

## Scope of Work

**M**easurement Incorporated welcomes this opportunity to respond to the Calcasieu Parish School System (CPSS) Request for Proposal to evaluate the **Professionally Rewarding Outcomes and Growth \* Raising Effectiveness and Student Success (PROGRESS)** funded through the Teacher Incentive Fund grant (TIF 4). As a nationally recognized research organization, MI has more than three decades of experience implementing high-quality evaluations in some of our nation's most complex environments. Our *Program Evaluation and School Improvement Services* division has successfully completed more than 2,000 studies at the federal, state, and local levels, and has a 40-year history helping educational agencies to advance their practice through superior work. MI's relevant qualifications include the following:

- Since 2007, MI has served as the external evaluator of the Partnership for Innovation in Compensation for Charter Schools (PICCS) project, a **TIF grantee** located in New York City and serving 10 charter schools. In 2010, MI was selected as the evaluator for two additional TIF-funded PICCS projects located in Buffalo, NY and New York City.
- In November 2012, MI was awarded the external evaluation contracts for two TIF Round 4 grantees – a new cohort of charter schools in New York City, and a consortium of charter schools in Newark, New Jersey.
- MI also is evaluating **TIF-funded** projects in Maryland—the Prince Georges County Public Schools FIRST program (Round 3) and the Washington County Public Schools POWER program (Round 3)—as well as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) *Schools for Excellence* TIF initiative (also Round 3), which is being implemented by 5 high-need rural districts in Maine and the Richmond Public Schools, Virginia school district.
- MI assisted the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to assess the challenges states face in designing **statewide teacher and principal evaluation systems** aligned with best practice.
- MI has strong capacity for developing and implementing **rigorous research methods** to conduct formative and summative evaluations. We specialize in the use of mixed-methods evaluation designs, and have the ability to collect, store, and transmit highly confidential data through multiple formats and media.
- MI has a solid reputation for **collaborating with and engaging SEA and LEA stakeholders** in all phases of the evaluative process: from the development of the evaluation plan, to the design of data collection instruments, to the analysis and sharing of results.
- MI has a distinguished track record of **providing quality products and reports** to all types of clients in a timely manner. We work closely with our clients to ensure that findings and recommendations are valid, reliable, and, above all, useful.

Given this background, MI is keenly aware of the goals and objectives of performance-based compensation systems and how an evaluation must be shaped to accommodate the diverse ways that schools/districts implement these systems as they strive to improve educator effectiveness and, ultimately, advance student performance. Below we present our understanding of TIF, PROGRESS, and the purpose of the evaluation.

## Understanding TIF and PROGRESS

Research shows that good teaching matters. Indeed, some studies suggest that having a very good teacher for several years in a row can close the achievement gap. Yet, while researchers agree on the importance of teacher quality for student outcomes, there are serious disagreements about what constitutes an effective teacher. The debate has intensified in recent years with concerns about widespread teacher shortages and the pressure to have a “highly qualified” teacher in every class. In an effort to meet the demand for more teachers and to attract and retain top talent, interest in alternative teacher compensation programs has grown. The large federal investment in the *Teacher Incentive Fund* (TIF) exemplifies this increased attention. Created by Congress in 2006, TIF initially provided \$99 million in competitive grants to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems in high-need schools. Today, TIF is almost a \$900 million program, with more than 150 grantees. Currently, under TIF 4, there are different requirements for the general TIF competition grant and grants under the TIF competition with a STEM Focus. Applicants in both areas are required to address the following priorities: 1) an LEA-wide Human Capital Management System (HCMS) with educator evaluation systems at the center. An HCMS is defined as "a system by which an LEA makes and implements human capital decisions, such as decisions on recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, compensation, professional development, tenure, and promotion," 2) an LEA-wide educator evaluation systems based, in significant part, on student growth, 3) improve student achievement in STEM, 4) new or rural applicants to the TIF, and 5) an educator salary structure based on effectiveness. It is the only federal funding stream dedicated to experimenting with alternatives to the uniform salary schedule and learning how to improve teacher compensation practices throughout the country.

