

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

Part 4: Project Narrative Attachment Form

1.	Table of Contents	1
2.	Project Narrative	1
a.	<i>Significance (20 Points)</i>	9
b.	<i>Quality of the Project Design (40 points)</i>	14
c.	<i>Professional Development Systems to Support Educators (15 points)</i>	33
d.	<i>Quality of the Management Plan (15 points)</i>	40
e.	<i>Adequacy of Resources (10) Points</i>	
3.	<i>Priority 1 (Absolute): An LEA-wide Human Capital Management System (HCMS) with Educator Evaluation and Support Systems at the Center.</i>	
4.	<i>Competitive Preference Priority 1 -- Supporting High-Need Students</i>	
5.	<i>Competitive Priority 2 -- Improving Teacher Effectiveness and Promoting Equitable Access to Effective Educators</i>	
6.	<i>Invitational Priority—Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators:</i>	

Part 5: Budget Narrative Attachment Form

7.	TIF and Non-TIF Budget Narrative and Budget Tables
8.	High Need Documentation
a.	<i>List of High Need Schools where PBCS will be implemented</i>
b.	<i>Current High Need School Data on school's students who are eligible</i>
c.	<i>Persistently lowest-achieving school by name</i>
d.	<i>Priority school State documentation and USDE approval for waiver</i>
9.	Charter School LEA Documentation if applicable
a.	<i>George Gervin Academy (GGA)</i>
b.	<i>Por Vida Academy (PVA)</i>
c.	<i>Positive Solutions Academy (PS)</i>
d.	<i>Southwest Preparatory (SWP)</i>
e.	<i>Nonprofit Proof – Youth Empowerment Services, Inc.</i>
10.	Commitment Letters, surveys, other evidence
a.	<i>Commitment Letters and Educator Comments regarding EEP</i>
b.	<i>LEA-Wide Buy-In Documents</i>
c.	<i>Teacher Leader and Superintendent Meetings Sign-ins and Agendas</i>
d.	<i>Signed Memorandum of Understanding from LEA's and non-compete Agreements</i>
e.	<i>HCMS System with educator input</i>
f.	<i>PBCS documents with teacher input-survey results</i>
g.	<i>EEP Support Survey from External Evaluator-Wrxford</i>
b.	<i>Non-Compete Documents</i>
11.	Indirect Cost Rate Agreement
12.	Individual Resumes for Project Directors and Key Personnel
a.	<i>Resumes</i>
b.	<i>Job Descriptions</i>

Part 6: Assurances and Certifications

- Assurances for Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B Form)*
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Standard Form LLL)*
- Grants.gov Lobbying Form*

Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) TIF5 Project Narrative

(a) **SIGNIFICANCE** (20 points) One hundred percent (100%) of the educators including teachers, teacher leaders, principals and the four (4) LEA Superintendents representing all 13 LEA-wide campuses and four (4) LEA's unanimously agreed and have bought into this TIF5 project being presented as evidenced by the names and signatures in Attachment 5. "Buy-in" commitment activities took place on each campus after all four targeted LEA Superintendents met and agreed to unanimously create the shared instructional vision that will serve as the foundation of this TIF project, "TEES ensures that all students have equitable access to effective educators" ... a) by ensuring that the evaluation system with supports is effectively implemented on all 13 campuses within all four (4) LEA's, b) by providing a well-designed PBCS that focuses on compensating effective educators, and c) by implementing the first-of-it's-kind HCMS for charter schools in San Antonio, Texas." This aligns directly with Competitive Priority 2 which states a focus on improving teacher effectiveness and promoting equitable access to effective educators. Texas Education Equity System is the group name the four (4) Superintendents agreed to. Supported by Youth Empowerment Services, Inc., the fiscal/lead agent, for this TIF5 project, TEES includes four (4) San Antonio-based LEA Charter Superintendents, representing 13 high-need campuses, high-poverty campuses, and persistently lowest-achieving campuses that have been successfully making progress while implementing TIF projects since 2010 in the San Antonio and Corpus Christi areas of Texas. The most significantly high-need schools in San Antonio as identified by the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Title I priority school list schools are participating in this TIF5 project. Of the forty (40) San Antonio Area LEA's identified as Title I priority schools in the state, 20% are represented by the TEES thirteen campuses. Thus, eight (8) of the thirteen (13) high-need schools identified for this Texas Education Equity System

(TEES) TIF5 project, represent the lowest performing schools in San Antonio and all 13 campuses meet the TIF5 high-need documentation criteria detailed in Attachment 5.4. **Three** new campuses within existing participating LEA (one in Corpus Christi, TX one in Phoenix, AZ, one in San Antonio, TX) will join the **10** existing campuses for this TIF5 project. Part 5 the attachment 1 shows the 13 campuses and the timeline in section e highlights the major activities that will ensure that the new campuses have access the EEP evaluation and PBCS activities in order to experience the effectiveness activities that will lead to effective educators and improved student performance .The instructional vision created (May 31st) and approved by the teachers (June 21st) has been fueled by the commitment and determination of each LEA to accelerate the comprehensive school improvement efforts happening within each LEA. The focus on our vision ensures that the LEA's meet the TIF absolute priority by 1) continuing to provide and improve the current USDE-approved evaluation system with supports, 2) continuing with an updated and improved PBCS to provide compensation to effective educators, and 3) expanding the EEP project to include a strong Human Capital Management System (HCMS). 1) Continuing to provide and improve upon the current USDE-approved evaluation system with supports: The current system that was funded in 2010 by USDE is called the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP). Sponsored by Youth Empowerment Services, Inc This system has been responsible for creating and implementing a 1) USDE-approved teacher evaluation system, a 2) USDE-approved principal evaluation system and a 3) USDE-approved PBCS that has targeted ten (10) campuses over six years focusing on over 1500 students served by over 150 teachers and 10 principals. The three (3) new campuses' leaders and teachers will receive all of the initial support that the existing schools received in order to have high levels of fidelity implementing the project see EEP at a Glance significance attachment b and c. We will continue to improve the evaluation

system as stated in Absolute Priority I. With this request, EEP will be expanded to include additional professional development supports using the evaluative data to align with educators' needs. This support will include induction professional development for new teachers, coaching for all teachers and principals, and mentoring for teachers. The increase in the level and type of evaluation system supports will ensure that the current vision of providing equitable access to effective educators is achieved for all students. Details of the comprehensive, USDE-approved evaluation system is included in section b, program design. There is significant evidence of the success of the current 2010 TIF project to support continuing to make the system more robust and relevant. One of EEP's focuses was on the high need subjects Math and Science, of the thirteen (13) high need schools participating in the Texas Education Equity System (TEES), ten participated in the 2010 TIF3 Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) and six of the nine campuses had double digit increases in the percent of students meeting and exceeding standards in math and science over the EEP TIF3 5 year grant period, see the three powerful depictions in significance attachment f, g and h. This is an example of what this comprehensive Educator Effectiveness Process will continue doing for all students in all subjects including hard to staff subjects such as math, Science, Special education and English Language Learners and the not so hard to staff subjects such as Reading. The targeted campus educators have been unanimous in the belief that the comprehensive evaluation system played a significant role in ensuring that educators became more effective at instructing students to improve academically. All principals have indicated that EEP is one of the major factors in the improvement of teaching and learning within their schools. Continuation of EEP through TIF5 is critical for the students that depend upon their effective educators. 2) Continuing with an updated, improved PBCS to provide compensation to effective educators: The current USDE-approved PBCS has provided

