-83). It is stated that during the planning year (38-39) efforts will focus on the process of building stakeholder involvement from all schools, including superintendents, teachers, teacher unions, and boards of education, and designating a person to serve as point of contact (p. 40, 89)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

A state oversight group with representatives from all partners and each of the participating LEAs will be established. Collaborative Working Groups made up of teachers and principals will be developed during the planning year to promote involvement at the school and LEA levels (p. 40-41). A Steering Committee that will involve key decision makers, together with the working groups, will identify benchmarks for success, promote effective communications on the PBCSs and strengthen organizational capacity to support and strengthen PBCS initiatives. The milestones for the planning year, as detailed in pages 42-44, clearly identify the steps that will be taken and responsible parties for ensuring the effective development of the fundamental elements of the PBCS. Timelines for implementation of the main activities related to each absolute priority are clearly presented, particularly in pages 53-55, 62, 64, others. Personnel positions, qualifications and time commitments for key staff are spelled out in pages 101- 103. The budget for the five year grant period is sufficient to attain project goals. The State Department of Education will contribute above \$500,000 per year and the partner Batelle for Kids is committing \$3.5 million during the five years (see budget narrative). To sustain beyond the grant period, several strategies are envisioned: LEAs reevaluation of available funding and allocations, counseling by business experts on entrepreneurial approaches, seeking foundation and corporate support, and embedding PBCS operating procedures within the LEA regional Educational Service Centers (p. 101-103).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

A third party evaluator will be procured and selected based on a proposal that demonstrates sufficient rigor in methods that are thorough, feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project (p. 104). Evaluation information will be required at appropriate intervals to enable the project to use data for planning and continuous program improvement. The evaluation will be required to use mixed quantitative and qualitative measures to address a set of research questions on the implementation, impact on teacher effectiveness and behavior, impact on student achievement, impact on administrative behavior and LEA/school processes, sustainability and best practices (p. 104-106) that will generate useful knowledge for the future development of PBCSs.

Weaknesses:

While the overall description of the evaluation is adequate to meet TIF requirements, measureable performance objectives for raising student achievement, increasing teacher effectiveness, and recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers, are lacking.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The use of Value-Added Measures of Student Achievement will be carried out through the partnership with Battelle for Kids (BTK) a non-profit organization that is a demonstrated leader (as stated by the applicant) in the field of value added analysis and performance

based compensation system reform. BTK has developed the Teachers Connecting Achievement and Progress initiative that focuses on accurately linking annual student growth data to individual teachers, providing substantial professional development, instructional resources, and online courses that focus on the appropriate interpretation of value added data and its correct use in the framing of school improvement decision (p. 83-84). The Educational Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) has been chosen, specifically the Univariate Response Model or URM methodology. In this model, multiple previous student scores will be used as predictors, including ESEA mandated assessments in mathematics and reading, and for non tested grades and subject, other alternative measures of student learning and performance will be used such as end of course exams, ELA proficiency tests, and other measures that are rigorous and comparable across schools. A detailed communication plan is presented on pages 75-78 that includes various activities and means to explain the value added model and effectiveness measures to all teachers, principals and other community members, and how to use data generated through the model to improve teaching.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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:

Fifty percent or more of the students targeted by this proposal come from low income families, as evidenced by the data on the enrollment of the participating schools presented on table 1 (pages 16 to 29). On page 63-64 it is stated that in addition to performance-based enhanced compensation for all effective teachers, compensation structures will also be designed specifically to encourage teachers to teach in hard-to-staff schools and/or subject areas. On page 98 the applicant indicates that a specific goal is to place highly effective educators (both teachers and school leaders) into hard-to-staff schools, especially in urban and rural areas where there are high percentages of poor, minority, and disadvantaged students and/or histories of low performance. School leaders will be trained to lead low achieving schools with the goal of increasing the number of effective teachers in mathematics, science, world languages, special education, and ELL (p. 100). The applicant will ensure that teachers are aware of which schools are high need and the subject areas that are hard to staff.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/30/10 11:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 3:10 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio,Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

