

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	44
Sub Total	65	64
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	12
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	3
Sub Total	20	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	2
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	7	7
Total	107	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 3: 84.374A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider the extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

General:

Strengths:

The collaboration with Arkansas Tech University School of Education indicates that the LEA is fully committed to increasing educator effectiveness and student achievement, providing assurance of their intent to build local capacity to address the needs of the target population (pg. E16). In addition, the applicant presents information regarding the number of students eligible for free or reduced lunch (over 70%) and the annual teacher turnover rate (10-26%) as supporting evidence to depict challenges that exist within rural education in Cross County (pg. E18) providing assurance of their intent to address the needs of the target population (pg. E18). For example, on page E-18, the applicant indicates that most effective teachers are drawn to larger schools therefore causing educators from lower quality education programs to work in the schools who are not yet trained and unprepared teach. Finally, the applicant ties full implementation of the TAP system into building local capacity to improve educator effectiveness and preparing students to become life-long learners (pg. E19-E20). Implementation of the HCMS and educator evaluation and support system are research-based practices and strategies that will lead to attracting and retaining effective teachers and principals which in turn will impact student achievement. Additionally, the LEA details connections to universities as other support, providing assurance that the project will build local capacity to provide, improve, and expand services to meet the needs of the target population (pg. E16-E19).

Weakness:

The reviewer found no weakness for this criterion.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 44

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

Sub Question

General:

Strengths:

The reviewer found no strengths for this criterion.

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions using the PBCS as the tool for strengthening educator workforce by working with teachers, principals, and other school leaders (pg. E16, E23) however on the performance compensation table on E-29 the applicant makes no mention of other personnel. Without this information it is unclear of how other personnel fit into the LEAs PBCS.

Strengths:

The applicant provides convincing information to show how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant provides a plan of action that includes multiple strategies to support teacher and student development, implementation of the TAP System, and a comprehensive HCMS to foster educator excellence and student achievement. The plan indicates that the LEA thoroughly explored ways to improve teaching and learning and offered a well-justified rationale for the plan and changes necessary to meet goals for students and teachers. Additionally, the LEA provides details that professional development and support will be determined based on data collected from teacher and administrator evaluations providing assurance that the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort (pg. E43).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weaknesses for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

General:

Strength:

The applicant presents a convincing plan of collaborative partnerships to maximize the effectiveness of the proposed project services. The applicant provides details of the intent to collaborate with Arkansas Tech University to recruit highly skilled teacher candidates, provide ongoing professional development specific to individual needs of educators as well as reciprocal professional development (pg. E21). In addition, the LEA details the intent to partner with other national organizations (i.e. Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) and NIET to research effective educator systems to foster rural educator excellence and increase student achievement providing assurance that the proposed project involves the collaboration of additional and appropriate partners to maximize effectiveness (pg. E21).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.

General:

Strength:

The narrative in this section indicates that the LEA has thoroughly explored the TAP system and offered a well-justified rationale for selecting the system and how it will be implemented (pg. E21-23).

The applicant references authors, input from teachers, and data from research studies in the narrative that support the use of the TAP system. The applicant provides details of implementing the TAP System which is based on valid

Sub Question

research and strong theory (pg. E22). In addition, the applicant includes a TAP Action Plan to show how it will be implemented with the proposed partners (pg. E-22).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

- 4. **(4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a table within the narrative depicting how the TAP system strategies the LEA developed align with the Arkansas Equity Plan Strategies as well as plans to continuously build on the strategic planning and school improvement plans currently in place to demonstrate how the proposed project will integrate related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (pg. E43-E44). In addition, the applicant plans to make enhancements to the human capital management system (pg. E29). The applicant intends to use existing funding (National School Acts and Title II) to continue to support ongoing implementation of the TAP system (pg. E44). In addition, the applicant plans to leverage partnerships with ATU and NIET to develop capacity and effectiveness among educators (pg. E44).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