significant levels of support to struggling participating teachers .The five years of survey data (see attachment g), improved educator observation results, the value added data as well as the campus' achievement data, along with the letters and comments and the personal expressions to EEP from participating educators (see part 5 attachments 11 and 12), leave-no-doubt that during the past six years of implementation, we have made significant progress towards achieving our vision of equitable access to effective educators for our students. The PBCS has been updated to include Superintendents beginning in year 1, and “other professionals” beginning in year 2involved in the provision of direct academic support to students .Other professionals include assistant principals, college and career counselors, social workers, psychologists, Special Education Directors and ELL Coordinators .The inclusion of “other professionals” will help ensure that effective educators are differentially compensated throughout the LEA and will assist in meeting our instructional vision of “equitable access to effective educators” for all students so that students' academic careers from PK – 12th grade are relevant and rigorous and prepares for careers and college after graduation. The design of the improved PBCS is detailed in the section b, and will help the LEA's have reliable and valid data to document effective educators in order to provide relevant PBCS payments (see attachment a, b, and c) .The attachments clearly identify the planned, updated PBCS to provide compensation to effective educator's program design as stated in Absolute Priority 1. 3) Expand to include a strong Human Capital Management System .The theory behind creating a HCMS with “equity compensation” as a goal is strong as it is based upon the premise that well-compensated educators will continue to perform well and become more effective as they continue in the education system. Currently, EEP does not provide for a HCMS to the participating LEA's and the planned TIF5 HCMS will be a new feature of the comprehensive approach to school improvement that will help ensure that

all students have equitable access to effective educators with compensation that matches the effectiveness of educators .The HCMS will ensure that educators who are not effective are given support and resources to become effective so that they can move up in the HCMS or move out of the education system .“A quality teacher is the critical factor in determining student achievement in the classroom.” In the past, educational attainment, experience, and subjective recommendations from others, have been used to recruit teachers but these measures have consistently fallen short of ensuring that all students have equitable access to effective teachers. Each high need school is ready to embrace the use of other high-stakes measures using a strategic HCMS based upon a comprehensive evaluation system to recruit, hire, place, retain, dismiss, compensate, train and support, with tenure and promotion opportunities to ensure all students have equitable access to effective teachers. Each high-need LEA leader has confirmed through surveys, questionnaires and through extensive meetings and discussions that the *recruitment of effective teachers is extremely difficult* especially in the areas of math and science. One of the reasons for the difficulty in recruiting effective teachers is that the thirteen (13) high-need schools targeted for this TIF 5 HCMS/PBCS grant are always competing with the 16 larger traditional public LEA’s that have more resources to pay teachers, the recruitment and retention of effective teachers by LEAs is more difficult because the multitude of options when deciding what school district to apply for employment. Recruitment is also hard when it comes to hard-to-staff areas like math and science, Special Education and English Language Learners because surrounding districts sometimes offer hard-to-staff teachers for math and science incentives when the teacher selects their school district. The targeted LEA salaries are usually between \$5000 - \$20,000 lower than the base salaries at the competing local district schools see the “average teacher salary chart” in attachment b depicts the San Antonio area average teacher

salary and each of the thirteen (13) targeted high need school's average teacher salary. The State of Texas average salary of \$50,715 is higher than all of the average salaries at each of the thirteen (13) targeted high need schools and in some cases the State Average Teacher Salary of \$50,715 is almost \$16,000 higher. This is evidence of the dire need for a continuation of the EEP PBCS that compensates based on effectiveness and the additional resources to implement HCMS that includes recruitment and retention by year 3. The current PBCS and the planned HCMS to be implemented will definitely ensure that each campus lives the vision for the sake of all of the participating students. Even though retaining teachers continues to be a challenge in our participating LEA's, 80% of the teachers in a 2015 survey would rate their job as satisfaction as good and very good. See survey results in attachment g. 68% of the teachers surveyed would "stay at their current schools longer because of EEP. This TIF5 project includes a provision to establish a significant "base pay" provision that will help to equalize participating LEA's teacher and principal salaries and will close the gap" for the teachers and principals. Base pay step is one of the first steps in creating our HCMS .The project design section (b) of this project narrative provides a comprehensive, detailed accounting of how the improvements made to EEP and the inclusion of the HCMS will improve the teaching and learning that support rigorous academic standards as well as include the strong theory that supports the EEP project design (*see the end of section a (See Significance Additional Information - part a)*). Project narrative attachments in letter (a), provides additional significance support.

(B) QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN (40 POINTS) The comprehensive school reform efforts of the participating LEA's and their community of educators (*including over 250 teachers, principals, other professionals and Superintendents serving over 2000 students in San Antonio*) that have been involved over the past six years in implementing the 2010 TIF project

have been eagerly anticipating the opportunity to implement a comprehensive HCMS so that effective educators receive differentiated salaries based upon effectiveness as measured and analyzed by the observation data and student performance/valued added data. Our project design is comprehensive, has already been effective at improving the teacher and learning for students, and will, with this TIF5 project be more robust and relevant resulting in greater academic gains for all students with the implementation of TIF5 HCMS .(1) Comprehensive Evaluation System With Supports, PBCS And Nine HCMS Initiatives .The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) is the 2010 USDE approved PBCS and Evaluation System currently being implemented in the LEA's that are a part of this TIF5 project. Through the first planning year of the grant from 2010-2011, the USDE approved the PBCS for teachers and principals, the teacher evaluation system and the principal evaluation system see significance attachment b and c. This was the first time that the participating LEA's had been a part of a comprehensive educator evaluation process and the results have been astonishing especially when reviewed through the experiences of the educators who have lived through the process so far. In addition, EEP was the first TIF III project approved for the first-ever 12 month USDE "no cost extension TIF" and received an unprecedented "sixth year" to continue the project beyond the initial five-year completion date due to effective implementations and results. The evidence is strong that supports the reasons and rationale behind the successful implementing of the TIF project, but the main reasons are a) high-level of fidelity exists among the educators implementing the project at the campus level so that "no stone is left unturned" and every attempt is made to follow the details of the project explicitly, and b) the strongest support possible from the EEP TIF personnel responsible for training, supporting, retraining, meeting, planning and delivering evaluation and PBCS guidance and resources everyday throughout the school year and the summer year. The details describing

the EEP project that have led to the “great achievements” are described below in the comprehensively detailed elements of EEP, and also detailed in the EEP Implementation Rubric see Attachment 5 .The goal of the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) evaluation process is to improve the teaching and learning that occurs in the classrooms so that students are supported by effective educators using rigorous academic standards and thus able to compete throughout their education experience. The goal of the EEP PBCS is to compensate educators based upon their effectiveness towards ensuring that all students successfully meet their academic goals. These goals are aligned with the overall instructional *vision* to ensure that *all students have equitable access to effective educators in order to meet the academic standards.* What follows is the comprehensive EEP evaluation and PBCS system explained as it currently exists and the new processes that will be added following approval of this application .Then a detailed overview of the HCMS to be implemented beginning in the third year of this project is provided.

(i) EEP Observation System – EEP observations are research rubric based observations see the project design attachment p. Each teacher receives a minimum of three (3) formal observations each year, one unannounced that consist of one pre conference and a post conference and two unannounced which consist of a post conference for each. Each principal receives four (4) formal observations each year. One observation is announced and includes a pre-conference and a post conference. All other observations are unannounced and include a post-conference. All post-conferences include a discussion of a reinforcement goal for the educator to continue reinforcing what they are doing well and a refinement, something they can do more effectively. All observation are based on the instructional rubrics, only focused EEP instructional rubric and the evidence from the observation. These processes are transparent in that all participants are kept updated throughout the entire observation procedures. The observation processes do not happen

to the educators; the processes happen with them, as they are instrumentally and very deliberately involved throughout the entire observation procedures. **a) EEP Observations**

Process: Teachers and principals are scored and assessed in writing using the EEP tools created to be a transparent overview tied to the rubric of the effectiveness of the educator's lesson. The process is a comprehensive systemic one that includes professional development tied directly, specifically and explicitly to the observation data of the observed educator. The process includes the following components. **1)** A pre-observation conference to review with the educator the planned lesson or meeting that will be assessed, the planned outcomes that are expected and the ways the educator will implement the rubric throughout the lesson or meeting. This pre-conference is usually scheduled during the teacher's planning time and lasts approximately 40 – 45 minutes. **2)** The actual observation is scheduled before the pre-conference is held and occurs within 24 hours of the pre-conference. **3)** The actual observation lasts the length of the lesson or meeting from beginning to the ending. **4)** The post-conference is held within 48 hours of the observation allowing the observer to create a written post-conference plan that will be used to review the observed lessons effectiveness tied to the instructional rubric highlighting the refinement and reinforcement goals that will be discussed during the 45-minute post conference meeting. **b. EEP Certified Observers** – All observers are required to be “certified observers” in order to observe campus teachers, teacher leaders and Principals. The EEP Co-Director and Regional Coordinator will be certified trainers and will provide the Teacher Observation and the Principal Observation Certification Training each year during the summer institute and throughout the year as needed to ensure that all observers are certified to implement the observation process described above. The four-day training is intensive and involves all participants engaging in all facets of the teacher observation and the principal observation,

including inter-rater reliability, and how to conduct and implement pre and post observation conferences. Selected teacher leaders and principals will participate in this training.