**The Calcasieu Parish School System and PROGRESS.** Located in Lake Charles, Louisiana, Calcasieu Parish School System (CPSS) serves a diverse student population of over 30,000 students in 57 schools (15 elementary, 6 middle, and 3 high schools) of which 19 are PROGRESS schools. About 60% of CPSS students and 84% of PROGRESS students are eligible to receive free and reduced meals. Significant numbers of CPSS students struggle to meet the state standards. On the 2011 Performance Index, the district overall received a grade of C (score 101.9), while a majority of PROGRESS schools compared to non-PROGRESS schools received Ds and Cs. Although, the percentage of students achieving Basic or above on State Assessments increased in 2012, CPSS declined in the overall state achievement ranking from 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>. CPSS also has difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers including STEM and, on average, teachers have less than 5 years of experience in teaching at PROGRESS schools.

To remedy these needs, CPSS applied for a TIF grant in 2012 to support the design and implementation of the **Professionally Rewarding Outcomes and Growth\* Raising Effectiveness and Student Success**. PROGRESS aspires to combine the ongoing state improvement efforts directives aimed at teacher evaluations and the statewide implementation of a value-added assessment (VAM) model in current school year (Act 54, 2010 and Act 1, 2012). Specifically, PROGRESS aims to meet the following goals: (1) create and implement a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) that increases educator effectiveness and student achievement, (2) create and implement a rigorous, valid, and reliable teacher evaluation system, (3) create and implement a research-based, data-driven professional improvement plan that provides every educator with the opportunities to succeed, (4) ensure long-term sustainability of the newly developed HCMS and professional improvement plan, and (5) improve student achievement and foster student interest in STEM disciplines. The following components serve as strategic levers for addressing these goals:

- **Human Capital Management System.** CPSS will develop an effective human capital system by developing strategies for recruiting, retaining, and developing an effective workforce that includes STEM teachers that will help in not only reducing attrition in the district but also in retaining talent and encouraging educators to teach in high-need schools within the district.
- **Student Growth Measures.** PROGRESS uses a variety of formative, criterion-referenced and norm-references assessments to measure student growth. These assessments are integral to the COMPASS (the state mandated performance management system) which will use VAM student growth data for rating teachers and principals. Student growth assessment measures include the following: (a) state standardized assessment in Grades 3-8- the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and Integrated LEAP or iLEAP, and Graduation Exit Exam (GEE) and End-of-Course (EOC) for grades 10 and 11. Freshmen entering high school in the 2010-11 school year and thereafter will not take the GEE. These students must pass three End-of-Course (EOC) tests in the following categories: English II or English III, Algebra I or Geometry, and Biology or American History. In 2014-15, Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) will be fully implemented. In addition, teacher portfolios will be developed to assess non-tested grades and subjects (NTGs) for student growth measures.
- **Differentiated Incentives.** PROGRESS includes incentives to differentially reward teachers and principals via PBCS including (a) sign-on bonuses to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers; and (b) additional compensation for assuming higher-level leadership responsibilities such as instructional coach, mentor, and staff development trainer in core subjects and STEM. The performance incentives for teachers include these stages: Highly Effective or Effective Proficient will receive \$3,000 or \$1,000, respectively, while administrators rating Highly Effective or Effective Proficient will receive \$5,000 or \$2,000, respectively. An additional \$500 will be given to teachers and other personnel for successfully facilitative PLCs or for allowing their classrooms to be “demonstrative classrooms,” and for developing PDs for CPSS. There are additional incentives for STEM teachers who transfer to high-needs PROGRESS schools or for contributing to STEM portion of the PD website.
- **Comprehensive Professional Evaluation.** A key component of PROGRESS is a transparent evaluation system, which focuses both on improving practice and student learning. The teacher and principal component of this system comprises two formal observations. This includes one formal announced visit including a pre and post conference and a second informal observation which is an aggregate of walk-throughs to identify competencies of the observed. This component comprises 50% of the evaluation. Principal effectiveness is based on an evaluation instrument based on

components such as promoting student growth, collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement, and ability to support students with special needs. These will be completed by the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) directors. CPSS has adopted Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* for qualitative measures of teacher effectiveness which will comprise the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of teacher evaluation.