- 1. **In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. **(1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a high quality plan for professional development to help all educators in high-need schools, improve their effectiveness that incorporates the use of collaborative learning teams and instructional coaches (pg. E45). The LEA clearly identifies the system that will be utilized to link teacher and administrator evaluation to specific professional learning opportunities. The plan specifies current policies and practice and modifications to policy and practice to be made upon award of the grant. In addition, the applicant provides an illustration of the existing professional development model to show how the TAP professional development system works (pg. E46). Additionally, the applicant provides details of school based job embedded opportunities that focus on the specific needs of teachers and students. For example, the use of one-on-one coaching, cluster groups, follow-up coaching, TAP leadership team, etc. (pg. E45-E47). These components comprise a plan that will comprehensively improve educator effectiveness.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

- (2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

General:

Strength:

The applicant proposes a well-developed plan for using disaggregated information to identify professional development needs of individual educators and administrators' and schools. The proposed evaluation system utilizes master and mentor teachers to facilitate the identification and implementation of professional development for individual educators and schools (pg. E34). One-on-one coaching, frequent observations, team teaching, and cluster groups are additional evidence that the proposed evaluation system uses evaluation data to meet individual professional development needs of teachers, principals, and administrators (pg. E47-E48). The plan indicates the LEA has thoroughly explored ways to use information collected to drive the focus and goals for each school. Additionally, the LEA provides details that they will use data from evaluations to target specific needs of teachers and students as well as in making human capital decisions (i.e. recruitment, placement, hiring, retention, compensation, etc.) (pg. E26). Finally, the budget includes a line item for NIET training and technical assistance that will be used to support the professional development for the leadership team, providing assurance that there will be ongoing support to identify the needs of educators and schools (pg. E117).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant states that Cross County will serve as fiscal agent for the proposed project and includes details of their success in serving as fiscal agent for other federal grants (pg. E52). Cross County's current management structure will be used for implementation of the proposed project and fulfilling all goals and objectives on time and within budget (pg. E51).

The project director (once hired) will spend 100% of his/her time on the proposed project (pg. E51). This is appropriate and adequate, given the extent of responsibility noted in the narrative of the project management plan (pg. E51). Oversight and administration, management, and coordination of the proposed grant will be led by the project director, and this time commitment is appropriate given the extensive array of activities this person will be responsible for performing under the management plan (pg. E51). The management plan also clearly identifies two additional leadership personnel as well as provides a very brief role description for the superintendent and chief learning and financial officer (pg. E52). A resume is included as supporting evidence of background information for the chief learning and financial officer in the appendices section of the application (pg. E66). The LEA needed to provide evidence to show relevant training and experience of the superintendent to strengthen their management plan and demonstrate their ability to achieve objectives of the proposed project.

The completion of an evaluation by a third party professional evaluator for the proposed project will enhance the likelihood

of timely completion and implementation of the proposed grant objectives and tasks (pg. E53). Timelines including project milestones, responsible parties, and specific grant year for HCMS development and implementation, PBCS preparation, career advancement, professional development, evaluation, calculating student growth, PBCS implementation for all schools, teachers and principals, and dissemination of information are included. The timeline addresses major proposed project components and clearly align tasks with project year and details of responsible parties for each (pg. E54-E58).

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes a range of years for implementation of project tasks and objectives aligned to proposed phases of the entire five-year project period (pg. E54-E58). The lack of specificity on dates makes it difficult to discern when or if project tasks and objectives will be completed during the five-year grant timeframe. The LEA needed to provide a quarterly or monthly breakdown of when tasks would be completed during project year one, two, three, etc. Without this information the applicant did not adequately address this criterion.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 3

Sub Question

1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.

General:

Strengths:

The reviewer found no strengths for this sub-criterion.

Weaknesses:

It is difficult to determine if the PBCS was developed with input of teachers and school leaders in the schools and LEA to be served by the grant. The narrative notes that the decision to implement TAP was "driven by teacher input and agreement" (pg. E58). However, this statement is not sufficient information. The LEA needed to provide detailed information like, results of teacher surveys, feedback from teachers, focus groups, or discussion panels to demonstrate that their plan was developed with the input of teachers and schools to be served by the proposed grant. Without this information the applicant did not sufficiently address the criterion.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides details of a plan for sustainability by describing how the LEA will use non-TIF funds to take over a share of the new compensation system beginning in the first year of the grant as well as provide a share of performance based retention bonuses beginning in year three which are the largest components of the proposed

Sub Question

project budget (pg. E58-E59). In addition, the LEA plans to fund one mentor teacher position for each school (pg. E59). The non-TIF funds are considerable and will allow the proposed partners to concentrate on implementation of the PBCS. They also make mention of utilizing Title I and Title II funds to account for non-TIF funding (pg. E59).