Superintendents and principals selected by their Superintendents qualify for principal observation training. At the end of the Teacher Observation Training must test by completing a complete observation on a teacher or principal. The test are then sent to an outside service provider to be scored. This is apart of the robust and transparent process of EEP. EEP Multiple Teacher Observations – The three (3) required teacher observations are conducted by three different leaders over the course of a school year beginning shortly after the school year starts and ending by March 31st the beginning of testing season each year. The principal, the expert teacher leader and the career teacher conduct the observations per the scheduled created by the leadership team (*See Project Design and Additional Information - part b*). Teacher Observation is a consistent agenda item on the weekly Leadership team meetings, the leaders discuss and schedule professional development based upon the outcomes of the teacher observations. While one of the purposes of the observation processes is to determine the level of effectiveness and to improve the effectiveness of each educator by using the results to provide supportive coaching, mentoring and additional targeted professional development so that the subsequent observations results in higher proficiency levels .

d .EEP Multiple Principal Observations – As the principal becomes more of the instructional leader rather than the building/operational manager, the observation processes focuses on the principal in multiple instructional roles as the principal leads the educational attainment of the campus. Principals are observed by a set of different leaders in a variety of different instructional settings. The principal receives one (2) observations from an EEP staffer and peer educator using a tool to assess how the principal leads the leadership team in a meeting where data, evaluation

results/decisions for professional development, unit meeting preparation, and instructional strategies are addressed with action items and follow up items .The principal receives two (2) observations from the LEA Superintendent where the focus of the principal is observed coaching/mentoring another educator .One observation is announced and three are unannounced .e .EEP Teacher Observation Rubric – see project design attachment p. The standards-based EEP Teacher Observation Rubric provides a rigorous means for measuring teacher effectiveness through observation as it methodically establishes standards and expectations around researched-based proven detailed indicators and sub-indicators of educator effectiveness. The EEP Observation Rubric articulates teacher expectations by defining performance criteria from novice to expert using indicators and sub-indicators. It is designed to evaluate teachers’ planning, delivery of instruction and use of formative and summative assessments. The rubric has four Domains. Domain I focuses on facilitating student learning and has twelve indicators .Domain II focuses on educator planning for learning, Domain III focuses on the teacher’s ability to ensure a balance exists around students’ mental, physical and emotional learning needs and Domain IV focuses on each individual campuses input into the teacher evaluation system. Domain IV is evaluated by each set of educators. Career teachers evaluate their teacher leaders. EEP Observation Levels of Proficiency – There are three (3) overall levels of proficiency used to identify to what extent does-an-educator-implement the research-based, specific twelve (12) instructional indicators detailed in the instructional rubric. Educators’ observations are scored using the three proficiency levels. Educators can receive the following scores on any indicators – “1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 4.5 and a 5.” The levels are 1) The Expert Teacher Level – An observation score of a five “5” in any of the 12 indicators that the educator is “above proficiency” in the ability to utilize the particular indicator to guarantee that “students will learn

the content being taught. The question the observer has to answer in order to rate an indicator a “5” is “to what extent did learning occur for all of the students in meeting the stated objective for the day’s lesson by demonstrating the criteria in the specific indicator?”

2) Career Teacher Level – An observation score of a 3 through a 4.5 indicates that the proficiency of the educator to provide instruction guaranteeing that students learn based upon the lesson’s objective is “proficient and adequate to guarantee a majority of the students are mastering the day’s learning objective” as evidenced by the formative assessment that is required to occur during the lesson. “*Three (3) is where you want to be*” is the motto used when initially training educators so that they can obtain consistent threes at the beginning of their introduction to the EEP process as they pursue a goal of eventually becoming a level 5 teacher. The level 3 indicates that the teacher is providing instruction using instructional strategies and activities that aid students in mastering the learning objectives. **3) The Novice Level** is represented by teachers who earn 1 – 2.5 scores on their instructional indicators and indicates that the educator is below proficiency in implementing the instruction, instructional strategies and content knowledge. Scores at this level are a strong indication to the observer that the educator would need additional coaching and mentoring to improve. Scores that are at this level on any indicator always end up being a “refinement goal” for the educator during the “post-observation conference.” The teacher and principal observation system tools are included in attachment b. **g) Inter-rater reliability** – Achieving “inter-rater reliability” is a major responsibility of the principal as instructional leader working with the leadership team each week. All leadership members observe instructional videos, review observation scores, indicator evidence notes and post-conference plans to achieve inter-rater reliability throughout the school year usually on a monthly basis (during at least one of the weekly leadership team meetings each month.) The level and depth of discussion

surrounding the rubric indicators helps the principal lead the team towards achieving a high level of inter-rater reliability .For the EEP program, inter-rater reliability focuses on each indicator being no more than “one point off” among the observers. All members are required to document their scores based upon evidence tied to the observed behavior related to the scored indicator. Then when discussing the indicator and the score, the observers must “prove” by the rubric the score .As long as all observers are equal or no more than one point off, inter-rater reliability is obtained on the indicator being addressed. When a score is more than one point off, then the principal leads the discussion to show proof of the score to help all members come together to agree on the indicator score for the observation being reviewed. h. Teacher Education Data System – TEDS – TEDS is the online evaluation platform where all educator observation data is documented and stored for use by leadership staff members to analyze and make professional development decisions for each educator. Teachers also can assess the system to store their self evaluations. i. Other Professionals Evaluation Systems – This is a new EEP component of the evaluation system .For this TIF5 opportunity, the LEA’s agreed that there was a need to provide a comprehensive evaluation system to Superintendents and the “other professionals” that directly impact student learning and to expand the current evaluation system from principals and teaches to “other professional educators”. On May 31, 2016, with input from 100% of the schools the following positions were added to the evaluation system to be developed and thus would become a part of the PBCS once developed. Superintendents’ evaluation system would be completed and implemented in Year 1 .Assistant principals, academic deans, Special Education Directors, ELL directors and coordinators, social workers/psychologist and career and college counselors’ evaluation system would be finalized and implemented during Year 2 with the PBCS following .All other professional positions to be included in Year 3 with the implementation of the HCMS

include the strategic HR directors, Academic Data Analysts .The timelines included in section d below provides more information related to the tasks completion so that we meet the goal of implementing the HCMS in Year 3 with ALL positions evaluated to ensure that all students have access to effective educators. All “other professionals” were identified and approved with input from all stakeholders as positions regarding additional academic degrees and or positions requiring a special certification. Interventionists are not included in the “other professional educators” as there are degree requirements for interventionists .j Multiple Career Paths – “*The consensus in the research about multiple career paths is that employees who have the opportunities for career advancement are motivated to improve the quality of their work,*” (KRUETZ, T 2006) This quote supports EEP strong theory for including multiple career paths as a significant segment of EEP. The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) allows for effective teachers to advance in the teaching profession without having to leave the classroom to become administrators in order to earn better pay opportunities .In the past effective educators left their students and their classrooms in order to earn more. EEP is designed to allow effective teachers the ability to take on leadership roles to strengthen the campus as a whole, while still teaching students. EEP provides teachers with growth options to move from being a career teacher, to a career teacher leader and to an expert teacher leader. The progress through the higher levels of the teaching profession is competitive, rigorous and performance-based so that all professional career teachers will be better able to work towards increasing their pursuit of the highest levels of the teaching profession. The opportunities provided through multiple career paths will be used in recruiting effective teachers to the LEAs. k .Career Teacher (CT) – The CT is a professional teacher who is either a new or established teacher working towards becoming a more effective teacher. As campus CT’s increase in effectiveness they will have opportunities to complete for

Career Teacher Leader and Expert Teacher Leader positions. The CT's collaborate with the more experienced CTL's and ETL's during unit meetings, observations, pre and post conferences during the evaluation process and during the teaching processes, lesson planning sessions, group meetings, student assessment activities and the other professional development supports provided. The CT's duties include, preparing and presenting effective lessons to students, analyzing student data, identifying needs and using the lesson planning process to address the students' needs, using data to develop intervention plans for students, collaborating with CTL's and ETL's to increase their expertise in meeting students' academic needs in a more robust and relevant manner. In teacher to qualify at an LEA as a Career Teacher, the teacher must be highly qualified for a Charter School.