- **Professional Development System.** All PROGRESS teachers and principals are provided with a series of opportunities in summer and throughout the year for professional growth to deepen their knowledge and skills. PLCs will be developed throughout the district for sharing and cross collaboration between educators. PLCs will be facilitated by Leadership Specialists and Leadership mentors to target critical needs. PD will be aligned with LA's Framework of Teaching, the LA Leadership Competencies, CCSS, critical needs, and research-based practices. STEM teachers will participate in targeted PDs that will adopt 2014 "Next Generation Science Standards." STEM Master Teachers will actively provide demonstration classrooms and lessons at elementary and middle schools and modeling and co-teaching in high schools.

## Purpose of the Evaluation

In accordance with the TIF grant, CPSS is required to conduct an external evaluation of PROGRESS. MI recognizes that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the district's progress toward achieving project goals and objectives, with a particular focus on two key questions: (1) To what extent is PROGRESS achieving its goals and objectives during the grant period, particularly the implementation of the HCMS and how components of the PROGRESS model help to inform human capital decisions and (2) How are students achieving in PROGRESS schools? Of particular interest is an assessment of the coherence of the HCMS, or the extent to which schools are able to align human capital decisions to improve educator effectiveness and, ultimately, student learning.

We also understand that CPSS is interested in learning about the progress of PROGRESS implementation including teacher/principal understanding of and commitment to the program. To meet these needs, our evaluation will feature a comprehensive design that adheres to rigorous research standards. We will employ a data-driven mixed methods approach ensuring that judgments about PROGRESS impact are grounded in reliable and objective data. Finally, we will allow ample time and opportunity for discussions with the PROGRESS/TIF grant staff in keeping with our collaborative evaluation philosophy. We are confident that our approach will translate CPSS's vision for the evaluation into solid and effective action.

## Evaluation Approach

MI's approach to the evaluation is explained in the following four sections: Evaluation Design, Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting.

### A. Evaluation Design

From our perspective, three activities are central to preparing a sound evaluation design: (1) identifying key questions to guide the evaluation; (2) constructing an evaluation/logic model to organize the key questions; and (3) specifying a research design to determine program impact. In

essence, the evaluation of PROGRESS will be conducted at both formative and summative levels. The formative evaluation will be ongoing across the first two years of the grant which will help in assessing the fidelity of implementation during the planning and first year of the grant while impact evaluation in years 3-5 years of the grant will enable to measure the effect/s of PROGRESS on student achievement.

## 1. Key Questions

Consistent with the goals and objectives of PROGRESS, MI's work will be guided by a set of key questions identified in **Exhibit 1**.

### Exhibit 1. Key Questions to Guide the PROGRESS Evaluation

Evaluation Questions
<i>Program Implementation</i>
1. How was PROGRESS introduced and received in the schools? To what extent did all school stakeholders—including board members—understand (a) the PROGRESS model; (b) the basics of an aligned human capital management system; and (c) the relationship between PROGRESS and an aligned HCMS? To what extent did PROGRESS provide a full range of professional development and support services to principals and teachers to help them acquire and use effective leadership and instructional practices? What was the fidelity of PROGRESS implementation? Were some PROGRESS components implemented more effectively and with greater fidelity than others? What was the breadth and depth of implementation across schools? To what extent are schools implementing the PROGRESS model as designed and envisioned by CPSS? What is the scope and quality of implementation in terms of the following components: (a) HCMS (b) differentiated incentives that give significant weight to student growth; (c) transparent teacher/principal evaluation systems; and (d) high-quality staff development? Are some PROGRESS components implemented more effectively than others?
2. What district/school factors promote the successful implementation of PROGRESS? What factors impede successful implementation? How are obstacles to implementation overcome?
3. To what extent do participating teachers, principals, and other staff find PROGRESS to be effective in (a) improving teaching and leadership practices; (b) increasing the proportion of highly qualified teachers in hard-to-staff positions, STEM; (c) retaining/reducing the attrition rate of highly qualified teachers and principals; (d) successfully improving instructional practices upon receiving PDs, and (e) improving student achievement? Do all staff members have a common understanding of PROGRESS? How satisfied are they with the program, overall, and with specific components: tiered incentives, staff development, evaluation system?
<i>Program Impact</i>
1. To what extent has CPSS achieved the stated goals for PROGRESS: (a) increase student achievement in core content areas; (b) improve upon the Career Ladder VAM to better reflect student achievement; (c) recruit and retain effective teachers and principals; and (d) develop a more comprehensive staff development approach focused on individual student achievement data?
2. What changes have occurred in teaching and leadership practices because of PROGRESS? Have CPSS teachers/principals acquired the knowledge and skills needed to improve student performance?
3. What is the relationship between PROGRESS implementation and impact in PROGRESS goal areas? Are some PROGRESS components more effective than others in improving student achievement, teacher recruitment, and teacher and principal retention?
4. Compared with Career Ladder, what aspects of PROGRESS have proven to be most effective? What aspects of PROGRESS need strengthening?
5. What strategies have been put in place to assure the sustainability of PROGRESS?