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
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton 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	6
--------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	58
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	92

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	102
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Department of Education Ohio -- Department of Education Ohio, Center for the Teaching Profession (S385A100100)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant will provide performance-based compensation at differentiated levels to teachers and principals (pg. 43). The proposal clearly demonstrated that student growth will be the focus of the compensation system (pg. 39). The proposal year clearly states annual observations of educators will be conducted at least twice a year by trained and credentialed evaluators (pg. 44). In addition, an objective evidence-based rubric will be used to evaluate teachers and principals. The applicant plans to ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability, however, the desired level of inter-rater reliability was not specified (pg. 44, 49, 59). The applicant is committed to collecting and evaluating additional forms of evidence such as documenting teacher leadership and mentoring, student surveys, and self-efficacy (pg. 49). The applicant indicated the specific amount of the compensation award and provided an appropriate justification for the level of incentive which is likely to change the behavior of teachers and principals (pg. 53).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant provided an adequate budget which projected the costs associated with carrying out the project (pg. 96). The applicant accepts responsibility of carrying out the grant and is committed to provided differential compensation based on effectiveness for teachers and principals who qualify (pg. 94). A clear plan was provided explaining the ways in which the applicant will work with LEA schools to contribute non-Teacher Incentive Funds to the project over the five years (pg. 95-96). Although the fiscal sustainability of the PBCS is considered acceptable, it is important to note that the applicant did not provide a specific contribution amount from each LEA throughout the five years of 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 PBCS will use effectiveness data from teacher and principal annual evaluations to drive decisions about professional development activities (pg. 89). Evaluation data will be used to remove principals and both tenured and non-tenured teachers who do not demonstrate effectiveness as determined by the PBCS (pg. 89). The tenure review period was extended from three years to seven years and evaluation data will be used to determine tenure and monitor tenure rates.

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 clearly identified a plan for awarding teachers with incentive compensation for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles (pg. 92). Examples of leadership roles and additional responsibilities, such as a lead teacher who mentor new teachers, were provided (pg. 92). The proposed plan for incentive to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles was adequate (pg. 92, 93, 102).

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 has an adequate plan for communication regarding the performance based compensation system by defining the PBCS, and explaining how it will be implemented (pg. 40, 41, 43). In addition to communicating the plan to teachers, administrators and other school personnel, the external audience of the community at large (business, leaders, parents, education centers) will also be a focus (pg. 66). The communication plan appears to be adequate and comprehensive consisting of brochures, PowerPoint presentations, a FAQ sheet, talking points, letters to parents, articles, and tips (pg. 43). In addition, an online course will be created for LEAs that explain PBCS specifics (pg. 66). Multiple different types of media will be used to communicate information. The applicant provided a clear plan for communicating the performance based compensation system to internal and external stakeholders (pg. 43). The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 1.

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:

Collaboration among educators and the teachers union was clearly stated (pg. 42, 44, 54, 58, 63). Teachers, superintendents, union representatives, and the Board of Education will be included in the first year which has been designated as the planning (pg. 42). Teachers, principals, superintendents, unions, higher education, and regional providers will be used to form a group during the planning year to design a model of teacher evaluation, however, the specific ways in which individuals will be selected to form groups and committees were not clear (pg. 58). Letters of support were provided as evidence of support from partners such as Battelle for Kids (appendix). The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 2.