The applicant has demonstrated the capacity to sustain the PBCS and educator evaluation systems by its thorough planning, history of success implementation of grants, and its practice incorporation of district and community stakeholders in its planning (pg. E58-E60). The MOU and letters of support provided indicate that the LEA has necessary support to ensure sustainability (pg. E68-E84).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.

General:

Comments

Strengths:

The proposed project is designed to improve academic outcomes of high need students within Cross County school district. The applicant provides data depicting 70% of students attending the school receive free or reduced lunch (pg. E18). In addition, Cross County school district is a "remote rural" district therefore providing assurance that the proposed project is designed to improve academic outcomes of high-need students served by Rural Local Education Agencies (pg. E42).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.

To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a well-developed plan for promoting equitable access to effective Educators for students from

low-income families and minority students. The implementation of the TAP System and comprehensive HCMS, professional development, evaluations, providing incentives, and continuous assessment of performance indicates that there are systems in place to achieve results. Further, the applicant provides details of their intent to align the TAP System strategies with the Arkansas Equity Plan Strategies. The applicant includes a table depicting how the TAP system strategies align with the Arkansas state plan (pg. E45).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness for this sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	44
Sub Total	65	64
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	3
Sub Total	20	16
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	2
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	7	7
Total	107	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 3: 84.374A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider the extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant details a project including two schools that are designated as high-need as defined by TIF guidelines. The applicant's project proposes a performance-based compensation system and a partnership with a national non-profit and local university focused on educator quality. Since the district struggles with attracting and retaining effective educators, the project focuses on the enhancement of their human capital management system (HCMS) to increase educator effectiveness and student achievement (p.e12). The applicant's project design and focus on recruiting and retaining teachers is very clear and provides convincing evidence that this project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 44

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant presents a project with a primary goal of implementing innovative strategies for attracting, developing, and retaining the most effective educators through the implementation of The System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP) developed by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET). This system includes a comprehensive performance based compensation system grounded in strong educator professional development structures and supported by a comprehensive HCMS. This applicant's proposed project plan presents a well-

Sub Question

developed HCMS system that emphasizes data-driven decision making that targets the specific needs of educators and students (p.e12).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not appropriately address requirement 1. The proposed project plan mentions other personnel on pp.e16 and e23. However, there is inadequate evidence detailing how the applicant will implement a comprehensive HCMS (utilizing the TAP system) for other personnel.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant details a project that involves the collaboration of partners that will maximize the effectiveness of project services. One of the main partnerships includes working with a local university to recruit and retain educators committed to students of the community (p.e36). The project plan details a partnership with Arkansas Technical University School of Education's Center for Leadership and Learning (ATU) which allows the applicant to recruit highly-skilled teachers and develop a reciprocal PD partnership. For example, expert faculty will work with and learn from teachers in the schools and the university faculty. Additionally, teachers in Cross County (CC) schools) will share their knowledge and best practices with teacher candidates at ATU. The applicant clearly and convincingly delineates the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant presents the philosophy that educator effectiveness is the primary driver of student achievement (p. e19). Additionally, this project argues for the adoption of the TAP system, which is a comprehensive school reform developed by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) with proven success in schools across the country (p.e21). Evidence demonstrating support of a strong research-based theory is detailed in the logic model presented (p.e22). Lastly, the TAP System's ongoing, applied PD incorporates two research-based strategies: collaborative learning teams and instructional coaching (p.e45).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

4. (4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding

Sub Question

streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant details how the project will build on LEA-wide human capital management system (HCMS) and comprehensive educator evaluation system characterized by strong support structures for teachers and principals (p.e23). The applicant proposes a project plan that clearly builds on similar efforts, in that the proposed plan is an extension of the current implementation of the TAP system and a demonstration of Cross County Schools' development of its educator-supportive culture. The use of information generated by TAP's comprehensive evaluation and support system allows CCS's leaders to cull and utilize data which drives efforts that include making human capital decisions relative to placement, retention, dismissal, compensation, and promotion. Furthermore, CC provides strong evidence of how the proposed project will make innovative improvements to their existing HCMS structure to ensure that they continue to meet the goals set for teachers and students. For example, the HCMS currently houses teacher evaluation, student achievement, and school accountability data. This project builds on these efforts by proposing an expansion of the functionality of the HCMS which will allow for better analysis and use of data in real time. The applicant presents convincing research compiled over a decade as direct evidence that augmenting the implementation of TAP will result in improved student achievement (p.e23). Additionally, alignment with evaluation systems for teachers and principals is noted as a means to foster school-wide student achievement gains (p.e25).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