## 2. Evaluation Model

The evaluation model we propose for PROGRESS is an **inputs-process-outcomes** model that represents what research has told us about the determinants of educational change. Shown in **Exhibit 2**, the model posits that the impact of PROGRESS on students is dependent upon improvements in schools and teachers, including improved leadership, school climate, recruitment practices, teacher retention, attitudes/expectations, instructional practices, etc. The model further indicates that both student and school/teacher impacts are influenced by program implementation: how well schools adhere to the core components of PROGRESS. Finally, the model indicates that program processes and impact are influenced by certain “inputs.” Two clusters of input variables are identified: (1) characteristics of the targeted schools and (2) implementation support variables.

This conceptual framework will tell us how to structure data analysis and reporting in a way that provides rich and powerful information about PROGRESS. Not only will this information enable us to answer the key research questions, it also will help us to identify important relationships and how they interact to promote or impede the successful implementation and impact of PROGRESS.

**Exhibit 2. Conceptual Model for the PROGRESS Evaluation**

Inputs	→ Process	→ Short-Term Impacts	→ Long-Term Impacts
<b>School Characteristics</b> - Organizational Capacity - Professional Capacity - Instructional Capacity  <b>Implementation Support</b> - Training/TA - Resources - Collaboration	<b>Program Implementation</b> - Scope - Quality - Valuing/Receptivity - Obstacles	<b>Improved School Practices</b> - Instructional Leadership - School Climate - Professional Culture - Teacher Recruitment/Retention  <b>Improved Teacher Practices</b> - Classroom Practices • Planning and Preparation • Class Management • Instructional Strategies • Professional Duties	<b>Improved Student Performance</b> - Achievement - Attendance - Promotion/Grade Retention - Dropout Rate  <b>Consistency of Effects</b> - By Type of Student - By Content Area - By School  <b>Program Sustainability</b>



## 3. Research Design

It is always MI’s goal to implement a highly rigorous evaluation that yields unbiased estimates of program impact. But as we are rarely in a position to conduct a randomized trial, we attempt to approximate high rigor by using a series of quasi-experimental designs. This will be the case

with the PROGRESS evaluation. Used in combination, our proposed designs will allow us to draw **plausible inferences about program effectiveness**.

- **Norm-Referenced Design.** In a norm-referenced design, normative data are used to substitute for data from a comparison group. The “no-treatment expectation” is that students will maintain their standing with respect to the norm group from pre- to posttest. In other words, in the absence of a special project or “treatment,” the expected pre-post standard score/percentile rank change is zero. *If*, however, students participated in a special program *and* the program was effective, the expected pre-post score change would be significantly greater than zero. We will use the norm-referenced design to assess the performance of CPSS students on the LEAP, iLEAP and other assessments<sup>1</sup> reading, language, and mathematics tests. To do so, we will examine student performance trends over an eight-year time period: three years prior to PROGRESS implementation (pretest) and five years after the introduction of the program in the district (posttest). If CPSS students achieve significantly higher scores/percentile ranks during the posttest period than the pretest period, this would be suggestive of PROGRESS<sup>2</sup> impact. **The trend analysis also will provide an indication of the value added by PROGRESS.**
- **Levels of Implementation Design.** In this factorial design, MI will use “levels of program implementation” as the independent variable for determining the impact of PROGRESS on student achievement. Here, PROGRESS principals and teachers will be assigned an aggregate implementation score based on available (non-confidential) evaluation data and data we propose to collect via principal and teacher surveys. This score will be used to classify schools/teachers into high- and low-implementing groups. Once the groups are formed, we will compare the achievement outcomes of students within the groups using appropriate statistical techniques.
- **Benchmark Design.** This descriptive design uses state or district benchmarks as a basis for judging program effects. We will use it in two ways: (1) to determine the extent to which CPSS schools have met annual performance targets for PROGRESS across all objectives; and (2) to compare the proficiency status of CPSS students and schools pre- and post PROGRESS implementation.
  1. *To determine the extent to which CPSS schools have met annual performance targets for PROGRESS across all objectives.* For achievement-related objectives, we will
    - (a) examine the baseline performance of each school on the state standardized assessments to determine if schools, on an annual basis, have increased the percentage of students that met or exceeded the state standards in mathematics, reading, and writing by 1%;
    - (b) examine the Performance Index of select schools to determine movement across the Improvement labels (A to D); and (c) examine the achievement profile of the 21 schools to determine if each school has met the 2015 goal of having an achievement profile in the Excelling and Highly Performing range.
  2. *To compare the proficiency status of CPSS students and schools pre- and post PROGRESS implementation.* We will calculate aggregate proficiency percentages on the state assessment for each school—and district wide—over an eight-year time period, pre- and post PROGRESS implementation; this will be done by grade level and content area: mathematics, reading, and writing. A significant change in pre-post performance trends—proficiency status and label categories—with students/schools moving from a lower to higher performance category—would