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 provided evidence to support a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals (pg. 55). Teachers will be observed a minimum of two times each year by trained evaluators (pg. 39, 42, 51). The applicant did not clearly state that principals would be evaluated twice a year, instead the applicant stated that principals would receive feedback twice yearly, coupled with coaching sessions (pg. 57). Evaluators will be trained in using the various instruments and inter-rater reliability will be assessed, however, the extent of the training and level of inter-rater reliability were not discussed (pg. 44). Additional forms of evidence will be collected and clear examples were provided such as student surveys and self-efficacy measures (pg. 49). Evaluators of principals complete three in-depth days of training prior to conducting principal evaluations which are appropriate (pg. 61). Completed evaluations will undergo and audit by the state's trainers to ensure reliability of implementation (pg. 62). The Office of Educator Quality will oversee the training and credentialing and collect qualitative and quantitative data to ensure continuous improvement of the evaluation process (pg. 62). The objective evidence-based scoring rubrics will be used and calibrated for reliability (pg. 61). The quality of the plan for implementing a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system is supported with sufficient evidence from the applicant. The applicant met the criteria 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 stated that at the end of the planning year (year one) the robust data-management system will link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resource systems (pg. 70). The applicant stated the payroll system already used by the LEAs is robust enough to accurately link student data to the system (pg. 70). In addition, the applicant already has an Educational Management Information System (EMIS) to track students' academic achievement (pg. 70). Based on the first round of TIF, the applicant has reported no problems were encountered when linking the systems together. A new web-based system will be made to link student data to teachers. A help desk and

online inquiry system will be enacted to provide support and reinforce employee confidence in the system (pg. 71). The plan for implementation sounds reasonable and feasible. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 4.

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 identified that communication will play a critical role in teachers' and principals' understanding of the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness (pg. 75). Teachers will be identified at LEAs to take on leadership roles and attending trainings to better understand the design, measures, and lead collaborative change (pg. 44). Trainings will be held by LEA leads, leadership team, and work group members, throughout the planning year to help teachers and principals understand the process and provide ongoing feedback (pg. 53). An end of the year survey will be conducted to assess understanding of the teacher and principal effectiveness measures which should provide sufficient evidence to assess teacher and principal understanding (pg. 54, 79). Professional development activities will center around value-added data and understanding the award measures and award process at the LEAs (pg. 54). The planned professional development activities will enable teachers and principals to use classroom level value-added data to make instructional decisions which should increase student achievement (pg. 65). The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 5.

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 professional development activities will be targeted to meet the needs of need to increase academic achievement (pg. 65). Effectiveness data from teacher and principal evaluations will drive the decision made regarding professional development (pg. 67). Teachers and principals with consistently high levels of student growth and evaluation rubric scores will be identified to participate in focus group research to uncover the practices of these highly effective educators (pg. 67). Individual growth plans will be made for individuals who are rated an ineffective. The growth plans will target the specific needs of each individual which includes targeted professional development activities (pg. 67). Professional development planned to build educatorsâ capacity to use data to inform instructional practices are aligned to the project goals and appropriate (pg. 65-69). Online courses will be part of the professional development system so teachers and principals can learn more about the PBCS any time, any place, and any pace (pg. 66). Formative and summative evaluations will be conducted to measure the effectiveness of the professional development activities (pg. 69).

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:

Strengths: The proposal provided data demonstrating high-need schools and support from the research about high-need schools and problems with inexperienced teachers and teachers who are not certified in the appropriate areas (pg. 13). Many of the schools have over 75 percent of students eligible for free or reduced lunch (pg. 16). The proposal documented the differences in academic achievement, using ACT scores, of the target LEAs and those from comparable schools (pg. 32-35).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: A definition of comparable schools was not provided, therefore the appropriateness of the applicant's school and comparable schools cannot be determined. The proposal provided limited details regarding difficulties recruiting highly qualified and effective principals and teachers in any specific subject areas, and information on problems recruiting and retaining high qualified or effective teachers and principals (pg. 13).