1. Career Teacher Leader – The CTL is a proven is an effective teacher based upon the observations and the value added teacher and school level data. CTL's are selected through a thorough and comprehensive interview process to ensure that teachers selected to become CTL's have the capacity to effectively coach, mentor and training other teachers. CTL's are trained by EEP staff in all aspects of the EEP observation process and must pass the certification test in order to be qualified to observe teachers. The CTL serves in a campus leadership role, supporting 6-8 teachers. With oversight and support from the principal and the ETL, the CTL spends 80% of the time in the classroom as a classroom teacher and 20% (one day each week or 8 hours spread throughout the week). CTL additional duties include 1) working with the ETL to plan and prepare agendas for unit meetings based upon the data collected from walk-throughs and evaluative observations, 2) attending and co-facilitating unit meeting; 3) analyzing student data to identify needs, 3) working collaboratively with teachers to develop intervention and academic plans, working with the leadership team to develop the school plan and plans based upon

assessment data, 4) conducting pre and post observation conferences and formal observations and using the data to help plan professional development sessions, and 5) coaching and mentoring teachers towards effectiveness. Expert Teacher Leaders – The ETL is the top-ranked, highly skilled professional educator next to the campus principal. The ETL shared significant leadership responsibilities and authority for instruction with the principal. To qualify to become an ETL, a teacher must have demonstrated expertise in instruction, content, curriculum development, student learning, data analysis, coaching and mentoring. A minimum of three (3) effective years in the classroom is also required with effectiveness being based upon student academic performances and teacher observation results. ETL's are held to higher performance standards and are looked upon for overall guidance and support while the campus is implementing EEP. The ETL completes all of the tasks as the CTL and also oversees the campus professional development schedules of activities, strategies and events, facilitates the curriculum and instructional calendar planning, team teaches and performs demonstration lessons on strategies and with teachers as needed, takes the lead in ensuring that the leadership meeting agendas and unit meeting agendas are prepared and presented 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meetings.

(iii) Performance Based Compensation System – EEP's USDE-approved PBCS currently targets and supports teachers and principals only. However, with this TIF5 plan, EEP intends to expand the PBCS to include **1) Superintendents**, with the teachers and principals; **2) Academic Deans** including instructional coordinators, assistant principals, special education, ELL and 504 directors and coordinators, **3) Project Directors** including social workers, career and college counselors and psychologists, parent liaisons, and specialized data analysts .a) EEP's Current PBCS – Please see attachment for the EEP PBCS graphic for more information .EEP's PBCS is two-fold, the teacher PBCS and Principal PBCS are included .Within the teacher PBCS, there are

two approaches to differentiating teacher compensation .One approach is for teachers who have responsibilities for teaching students who are required to be assessed using the STATE EXAM (the 50/30/20 approach) and the other model is for teaches who teach PK – 1st grade and teachers who teach elective classes and other non-state-tested classes (the 50/50 approach). The 50/50 model/approach allows for 50% of the teachers differentiated compensated to be based 50% on the teachers’ observation scores (an average of the three) and 50% of the teachers’ differentiated compensation to be based upon the school-wide value added score. Thus teacher observation and student data is included in the differentiated compensation to be awarded to the teacher in a one-time payment after all of the data has been received, verified and supported. The 50/30/20 model/approach is for all teachers who teacher students and subjects required to take the STATE TESTS. The are the 3rd – 8th grade reading, math, science, writing and social studies teachers for the elementary grade levels and the 9th & 10th grade teachers for biology students, Algebra I and English I and English II teachers. Their differentiated compensation is based upon 50% of the teachers observation scores (an average of the three), 20% of the school-wide average score and 30% of the teacher-level value added score if the teacher taught enough students to generate a teacher level value added score. If a teacher in this model does not generate a teacher value added score, the teacher defaults to the 50/50 model to assess whether a differentiated payout has been earned. To earn a payout on either model a minimum score of a Level 3 is required. For principals, career teacher leaders and expert teacher leaders, a minimum score of a Level 4 is required. For purposes of extra duty pay for career teachers leaders and expert teacher leaders, extra duty pay is included as a part of the additional scope of work required unit the evaluation system where each career teacher leader qualifies for an annual amount of \$8,000.00 in salary addendum and the expert teacher leader qualifies for an annual salary addendum of \$12,000.00.

The principal model is assessed on a 40/40/10/10 model where 40% of the PBCS is based upon the level of effectiveness the principal had in implementing the EEP evaluation system on the campus (see attachment 5 for a copy of the EEP implementation rubric), 40% was based upon the school-wide valued-added score, 10% was based upon the principal observations (four averaged together) and 10% was based upon accountability ratings .b .The EEP Implementation Rubric is a comprehensive results-driven tool that is used by the principal for a guide in implementing EEP with fidelity to all of the processes involved in the evaluation and PBCS models. Through out the year the principal with the leadership utilize the rubric and then a formal mid-year review is conducted by the campus leaders to determine any areas that need refinement, areas that need additional human and financial resources allocated, and areas where implementation is occurring as planned. An end of the year, the EEP implementation review is then conducted by the EEP staff to as a part of the principal PBCS rubric model. A summative report and score are generated from the end-of-the year review. The principal and the leadership staff utilize the summative report to prepare an action plan for the upcoming school year based upon the areas of challenge, need and reinforcement. c .New Improved and Enhanced PBCS – EEP staff lead the LEAs and the leadership team in reviewing, updating an enhancing the PBCS so that the PBCS included a) Superintendents, b) other professional staff with direct involvement with students and included c) updated teacher models that help to highlight all educators who impact the learning of the students. In addition, principal salary addendums have been added to support the enhanced “scope of work” for principals to become the “school instructional leader”. The budget includes a salary addendum of \$15,000.00 for principals. A copy of the updated graphic is included in Attachment 5 and has received input from all Superintendents, principals and teacher leaders who have shared them with the teachers on their campus. We plan to finalize

the improved and enhanced PBCS model upon approval of this request for TIF5 funding per the timeline details provided in section d.d Human Capital Management System (HCMS) – The strongest evidence, from the significance of the EEP project including the impact EEP had on the participating LEA’s staff and students, exists to support the continuation of the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP). With the addition of the highly structured, well supported, strategically planned, Human Capital Management System (HCMS) we will guarantee that all of the charter LEA’s students have **equitable access to effective educators**. Each participating LEA is continuing to implement the current PBCS and the current evaluation system through the EEP process, there is no current HCMS in place within any of the LEA’s. This TIF5 request will allow the LEA’s to improve and enhance the existing PBCS and evaluation system with support and allow for the establishment of a HCMS. Each LEA has all been actively engaged in researching and learning more about the benefits of implementing an HCMS, we have been limited by the time, effort and funds required to establish a well-functioning HCMS. We believe a comprehensive, strategically-designed, HCMS is important to ensuring that the LEA’s can recruit and retain effective educators making our vision a reality for the students we serve. We plan to complete the RFP process per the EDGAR regulations to obtain the best possible entity to assist us in creating, designing and implementing the HCMS, what follows is the information we believe will be a part of the HCMS once finalized, approved and implemented within 3 years. We plan to reach out to the Texas Association of School Boards to assist us as they assisted the Teacher Advancement Process (TAP) to establish an HCMS in other Texas Public Schools or another entity like TASB that help establish our HCMS .(1) The LEA’s not only came together to agree on an instructional vision that would cover all four (4) independent LEA’s, they also agreed to form a group specifically designed to ensure that the HCMS is fully implemented and