<sup>1</sup> This design can be implemented for CPSS students in grades 3 and 9 and for students in grades 3-9 for the LEAP.

<sup>2</sup> This assumes that CPSS students were not exposed to another intervention during the treatment period that could account for their achievement gains.

be suggestive of PROGRESS effectiveness. As a further means of judging PROGRESS effectiveness, aggregate achievement percentages also can be computed for similar comparison schools and the state, as a whole, during the same pre-post time frame, although we recognize that PROGRESS staff may find it more beneficial to focus on within district results.

## B. Data Collection

MI's proposed data collection methods for the evaluation are summarized in **Exhibit 3**. Four factors are noteworthy in our approach: (1) we will collect data from different sources to provide multiple perspectives on the evaluation questions (i.e., **data triangulation**); (2) we will build upon, not duplicate, existing data to minimize disruptions to ongoing operations; (3) we will use a judicious blend of quantitative and qualitative data, incorporating stringent quality control procedures; and (4) we will take steps to ensure **strict confidentiality** of all data collected. All instruments and procedures will be submitted to CPSS for review and approval before use.

### Exhibit 3. Proposed Data Collection Procedures for the PROGRESS Evaluation

Instrument/Procedure	Description
<p><b>Document Review</b> <i>Timeline:</i> Conducted within the first month of notice to proceed.</p>	<p>As an initial step in data collection, our research staff will conduct a thorough review and assessment of the existing descriptive information base. Documents to be reviewed include the TIF grant application, website postings, minutes of planning meetings, press releases, monitoring reports from ED, and correspondence between PROGRESS staff members. This review not only will furnish relevant information on the evaluation questions, it will also help us to identify information gaps that must be addressed through new data collection instruments. An internal review form organized around the variables in the evaluation model will guide our review of the material.</p>
<p><b>Educator Surveys</b> <i>Timeline:</i> Administered in March-April of 2013, and every spring thereafter. <i>Sampling:</i> Administered to all principals, other administrators, and teachers in the six schools.</p>	<p>We propose to develop and administer two surveys—web-based if possible—a Teacher Survey and a Principal Survey. These surveys will be the primary tools for capturing quantitative data on selected process and impact variables shown in the evaluation. The <b>Teacher Survey</b> will assess background characteristics of teachers, school organizational features, PROGRESS implementation, teaching practices, teacher attitudes (about PROGRESS, VAM, in general, teacher evaluations, staff development, and the compensation received), perceived changes in students, and the value added by PROGRESS over and above the Career Ladder .</p> <p>The <b>Principal Survey</b> will target many of the same variables for triangulation purposes, with a special focus on school-level processes and outcomes. We also will probe more deeply principals' reactions to PROGRESS as compared with Career Ladder to better understand what features of PROGRESS are most effective and what may need to be revised to achieve greater results.</p>
<p><b>District-Level Interviews/Visits and Attendance at PROGRESS Staff Meetings</b> <i>Timeline:</i> Conducted in April in 2012, and every spring thereafter. Note: We plan to spend a week in the state each year to conduct</p>	<p>The interviews/visits will be a major source for capturing activities that took place during the planning year. Conducted onsite and, if needed, by telephone, the interviews will probe the key questions related to program development/start-up including involvement of stakeholders, decisions made in designing the “new” VAM, outreach to schools, and professional development for teachers and administrators. To augment the interviews we also plan to <b>attend relevant PROGRESS/TIF grant staff meetings</b> to</p>