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Strengths: A timeline with milestones and responsible personnel was provided exhibiting an organized plan for carrying out the methodology (pg. 87). The plan identified criteria for eligibility in the PBCS, the design or model to be used to determine compensation, and the amount of the bonus compensation was described (pg. 47, 51). Examples of appropriate valid and reliable instruments were provided for measuring student academic achievement and growth, such as the ACT end of course exams, and the Ohio end of course exams when they are ready (pg. 48). Core and non-score Teachers, principals and assistant principals, and paraprofessional with more than 50% instructional contact time will be eligible for differentiated performance-based compensation (pg. 47). An appropriate statistical software program, SAS EVAAS, was identified for use in the valued-added analysis to measure student growth (pg. 47). A clear explanation of the way effectiveness will be determined using a value-added measure of student growth was provided (pg. 83-85). Each LEA will be able to choose the award incentives using rank, such as the top 20% of teachers receive incentives or standards-based, where all teachers who need a specific standard for performance receive incentives (pg. 50). Teacher effectiveness will be differentiated across five levels based on the new Ohio teacher evaluation system launching in Fall of 2010. Measures of effectiveness were provided with incentive level designations such as the teacher-level, team-level, or building level (pg. 43). The applicant has involvement of teachers, principals, other school personnel, and representation from the union in the development and implementation of the PBCS (pg. 85, 92). A principal evaluation system has already been created with the input of teachers and administrators. Fifty percent of the evaluation system for principals is based on performance data, with the other fifty percent based on knowledge and skills. An example of a performance rubric for principal evaluation was provided (pg. 57). Individuals who will evaluate teachers and principals undergo three full days of training and credentialed which provides support for a rigorous and fair evaluation (pg. 61). A comprehensive data management system will be created for educators to access and use data for various levels of analysis (pg. 70). The applicant provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate its ability to link the student achievement data to the payroll and human resource system. Professional development will take place to build educators' capacity to use data to inform instructional practices and increase student achievement (pg. 65-69). The collaboration and approach proposed for the professional development activities is clear and convincing.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: The applicant does not clearly state that principals will be observed twice a year. On pg. 57 of the proposal, the applicant states that principals will receive feedback twice annually, which does not indicate an observation will occur.

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:

Strengths: The comprehensive timeline provided indicates like project is likely to be carried out on time and the milestones and objectives are feasible and appropriate (pg. 87). The experience and background of the partners appear to be appropriate and qualified to carry out the roles assigned (pg. 101-103). Resumes of critical staff members were provided and demonstrated qualifications for designated positions in the proposal (appendix). The applicant provided support from outside funding such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (pg. 101). Timelines for each component of the project provided a clear plan for executing the project (pg. 43, 44, 80-83, 87). The request amounts for the project appear to be sufficient for attaining the project goals based on the information presented in the budget.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: 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:

Strengths: A request for proposal will be used to identify an appropriate evaluator or evaluation team to ensure a qualified evaluator is hired (pg. 103). The selected evaluation proposal should produce information for planning and continuous program improvement. Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected as part of the evaluation (pg. 107). Specific quantitative and qualitative data were identified. Deliverables for the evaluation were created and provided (pg. 107). The applicant provided procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement of the project based on the evaluation plan (pg. 107).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: The applicant did not provide measureable performance objectives.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

STRENGTHS:

The applicant demonstrated the ability to implement the proposed value-added model using differentiated levels (pg. 9, 43, 45, 47). During year one of the project, a plan for communicating the components of the PBCS will be developed to communicate the system to teachers, principals, other personnel, and the community at large (pg. 53). Brochures, videos, and web portals for on-going communication are planned (pg. 57).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

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 demonstrated that the PBCS is designed to meet the needs of high-need schools (pg. 98). The project proposes to recruit and retain effective teachers by providing enhanced levels of compensation (pg. 98). Part of the communication plan includes notifying teachers who are eligible for the compensation plan (pg. 78-79). The applicant will fill vacancies with effective teachers or teachers who are predicted to be effective by moving effective teachers to high need schools and hard-to-staff subjects such as mathematics, science, and special education (pg. 78-79).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 7/29/10 3:10 PM