can be sustained. The LEA-wide instructional vision that each LEA's Superintendent and all LEA's teachers, teacher leaders and principal had opportunities for input is the "*TEES ensures each student's equitable access to effective educators.*" We have 100% confidence in the knowledge that the HCMS created within the next two years can be implemented with a high degree of fidelity and support because of the high level of commitment, determination and support from all stakeholders. The instructional vision is aligned with the planned HCMS and it is also the propeller guiding the creating of the HCMS to ensure that all students on each campus have access to effective educators (vision) .This is the number one goal of the HCMS being creating to begin in the school year 2018-2019. Every effort will be taken to ensure that through the design of all nine (9) of the HCMS initiatives that the vision is taught, reviewed, experienced and becomes "alive" as the HCMS is created and implemented. The EEP evaluation system with supports will provide the information that will be used to guide the human capital decisions required for a high-functioning HCMS .The nine initiatives to be included in the design of the HCMS are 1) the recruitment of effective educators, 2) the hiring of effective educators to include a well-designed induction program, 3) the placement of effective educators particularly in classrooms that are high poverty classrooms, 4) the retention of effective educators including their renewal, the dismissal of ineffective educators, the compensation that is differentiated for all educators, the professional development to be provided to all educators (See section c), the tenure and promotion of effective educators. **(2)** Information from the evaluation system including observation reports and results, student level achievement and value added data information will be used extensively to 1) inform the design of the HCMS, 2) inform the design and delivery of professional development (section c above) and 3) ensure that the HCMS is implemented in year three of this project (2018-2019 school year.) **a** Recruitment – When the

LEA Superintendents met on May 31, 2016, to create the Texas Education Equity System as a way to create and establish a strategic HCMS, one of the first initiatives discussed was the ways in which the LEA's currently recruit effective teachers. Discussions led to an understanding that assistance would be needed to create a comprehensive recruitment plan designed to attract effective educators. Also discussed as a part of the recruitment initiative were the inequities in salaries (discussed in section a, significance of project.) An agreement soon was obtained that planned a "base salary for teachers and principals" a part of the recruitment process. Further discussions took place, during an eight-hour work session on June 29, 2016 where decisions were made to establish a "base pay salary structure" as the beginning of the HCMS being development. See the budget narrative for the amounts. It is expected that the base-pay for current teachers beginning the school year in 2016-2017, will be beneficiaries of the new base pay salary structure as the first part of the HCMS which will most qualified teachers go from earning \$33,000 - \$37,000 per year to earning \$50,000 per year to be in alignment with the other 16 San Antonio public LEA's as well as slightly under the regional public teacher salaries.

b) Hiring – The HCMS to be development will lead to a comprehensive hiring process that will follow the vision of ensuring that students have equitable access to effective educators. All LEA's agreed that support is needed to ensure that the hiring that is done leads to more effective educators being employed in the LEAs .**c) Placement** – A discussion of "placing" teachers lead to quite a few questions about the best fit for the students and the teachers .The LEA's had several questions about the best way to place educators. A review of the State of Texas initiative on ensuring that all students have equitable access to effective educators was helpful and the group selected through the RFP process will be asked to address this issue very thoroughly to make sure that the HR departments in each school are trained and able to follow-through on the

procedures to be established to place the most effective educators in the highest-need campuses and classrooms. **d) Retention** – All of the LEA Superintendents strongly agreed that the HCMS, the base salary and the other supports guarantee that their retention issues will be resolved and they are expecting a teacher mobility rate to decline more than 20% over the five year TIF5 project year. All the LEA’s have seen mobility rates of over 30 – 50 % with some LEAs campuses at 70% or higher over the past years. To obtain a consistent mobility rate of less than 20% is a worthy goal and will help ensure that students have consistent, effective educators in the classrooms each year. **e) Dismissal** – The dismissal initiative of the HCMS will help transition ineffective educators out of the classrooms. In the past, LEA’s had been at the mercy of ineffective educators, often requiring “a body” to be in the classroom just to keep students safe, even if the body of that of an ineffective teachers. Having a dismissal system based upon the evaluation system the PBCS will help identify educators earlier and provide support earlier and help those who are not benefitting from the support move out of the classrooms. This will be a great benefit for the campuses and the students .**f) Compensation** – The first topic of conversation at the first TEES LEA meeting was the inequities among the LEA’s related to compensation. The first decision discussed was the implementation of a “base salary” for all new teachers to the LEA’s and all existing teachers within the LEA’s to assist with recruitment and to serve as the basis for furthering the discussions regarding the HCMS salary information. A base salary was approved the first year of the TIF5 when funded for principals and teachers. In Attachment 5 is a breakdown of the resulting HCMS listed criteria, scores and possible salary amounts. This is one aspect of the HCMS that will be determined in order to communicate to all stakeholders by August 2018 .**g) Professional development** – Professional development supports are an intricate part of the current PBCS system and all professional development inputs and

outputs will continue as described in section c below. The data from the professional development activities and strategies and the results of the use of the training received by the teachers participating in the PD will be required to be used in the HCMS that is developed.

h) Tenure – The LEAs are excited about the opportunity to create an HCMS that will provide tenure security to effective educators. The HCMS will be required to include a well-thought out tenure process to ensure that the most effective educators are retained for multiple years and hopefully leading to retirement from the LEA. This would be a part of the sustainability process.

i) Promotion – The HCMS to be developed will retain the very positive aspects of the multiple career opportunities that exist within the existing evaluation system and allow for more opportunities for promotion that allows the most effective educators to remain in the classroom, working alongside educators, mentoring and coaching educators and continuing to ensure that all students have equitable access to effective educators. We know that the HCMS to be created and implemented will include strategies that ensure that 100% of each LEA’s high-need schools will be able to attract and retain effective educators based upon the focus of the planned HCMS on the nine initiatives described above. We also know that we plan to meet the invitational priority of matching our HCMS to the State Plan for ensuring that all students have equitable access to effective educators. This is ultimately our number one goal and objectives based upon the needs of our students to have access to robust and relevant instructions from the most effective educators. (4) The timelines included in section d below address specifically the plan to implement on time and on schedule within budget the HCMS no later than the 3rd year of this TIF5 initiative. The system will address all of the requirements of the Priority I Absolute for an LEA-WIDE HCMS that aligns with our *vision that ensures all students have equitable access to effective educators*. Invitational Priority—Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To

Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Our TIF5 promotes equitable access to all students as identified in the State of Texas plan including Special Education and ELL Learners. We will ensure TIF5 campus teachers are supported with professional development through mentoring, coaching and modeling for all teachers to ensure that we will have a master teacher in every classroom .The unqualified, inexperienced and out of field teachers will attend weekly unit meetings, participate in weekly walk-throughs with follow up coaching, mentoring from an effective teacher or teacher leader, coaching from teacher leaders and qualified outside contractors, teacher observation with one-on one post conference as job-embedded professional development. The support the inexperienced and the unqualified teachers receive will transition them to qualified and experienced. We will use the HCMS planning process to ensure that by the 3rd year of the TIF5 project we will not have out-of-field educators in the classroom. EEP will continue the communication plan that involves Superintendents, principals and teacher leaders, sharing information and collecting feedback from the career teachers. The EEP staff is committed to continuing the involvement of all stakeholders in the evaluation system with supports, the PBCS and the soon-to-be implemented HCMS. Specifically because the HCMS system to be implemented in year three of the project will be new to 100% of the stakeholders, the following communication plan and feedback strategy will be utilized to guarantee that 100% of the stakeholders have multiple opportunities to share their input into the design, creation and implementation of the HCMS. This will ensure that before the plan is officially adopted by the Superintendents in June of 2018, every stakeholder has had multiple opportunities to have their voices heard regarding the HCMS' policies and procedures, the formation of the policies and procedures, and the final policies and procedures. This TIF5 request is to implement the HCMS in the third year of the five (5) year project. Please see the Communication Plan attachment in

letter d detailing how we plan to utilize all stakeholders in the process to keep all stakeholders involved with a “voice” in the decisions that will lead to the HCMS. The process includes forums, advisory councils, and multiple opportunities for everyone to be involved in the creation of the HCMS. (2) STRONG THEORY – *(Please see the strong theory chart in attachment b letter “r”).* The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) was modeled after the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) established by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET). While TAP led the way in the early 2000s on recognizing and rewarding highly effective teachers, there has been considerable work done outside of TAP to study what teacher in-service training programs need to provide to support teacher effectiveness, what recognition motivates teachers to become increasingly effective, and what school leaders need to require and model to support a culture of continuous improvement in effective schools. Through the 2010 TIF 3 award, EEP began to go beyond the value-added outcomes based results to a theory of educator effectiveness that required alignment of all the feedback a teacher received about instructional effectiveness to be tied to the same model. Within EEP, all the feedback and coaching a teacher received regarding instructional feedback was directly tied to the distinguishing teacher behaviors demonstrated during direct instruction that separated out effective teachers from less effective teachers. Whether those data points were from routine walkthroughs, quarterly observations, individual coaching, or professional development sessions, the focus was always to move more and more teachers into the effective categories. The continued success of the EEP process is, in large part, a function of this integrated system of feedback that continually focused on reinforcing evidence-based teacher instructional behaviors that have been shown to result in significant student learning growth as measured by the Sanders’ value-added model. The success of EEP has been in part due to the research and work

done by TAP .Several EEP campuses were TAP campuses before becoming a part of the leadership group that created what has been the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) .The work done by NIET and an early report titled the WIDGET REPORT identified a gap between schools and students who were failing while teachers continued to earn high observation scores. The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) adopted six years ago the strong theory that “effective educators can be produced utilizing resources; human and financial, providing voice and input to all educators, identifying and providing extensive supportive services and encouraging collaboration between and with effective educators as a part of a system to improve instruction for students.” What we have learned is that this theory could be made stronger with integrated and consistent messaging and modeling what an effective teacher does in the delivery of direct instruction. In EEP, teacher effectiveness is not a once or twice a year conversation with a focus on financial gain. It is a continuous conversation and consistent focus on effective practices. The logic behind the strong theory is depicted below in the Logic Model Chart for the Educator Effectiveness Process with HCMS .We plan to continue developing the logic model on the HCMS as we utilize the next two (2) years to fully develop the strategic HCMS. Please see additional program design information in the project narrative attachments under letter “b”.

(c) Professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals

identified through the evaluation process (15 points) “*EEP shapes us – we are like a puzzle being put together to be an effective teacher;*” wrote a 2015 campus career teacher as part of an anonymous survey request. This quote is confirmation of the strength the professional development provided to all EEP educators because EEP uses the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator evaluation and support system to identify the professional development needs of individual educators and school. All participating educators have multiple

and diverse ways and means to grow into an effective educator through the vast amount of professional development opportunities provided .Professional development opportunities are managed in three (3) different categories, 1) required job-embedded professional development that occurs on-site at the campus level, 2) EEP mandated professional development provided by the personnel identified in the budget narrative and 3) external professional development provided by the local Regional Service Center, other external vendors selected through a required RFP process and subject-specific professional development related to math, science, reading and writing .1) **Required Job-Embedded Professional Development** is educator training and support that occurs at the campus level allowing for educators to learn where they educate without leaving the campus. This level of professional development is targeted to educators based upon data from teacher observations, walk-throughs and formative and summative student data and occurs during the regular school day during planning periods and scheduled times when students are in electives or extra – curricula activities, during that time teachers have support to spend time learning relevant and robust skills based on data .There are three (3) *current* professional development categories of activities that are the foundation of EEP and required of every educator: i) weekly unit meetings led by teacher leaders (30 throughout the school-year), ii) pre-observation conferences (1 each year) with teacher leaders and iii) post-observation conferences (2 each year) with teacher leaders .There is also Required Job-embedded professional Development for the teacher leaders .Not only do the teacher leaders participate in the three categories of professional development listed above, they are required to participate in a Leadership Team weekly meetings (30 per year) led by the principal and other teacher leaders in order to become more effective educators. Attachment q includes a professional development chart listing all the required Professional Development (a) Current

EEP Job-Embedded Professional Development to be continuous provided through TIF – The Educator Effective Process (EEP) has always included highly structured job-embedded professional development based upon the needs of the teachers, the results of the teacher observations and the data from formative and summative student assessments. The entire description of the job-embedded professional development is comprehensively-detailed so that consistency occurs on every campus .The project narrative attachments include additional information about the job-embedded professional development. 1)Weekly leadership team meetings, 2) Weekly Unit Meetings (PLC’s), 3) walk-throughs with feedback sessions 4) pre conferences (annually), 5) post conferences (three each year.) Please see the attachments for a detailed review of these job embedded professional development opportunities (*See Professional Development Additional Information - part c*). b) New Job-Embedded Professional Development to be added to TIF5 Project

iv) Pre-service induction professional development is training provided to all new teachers as well as teacher new to the LEA. This professional development will include introductory sessions on the EEP process, the professional development opportunities that exists within the LEA and within EEP, the lesson planning process .This process is called EEP 101 .All teachers will receive the EEP 101 on boarding to ensure an understanding of the process so that when participating in walk-throughs, teacher observation, unit meetings and all other professional development they are aware and can become more effective as an educator .**v) Coaching and Mentoring** is a training that will be added to the TIF5 project .All leadership team members including, teacher leaders and principals will receive training on how to coach and mentor teachers to effectiveness (*See Professional Development Additional Information - part c*).The leaders will participate in an active training that will how to communicate teachers, how to

discuss effectiveness, how to approach teachers and how to have tough conversations that are focused on moving teachers to effectiveness. Coaching and mentoring professional development will assist the teacher leaders in becoming more effective in leading teachers and becoming more effective leaders. vi) -Principal Coaching – Principals will be coached on all aspects to assist with the development in the position as the instructional leader in their school. Principal coaching will assist principals to define areas of needs, define goals, day to day challenges, asks questions what improvement will look like, principal perspective and facilitating tough conversations .As the instructional leader of the building principals are charged with being the model of learning and growing as well as being the leader in growing their students through the development of the leaders, teacher leaders, and teachers in their school .This Principal coaching is imperative for the entire school community because it will increase the leadership skills of the principals and success within their school . Current EEP Required Training – Monthly PD Academies- Monthly PD Academies are held once a month for 8 months with all leaders, principals .Superintendents from all the TIF5 project schools .These monthly meetings bring all leaders together from all schools for relevant, robust professional development that focuses on teacher leadership and how or what they can do to move the teachers or to become more effective as leaders .The leaders are able to receive professional development as well as learn from each other .**a** .Summer Institute for Educational Leaders- Summer Institute is a four-day training session that focuses on the gaps identified from the observation systems, and formative and summative student data. Educators get to choice based upon their needs the sessions that will be benefit them most towards becoming more effective.

b .Weekly Visits to School allow for EEP staff to support the campus leaders in all components of the evaluation system by attending unit meetings, leadership meetings and observing pre/post

conferences. EEP staff provides feedback, support, and guidance enabling the campus leaders to gain confidence in leading the evaluation process on their campuses. EEP staff work with campus staff from one – eight hours weekly to ensure that the evaluation system is implemented effectively. New EEP Required Training – a. Annual Campus level reflective/renewal retreats- During the reflection/renewal retreats all LEA’s will have the opportunity to analyze the data from the previous year, create the school plans and unit plans, renewal their commitment to becoming more effective and generally prepare for the upcoming school year. Multiple opportunities will be presented to allow educators to come together and reflect, share and learn from each other. Campus leaders prepare the reflective/renewal retreat agendas and EEP staff review and approve. Current External Professional development – Educators will continue to have opportunities based upon their needs, to increase their content knowledge through that focuses specifically on content, strategies, methods and activities that will help them become more effective educators. Each campus will have up to \$50,000 to contract with for external professional development aligned with each school’s needs. Educators will make data driven decisions to before attending specific training that will assist them with closing their gaps and becoming more effective. In the past, the Conference advancement of Science teachers (CAST) and the Conference for the advancement of Math teachers (CAMT) have been attended by participating educators based upon science and math data per campus. Consisting of over 750 sessions with a focus on content and pedagogy for K-12 teachers as well as curriculum and how to use manipulative effectively, campus leaders will make decisions based upon their needs. LEA’s will have multiple external professional development options to improve the teaching and learning on their campuses. Additional information is in the project narrative attachments.