Instrument/Procedure	Description
<p>district and school site visits. We will attempt to arrange the visits to coincide with relevant meetings of the PROGRESS/TIF grant staff.</p> <p><i>Sampling:</i> Members of the PROGRESS/TIF grant staff: the project manager, central office staff and administrators, and union leaders.</p>	<p>enable us to see, first hand, the issues confronting CPSS as it moves forward with PROGRESS implementation. While it is our hope to be able to physically attend a staff meeting during our site visit, we are committed to participating in all relevant meetings of the PROGRESS/TIF grant staff, virtually.</p>
<p><b>School-Based Site Visits</b></p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Conducted in April in 2012, and every spring thereafter.</p> <p><i>Sampling:</i> Staff from all six schools: principals and other administrators, teachers, other staff, and coaches/mentors.</p>	<p>MI will augment the survey data by conducting site visits in all targeted schools. The goal of the visits will be to gather detailed information about PROGRESS implementation; levels of satisfaction with program components; opinions about PROGRESS; and perceptions of change in schools, classroom practices, and student performance. We will be especially interested in learning about teacher understanding and use of new and/or innovative instructional practices and how these and other practices contribute to improved student outcomes. The site visits will involve semi-structured interviews with building principals and other administrators; focus group and/or individual interviews with PROGRESS teachers, and other faculty; and classroom observation. The interviews and observations will be guided by carefully constructed protocols.</p>
<p><b>Electronic Databases</b></p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Data extracted for a period encompassing three years before PROGRESS implementation and every spring after implementation.</p> <p><i>Sampling:</i> All PROGRESS schools. Our interest will be both schoolwide data and individual teacher/student data.</p>	<p>MI will extract relevant data from the CPSS data management system (e.g., COMPASS) and other district databases including student/school assessment data, student/school demographic characteristics, student attendance, grade promotion/retention, and dropout rates. We will also extract data on teachers: demographics, credentials, years of experience, certification, teaching assignment, migration and transfers, salaries, retention rates, and scores on the teacher evaluation rubric. <i>Note:</i> MI will adhere to <b>strict data security procedures</b> in extracting and storing the data, specifically the privacy, confidentiality, and suppression rules associated with CPSS data access.</p>

## C. Analysis

To provide CPSS with objective evidence to answer the key research questions, MI will design and implement a systematic analysis process for reviewing, analyzing, and presenting the data. The analysis will consist of three steps.

**Step 1: Synthesize Quantitative and Qualitative Data.** As a first step, MI will develop a set of specifications to guide the analysis. Our goal will be to integrate data from the various data collection methods in order to address the key questions. The initial treatment of the quantitative data will involve the calculation of descriptive statistics. To analyze the qualitative data gathered during site visits and interviews our researchers will use content analysis techniques.

**Step 2: Identify Factors that Affect Program Implementation and Impact.** This evaluation is based on a conceptual model that links student impacts with PROGRESS processes, intermediate outcomes, and context/input variables. To study the relationship among these variables—and

specifically to identify the various components of PROGRESS that most account for improved student outcomes—we will run a series of regression models. The models will be structured such that only statistically significant predictors of the dependent variables will be included in the equations.

**Step 3: Evaluate Data Based on Rigorous Statistical Analysis.** Previously, we discussed three designs for answering the summative evaluation questions: (1) norm-referenced design, (2) levels of implementation design, and (3) benchmark design. Each of these strategies requires a different, robust analytic technique, which we summarize in **Exhibit 4**.