- 1. In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. (1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

General:

Strengths:

The project plan documents a strong infrastructure that supports high-quality PD geared towards yielding positive results for both teachers and students. The TAP system combines collaborative teams and classroom coaching for greater impact. In TAP, master teachers, mentor teachers, and the principal are all responsible for leading inter-related PD activities that include cluster groups, individualized coaching, school level support and planning, enhancements to professional development and support, and dissemination of lessons learned - all targeted for maximum positive impact (p.e46-e50). The proposed project plan, which is research both based and highly adaptive to teacher, school, and student need, is indeed a high-quality plan for professional development (p.e45).

Weaknesses:

Sub Question

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

General:

Strengths:

The proposed project plan convincingly details exactly how the applicant will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and schools. The applicant's proposed project plan details how they will use individual coaching, school level support and planning, enhancements to professional development and support, and dissemination of lessons learned as an integral part of the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System. This system clearly provides strong support that justifies the extent to which their professional development identifies and addresses the needs of individual educators and schools. (p.e.47-50).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The project itself is designed to fulfill the goals and objectives of the TIP project period on time and within budget. The project plan identified the TIF Project Director as the one who will oversee and administer the grant. Additionally, delineated are three subsets of activities to ensure the goals and objectives are achieved on time within budget (oversight of grant execution, management of grant activities, and work to implement the proposed HCMS). The description of these subsets also notes that the project will use routine cost-control mechanisms that involve work and budget planning and systematic review to control project costs (p.e51).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did break down tasks and responsibilities by each year of the grant (Y1-Y5). However, the lack of clarity relative how this work will be accomplished throughout each year (e.g. use of quarterly or monthly milestone markers) makes this section somewhat poorly justified (p.e54-58).

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 3

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.**

General:

Strengths:

No strengths in this area of the application.

Weaknesses:

While the project plan details TAP's comprehensive teacher evaluation and support system and the goal of fostering an educator-supportive culture, there is little evidence detailing that the performance-based compensation systems are developed with the input of any teachers and schools served by the grant. The applicant's narrative indicates that the decision to implement TAP was driven by teacher input and agreement. However, this claim is not substantiated (p.e58).

Reader's Score:

- 2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant adequately demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired. The project plan includes key elements designed to ensure long-term sustainability and success of the project. Specific evidence is the focus on building buy-in, creating capacity through training and support, increasing educator skills and driving student growth, and establishing financial sustainability. Evidence of the commitment to sustainability beyond the length of the grant is the applicant's use of non-TIF funds to take over an increasing share of performance-based compensation each year from the onset of the grant (pp.e58-59).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

- 1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant is a remote rural Local Educational Agency (p.e12). The grant is designed to improve the academic outcomes for all students served in the schools and details the implementation of a research-based, educator effectiveness system to accomplish this objective (p.e43). Additionally, the proposed project plan provides evidence that this criterion is met as it is defined as a "remote rural" district by the National Center for Education where over 70% of all students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

- 1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the implementation of the enhanced TAP system and the connected comprehensive HCMS focused on the priority of improving educator effectiveness for all teachers and administrators under their jurisdiction. The applicant further describes the TAP System's evaluation and support structures based on comprehensive teacher observations, student achievement growth, and other inputs (p.e43). The project will support high-need schools where there are students from low-income families and minority students within district schools (p.e20).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses present in the application at this time.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	44
Sub Total	65	64
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	3
Sub Total	20	16
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	2
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	7	7
Total	107	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 3: 84.374A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Cross County School District (U374A160049)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider the extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a well-developed plan of teacher effectiveness and student achievement. The proposed project describes the applicant's plan of action to implement the TAP System. The applicant presents a developed plan that includes a collaborative partnership with a non-profit organization and a local university. The proposal project is designed for implementation in elementary and high schools that are designated as high needs as defined by TIF guidelines. The plan details the specific methods by which equitable opportunities will be provided to foster improved academic success for all students (P.e16-27). The applicant provides detailed evidence that the project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. The proposed project plan incorporates four essential factors for implementing the TAP system. These four areas of focus are (1) Performance Based Compensation Systems (PBCS), (2) multiple career paths, (3) instructionally focused accountability, and (4) ongoing applied professional growth. This provides adequate evidence that shows the project is likely to build local capacity that addresses the needs of low-performing students and high-needs students (P.e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 44