(d) Quality of the management plan (15 points): The management plan is designed to ensure that the TIF goal/vision of all students having equitable access to effective educators. Classrooms where instruction is robust and relevant, allows students to reach their goals after high school. Three sets of individuals are critical to the successful implementation of this TIF5 project; EEP staff, Campus leadership staff and the newly created LEA Superintendent group, the Texas Education Equity System (TEES) .The management plan will ensure that the project's timelines and deadlines are accomplished within budget and include clearly defined roles, responsibilities, specific timelines and milestones. One of the most critical components of our TIF5 management plan is the EEP and the campus leadership staff that will serve in critical positions germane to the successful management of 100% of this project at the EEP level, the LEA level and at the campus level. The existing staff and the staff to be hired will be chosen very diligently and deliberately in order to ensure that the highest level of oversight is provided to cover all tasks successfully. (1) EEP Staff/Personnel. Youth Empowerment Services, Inc. plans to continue to hire, train, support, and provide 100% of the staff needed to support the TIF project. The staffing pattern and clear lines of responsibility and communication have allowed YES, Inc .to have a singleness of purpose, vision and mission when managing the many facets of the PBCS, evaluations systems and now the HCMS to four (4) independent LEA's operating 13 charter campuses with over 2000 students and over 250 teachers and other professionals. Specifically, the Executive Project Director has been responsible for the hiring, selecting and training of all TIF staff. Then staff is repositioned to train and support each campus' leadership staff and they in turn train and support their career teachers who work directly with students. This staffing model has worked very well during the past six (6) years and we expect this model to continue being effective .The staffing model for TIF personnel and campus extra duty pay is shown in the

attachments .EEP Staff Roles and Responsibilities: Planned staff for this TIF5 project is 18 highly tasked positions that will come under the leadership of the Executive Project Director. Each position is detailed in the budget narrative and only the Executive Project Director and Co-Director positions are described within these pages .The eighteen positions are 1 executive project director, 1 co-director, 1 regional district coordinator, 1 EEP Coordinator for the evaluation and PBCS systems, four executive Expert Teacher leaders, 1 grant manager, 1 budget contract manager, 1 HR/HCMS director, four HCMS specialists, two (2) administrative associates. During the 2011 required scheduled USDE monitoring visit to the EEP project, the project was praised for being fully staffed (and able thus to fulfill all tasks and requirements of the project) and for having staff that met the requirements of the positions. During the USDE regularly-scheduled monitoring visit of 2011, EEP receive two (2) very rare commendations for exemplary performance in the management of the time and efforts reporting and for management of the fiscal reporting. We will continue managing the funds and the program in an exemplary manner. Our staffing plan plans a major role in our ability to manage the TIF5 project in a manner that ensures that all services to the LEA's are delivered in a manner that supports the achievement of all goals and objectives. We will continue our to have a high-profile focus on the selection of EEP staff charged because staffing is a critical component of our management plan as they help to manage the varying and various responsibilities necessary to deliver project goals and objectives to over 200-250 staff including principals and Superintendents. The Executive Project Director (EPD) is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations of all TIF5 evaluation activities, support activities, PBCS activities, and HCMS activities. The current TIF Initiatives have continued to ensure that Educator Effectiveness is the major priority facing San Antonio's charter students and educators with an emphasis on

ensuring that all students have equitable access to effective educators (See Project Evaluation Information - part d). Having seen the magnitude of the difference the 2010 TIF project has had on the targeted charter schools, the Executive Director's role will continue to be the capacity builder, the person to oversee all grant functions and activities for grant staff, and for the four LEA's (4) Texas Education Equity System Superintendents (See Project Evaluation Information - part d). Added to the responsibility of the EPD, is the task of ensuring that the Superintendents are successful at sharing management of assisting in the communication needed to establish a HCMS that is aligned with the vision and the timelines. Resumes and job descriptions are in the Part 5 attachment number 16. The Co-Director will assist the Project Direct in all areas of managing the evaluation system with supports and PBCS the two major components of the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) and in all areas of oversight and management of the HCMS system .The Co-Director will lead and collaborate with TIF staff all professional development academies designed, implemented and created to provide embedded Job Development to all TIF LEA's, the planning and implementation of the LEA-wide educator effective retreats and oversee the HCMS Director, and Evaluation/PBCS Director. Additionally, a major responsibility of the Co-Director will be to provide, training, coaching to principals and to lead principals in implementing with fidelity the evaluation with supports processes and the PBCS. (2) TIF5 Specific Objectives and Timelines .The timelines presented within this session are designed to ensure that 100% of the milestones for implementing the goals and objectives of this TIF project are met with a focus on the shared instructional vision of "ensuring that all students have equitable access to effective educators in all classrooms". The four (4) major milestones to be achieved over the five-year project are described below. Following the four major milestones are

the detailed timelines that will lead to the achievement of the four major milestones. Evaluation Milestone – By the end of each year, 1) all teachers (new and returning) would have been observed no less than three times from principals and teacher leaders with appropriate pre and post observation conferences used as professional development opportunities, 2) teacher leaders would have completed 30 weekly unity meetings and 30 leadership team meetings with follow-up walk-throughs with feedback that has been supported with, 3) coaching and mentoring sessions designed to ensure that all teachers receive support to continue reinforcing the effective teacher practice and refining the teacher practices that required more robust and relevant implementation into the teacher’s daily practice. Professional Development Milestone – By the end of each year, 1) all teachers and teacher leaders would have utilized the results from the observations and the walkthroughs with feedback to... a) schedule all teachers for coaching and mentoring designed to assist in the educator becoming more effective, b) schedule all teachers for professional development sessions that are based upon the data from the teacher observations, c) schedule LEA-wide PD for the external vendors based upon the teacher observation data, ensured that 100% of the required teacher leaders have fully participating in the EEP required monthly PD academies, summer institutes and the campus led reflective retreats. PBCS Milestone – To ensure that effective educators are compensated at differentiated rates, by the end of year one, all teachers, principals and Superintendents will have completed all observations/evaluations, received all linked value-added data and be actively participating in the PBCS with compensation for payouts based upon the revised PBCS model (*See Adequacy of Resources Additional Information - part e*). By the end of year two, all other professionals including assistant principals, academic deans, special education and ELL directors, career and college counselors, social workers and professional student support staff will have been included

in the PBCS based upon their observations results. HCMS Milestone – By end of year one, all teachers and principals will be a part of STEP 1 of the HCMS by being including in the BASE PAY System. By the beginning of year two, all educator positions including teachers, principals, Superintendents and all others, are including the 's HCMS so that all nine initiatives are fully implemented and lead to a salary structure based upon effectiveness and differentiated pay for the most effective educators. By the beginning of year three, all educators will be included in a strategic HCMS designed to ensure that the most effective educators are compensated differentially .What follows is summary of the major objectives, milestones, and timelines.