#### Exhibit 4. Summary of Analysis Procedures for the PROGRESS Evaluation

Purpose	Analysis Procedures
<p><b><i>Norm-Referenced Design</i></b></p> <p>To compare the outcomes of students exposed to PROGRESS with the age-appropriate norm group on the grade 3 and 9 and Non testes grades.</p>	<p>The basic statistical model is a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), with time (pre/post) and student background (e.g., grade, race/ethnicity, school) serving as the independent variables and the Stanford 10 standard scores in reading, language, and mathematics serving as the dependent variables. A significant main effect for time would suggest that PROGRESS made an impact in increasing student achievement (assuming students were not exposed to other interventions that could result in similar achievement gains). A significant interaction would suggest a differential program effect for grade, race/ethnicity, and school.</p>
<p><b><i>Levels of Implementation Design</i></b></p> <p>To compare student impacts in schools with higher and lower levels of PROGRESS implementation.</p>	<p>The basic statistical model is ANOVA, following these steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Categorize PROGRESS schools and teachers into “high” and “low” implementing groups based on implementation scores derived from the teacher and principal surveys and other relevant data.</li> <li>2. Statistically compare the achievement—of students in the “high” and “low” groups using analysis of variance.</li> <li>3. Descriptively compare the outcomes of teachers (e.g., retention, quality) in the “high” and “low” schools.</li> </ol>
<p><b><i>Benchmark Design</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To determine the extent to which CPSS schools have met annual performance targets across all PROGRESS objectives; and</li> <li>2. To compare the proficiency status of CPSS students and schools pre- and post PROGRESS implementation.</li> </ol>	<p>The basic approach for #1 is a descriptive comparison of school-level and districtwide results against annual performance targets. For #2, the steps are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Calculate aggregate proficiency percentages and LA labels for each PROGRESS school on state achievement tests; do this by grade level and content area over an eight-year time period covering pre-post PROGRESS years.</li> <li>2. Descriptively and statistically compare the pre-post trends.</li> <li>3. Analyze other student data—attendance rates, grade promotion/retention, dropout rates—and compare trends over time, pre-post PROGRESS implementation. Compare CPSS results with those of similar schools and with state averages.</li> <li>5. Analyze teacher retention rates and teacher qualification indicators for PROGRESS schools and district wide; compare</li> </ol>

Purpose	Analysis Procedures
	CPSS results over time, with comparison schools, and with state averages.

## D. Reporting

### Communicating with CPSS

MI prides itself in its ability to build and maintain an open flow of communication with our clients and respond quickly to their needs. We believe that our credibility, in large measure, depends on our being able to secure the confidence of our clients through **continuous and flexible interaction**. For CPSS, this means that our team not only will attend relevant PROGRESS staff meetings (physically and virtually), but also will be reachable for consultation when needed by telephone, email, and teleconference. In all cases, we will provide timely responses to requests for information from the PROGRESS/TIF grant project manager.

### Reporting and Dissemination

MI will share the evaluation results with the PROGRESS/TIF grant staff and other important stakeholders through a variety of communication channels including quarterly reports, which will update staff on activities conducted during the prior quarter. MI's sophisticated documentation and monitoring procedures will enable us to share important quarterly milestones in a timely fashion, including progress in instrument development, data collection, data analysis, and early findings. A list of anticipated evaluation milestones appears in **Exhibit 5**.

In addition to the quarterly briefs, MI will (a) prepare annual progress reports and a **comprehensive final report** covering all years of the grant; and (b) furnish the data needed to assist CPSS with all federal reporting requirements, including the APR and GPRA performance measures, which must document substantial programmatic progress as a basis for continued funding. An integral feature of our reports will be a set of **recommendations** for the purpose of program improvement, including our best thinking about the actions the district can take to improve the growth and sustainability of PROGRESS. Recognizing that dissemination is critical for maximizing impact on policy, we generally prepare two versions of the final report: a technical version suitable for funders and policymakers and a non-technical version suitable for general audiences.

A sample final report table of contents for PROGRESS is displayed in **Exhibit 6**.