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Strengths:

The proposed project details a strong comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning, and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant's use of the TAP system as a strong framework is evident. This framework is the foundation that the applicant will use to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous

Sub Question

academic standards for students (P.e20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address requirement 1 and does not provide any evidence demonstrating how this plan applies to other personnel.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

General:

Strengths:

The proposed project plan clearly describes the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, the partnership with local universities and national organizations will allow the applicant to provide a means for professional development for new teachers who are recruited and for current teachers already employed. Also, their partnership with national organizations which focuses on improving teaching and learning demonstrates appropriate collaborative partnerships (P.e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant's project is supported by a strong theory. There is ample evidence that that the TAP program provides effective leadership. This is evidenced by the collective improvement efforts focused on both improved student achievement and improved teacher learning. A focus on teacher professional development, which is ongoing and differentiated will help achieve both of these objectives. The applicant's proposed project supports this idea (P.e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score:

4. (4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant presents strong evidence that the proposed project will build upon their current HCMS by continuing to improve educator effectiveness and by focusing on improving practices and policies to attract, retain, and develop educators. The applicant will continue to utilize existing funds to support ongoing implementation of the TAP system. The applicant explicitly names funding sources which include local funding, state funding, national school act funding, and Title II funding. Thus, the applicant provides convincing evidence that the proposed project will indeed build upon their current HCMS (P.e43-44).

Weaknesses:

Sub Question

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

1. In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. (1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant specifies a high quality professional development plan to attract and retain high quality and effective educators for placement in high needs schools. The TAP system is aligned to the educators' growth and evaluation instruments. The professional development activities include workshops, one-on-one coaching, and cluster groups (P.e44-45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.

General:

Strengths:

The TAP program clearly helps schools create an infrastructure that supports tailored professional development and ensures that activities are aligned to teacher need in order to ultimately deliver positive results, both for teachers and students. Therefore, the applicant provides strong evidence of a high quality PD plan for teachers (P.e44-45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has a well-developed plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. For example, the applicant has identified personnel, either currently employed or to be hired. Additionally, the proposed project plan delineates specific job responsibilities for personnel to complete that will ensure the quality of implementation. The applicant includes resumes that specifically identify personnel and their job responsibilities. For example, the program director will be responsible for the oversight and implementation of the project. 100% of their time is dedicated to this task (P.e52-58).

Weaknesses:

Based on the timeline presented, it is unclear whether the objectives the project will be completed on time. This is based on the fact that the applicant's timeline does not indicate a very specific and detailed description of the timetable is clear and detailed enough to ensure adequate implementation.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

- 1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 3

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.**

General:

Strengths:

No strengths present in this section.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not show evidence that teachers contributed to the development of the proposed plan. On P. e58 of the application, the applicant mentions that implementation decisions were driven by teacher input. However, they did not provide any evidence to back up this claim.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.**

General:

Strengths:

The evidence presented in the proposed project plan supports the fact that the proposed is a reasonable plan for financial sustainability beyond the grant period. To demonstrate the commitment to TAP, CC presents a strong plan to take over a share of PBCS by continuing to utilize supplemental funding allocated to rural and high-need schools (P.e50-54).

Weaknesses:

Sub Question

No weaknesses present in this section

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

- 1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**

General:

Strengths:

According to the National Center for Education, the applicant is defined as a remote rural district (P.e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

- 1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence demonstrating that the proposed project plan is designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts (p.e20). According to the National Center for Education, the applicant services students in a district where over 70% of all students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies. Thus, the project will support high-need schools where there are students come from low-income and minority families.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:30 PM