#	Milestones Obj.	Major Timelines – Occurring Annually	Begin Act.	End Activity
1	Implement EEP evaluation system with supports within each of the LEA's qualifying campuses in order to ensure that all students have equitable access to effective educators.	1 .EEP staff works with campuses to interview and select teacher leaders.	August, 2016	August, 2016
		2 .EEP staff assists campus leaders in using their prior observations and student data to create their annual school plans, observation schedules, weekly unit and weekly leadership schedules.	August, 2016	August, 2016
		3 .EEP staff assists each campus in introducing the EEP Evaluation System and with supports to all educators.	August, 2016	August, 2016
		4 .EEP staff train and certify all observers in the observation process and the walk-through process	August, 2016	August, 2016
		6 .Campus staff begins teacher and principal observations activities including walk-throughs with coaching feedback.	September, 2016	March, 2017
		9 .EEP staff assists Principals in their mid-year reviews using the	January, 2017	February, 2017

		Implementation Rubric		
		10 .EEP staff complete campus summative review using the Implementation Rubric	May, 2017	June, 2017
2.	Provide multiple highly structured professional development activities based upon teacher observations feedback, coaching, mentoring and student data.	1 .EEP staff observes the campus leaders pre and post observation conferences and walk-through feedback sessions using the EEP protocols to ensure that professional development happens for each educator being observed	September, 2016	March, 2017
		2 .Campus leaders schedule professional development sessions, create weekly unit plans using data from teacher observation, and analyze student data.	September, 2016	March, 2016
		3 .EEP staff presents six monthly Professional Development Academies using data from campus visits, teacher observation data and school data .	October, 2016	March, 2016
		4 .Campus leaders complete RFP process for their Professional Development Contracts .	September, 2016	September, 2016
		5 .Principal utilizes coaching services.	October, 2016	May, 2017
		6 .Campus staff begins weekly unit and leadership meetings using data to make decisions.	September, 2016	April, 2017
		7 .EEP staff completes RFP processes for Principal Coach&Mentor Contracts	September, 2016	September, 2016
		8 .EEP staff begins visits to campuses to observe and support their weekly unit and leadership meetings and their walk through observations.	September, 2016	March, 2017

		9 .EEP staff presents Summer Institute based upon data collected during the school year from observations, coaching and mentoring, testing data.	June/July, 2017	June/July, 2017
		10 .Campus staff presents their reflective / renewal educator retreats.	July, 2017	July, 2017
3.	PBCS – Use the evaluation and student results to present PBCS payments to effective educators including Superintendents.	1 .Complete RFP process for vendor assistance with creating Superintendents Evaluation System	September, 2016	September, 2016
		2 .Obtain USDE approval of Superintendent Evaluation System	November, 2016	November, 2016
		3 .Implement Superintendent Eval .Sys	De ber, '16	November'17
		4.Ensure all educators have had input into improvements to the PBCS including all changes and upgrades by scheduling LEA-wide information sessions.	November, 2016	De ber, 2016
		5 .Make adjustments as needed using information gathered during information sessions, from the surveys and from the Texas Education Equity System (TEES) decisions.	De ber, 2016	January, 2016
		6 .Link teacher and student data in preparation for value-added analysis activities	March, 2017	June, 2017
		7 .Submit data for value-added analysis activities and have vendor conduct value-added analysis activities	July, 2017	November, 2017
		8 .Prepare and present first PBCS payout based upon observation data.	November, 2017	November, 2017
		9 .Prepare PBCS payouts based upon	December,	January,

		observation data to ensure reliability and validity in a review of all value added reports presented for campus-wide scores and teacher s scores	2017	2018
		10.Make 2 nd PBCS payout – value-added	February, 18	February, 18
Include “other professionals” in the PBCS processes based upon the approved evaluation systems.	11 .Utilize vendor who helped created Superintendent’s evaluation system to create the “other professional” evaluation systems, including assistant principals, academic deans, counselors, special education and other directors.	January, 2017	June, 2017	
	12 .Obtain USDE approval on “other professional” evaluation systems.	July, 2017	August, 2017	
	13 .Implement evaluation system leading to PBCS for all other professionals	September 2017	November 2018	
	14 .Payout to other professionals	November‘18	November18	
4. Implement a strategic, comprehensive HCMS to aligns with the vision of ensuring all students have equitable access to effective educators .	1 .Complete HCMS RFP process to help create strategic HCMS process	October, 2016	November, 2016	
	2 .Implement Base Pay for T and P	November, 16	November,16	
	3 .Follow HCMS Communication Plan detailed on page 27 by establish LEA campus teacher advisory counsels	January, 2017	June, 2017	
	4 .Finalize HCMS Plan for approval by all LEA educators including teachers, principals, Superintendents and other professionals	December, 17	December 2017	
	5 .Implement HCMS Plan with all effectiveness measures.	August 2018	November 2019	
	6 .Complete HCMS salary adjustments	November‘19	November19	
	7 .Continue implementing the EEP	December ‘19	October, ‘21	

		evaluation system with professional development supports, the PBCS and the HCMS		
--	--	---	--	--

(e) ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES (10 POINTS) (1) Stakeholder Involvement in PBCS. As

described in the first sentence of this Project Narrative, 100% of the educators to be served by TIF5, have unanimously signed their agreement to participate, participated in surveys and gave input into the development of the PBCS. Please see the project narrative attachment letter “I”.

There are no unions that exist in the targeted LEA’s and every educator had equal opportunity to provide input. The EEP PBCS has been created, developed and implemented successfully for the past six (6) years with input from both teachers and school leaders. The success of our collaboration is evidenced by 100% of the original participating LEA’s continuing for the entire six years of the original TIF funded evaluation and PBCS system. Each year, teachers and school leaders have provided input through the monthly professional development sessions, the monthly Superintendent meetings and the annual Summer Institutes. Surveys, questionnaires, workshop sessions, and feedback from the weekly, monthly and annual sessions provided the EEP staff with the necessary information to continue to implement and improve the USDE approved PBCS. The commitment attachment includes comments, letters and a sampling of the survey results that attest to the evidence that input from teachers and school leaders has been provided and used for implementing the PBCS and their readiness to continue the PBCS as we transition into the implementation of the HCMS. Specifically for this TIF5 project, over 1200 participant hours between March and June 2016 were spent focusing on critiquing and improving the evaluation systems with support and the PBCS. Superintendent meetings (168 hours) and teacher leaders meetings (1000 hours) were held between March and June 2016 for the purpose of refining the PBCS the sign-in sheets are included in the mandatory attachments. The newly

designed PBCS pictorial is included in the project narrative attachment a and showcases the changes that came from the recommendations of educators. Sign-in sheets from the input-gathering meetings, along with the feedback comments from the meetings are in the attachments. The commitment attachment includes letters and comments from educators satisfied with their involvement in the process. **(2) Sustainability Plan.** The TIF5 budget fully supports the implementation of all planned services and activities of the PBCS, evaluation system with supports and the HCMS ensuring that 100% of the services, activities, events, trainings, and implementation of a strategic HCMS can occur per the goals and objectives and the timelines. The \$800,000.00 worth in-kind support from the LEA is a strong has committed significant non-TIF resources to support this TIF5 project during and after the grant period. The budget narrative details the TIF resources to be used to fully implement the TIF5. Sustainability of the TIF project will be a primary focus of the Executive Project Director working together with the Superintendents along with the staff person tasked with coordinating all of the sustainability efforts. A major task of the sustainability expert will be to assist the LEA's in using average daily attendance rate of students, including increasing enrollment and increasing retention rates to generate additional funds. Each LEA is fully prepared to work very hard to close the gap in order to support the sustainability and continued implementation of the PBCS, evaluation system with supports and now the HCMS. **(3) Integration of Similar Efforts.** Each of the participating LEA's have one or more schools part of the Texas Priority School project over the past five years and has allocated funds to continue EEP. EEP has been a significant, integrated component of each campus' school improvement plan during the past six years. This year the State of Texas required campuses to choose the evaluation system to be used and 100% of the EEP campuses choose to stay with the EEP evaluation system.