### Exhibit 5. List of Anticipated Milestones for the PROGRESS Evaluation

<p><b>2013 – Evaluation Year 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Finalize the Evaluation Plan and data collection procedures</li> <li>2. Develop the following instruments/procedures: <i>Document Review Protocol, Teacher Survey, Principal Survey</i>, district- and school-level <i>Site Visit Protocols</i>, and procedures for extracting achievement and other data from district electronic databases</li> <li>3. Gather relevant project documents; conduct document review</li> <li>4. Arrange for and conduct the site visits to the district and all schools</li> <li>5. Prepare site visit summary reports</li> <li>6. Administer the surveys</li> <li>7. Extract all data necessary from district databases</li> <li>8. Develop analysis specifications</li> <li>9. Conduct appropriate analyses in accordance with the research questions and designs</li> <li>10. Prepare quarterly reports</li> <li>11. Attend relevant PROGRESS/TIF grant staff meetings (in person or virtually)</li> <li>12. Prepare annual progress report</li> <li>13. Present the findings to PROGRESS staff (virtually)</li> <li>14. Provide PROGRESS with data necessary to complete required federal reports</li> <li>15. Ongoing communication with PROGRESS</li> </ol>
<p><b>2013-2014 – Evaluation Year 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Evaluation Year 2 master data collection schedule</li> <li>2. Revise instrument/procedures as needed</li> <li>3. Conduct all data collection, analysis, and reporting activities as described above</li> </ol>
<p><b>2014-2015 – Evaluation Year 3</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Evaluation Year 3 master data collection schedule</li> <li>2. Revise instrument/procedures as needed</li> <li>3. Conduct all data collection, analysis, and reporting activities as described above</li> </ol>
<p><b>2016-2017 – Evaluation Year 4</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Evaluation Year 4 master data collection schedule</li> <li>2. Revise instrument/procedures as needed</li> <li>3. Conduct all data collection and analysis as described above</li> </ol>
<p><b>2017-2018 – Evaluation Year 5</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Evaluation Year 5 master data collection schedule</li> <li>2. Complete data collection activities for year 5</li> <li>3. Prepare and present the final report</li> </ol>

## Exhibit 6. Sample Table of Contents for the PROGRESS Final Evaluation Report

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Background  
Overview of PROGRESS  
Focus of the Evaluation  
Major Evaluation Questions

### **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

Evaluation Model  
Evaluation Procedures  
Evaluation Strengths and Limitations

### **IMPLEMENTATION FINDINGS**

PROGRESS Core Components: Scope and Quality of Implementation  
Obstacles to Implementation  
Program Support and Satisfaction Among Principals, Teachers, and Other Stakeholders

### **IMPACT FINDINGS**

Goal Accomplishment

- Student Achievement in Core Content Areas
- Expansion of Career Ladder PBCS to Better Reflect Student Achievement
- Recruitment/Retention of Highly Qualified Teachers and Principals
- More Comprehensive Staff Development Focused on Individual Student Achievement

Changes in School Practices: Leadership, Climate, Professional Culture  
Changes in Teacher Performance: Knowledge/Skills, Classroom Practices  
Student Outcomes

- Comparison of Student Performance with National Norms
- Comparison of Student Performance in High- and Low-Implementing Schools/Classrooms
- LEAP, ILEAP and other assessment Trends Over Time: CPSS, Comparison Schools, Statewide Results

### **FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPACT**

Statistical Analyses Results Linking Context-Process-Impact Variables

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

## Profile and Qualifications, Experience and Expertise

**M**easurement Incorporated is a full-service educational company and one of the nation's leading providers of professional assessment, evaluation, and school improvement services. Founded in 1980, MI provides a full range of solutions to support the needs of educational organizations, private businesses, and government agencies. MI has worked with schools at all levels and in nearly all content areas, and has considerable experience serving **high-need urban and rural** districts/schools. By consistently providing clients with services of the highest caliber at the most affordable rates possible, Measurement Incorporated has acquired both a reputation of excellence in the field of educational assessment/ evaluation and a depth of experience unrivaled within the industry. MI is currently conducting or has previously **conducted projects for 35 State Education Agencies.**

### Facilities, Personnel, Technical Capacity

**Office Locations.** MI is headquartered in Durham, North Carolina, and maintains 12 satellite offices in 8 states: Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The New York offices, under the direction of **Dr. Thomas Kelsh**, operate MI's *Program Evaluation and School Improvement Services* division, one of the company's seven organizational units. This unit will be responsible for work on the PROGRESS evaluation. But as with most MI projects, staff from multiple departments will collaborate on the proposed activities to ensure maximum efficiency.

**Staff.** MI employs more than **375 full-time staff**, and contracts with numerous experts, nationally, to ensure high-quality and research-based services for clients. Many of our staff have backgrounds in business, education, social science, and counseling and have taught at the elementary, secondary, and college levels. The *Program Evaluation and School Improvement Services* professionals are highly credentialed researchers with expertise in all aspects of the evaluation process. These professionals have managed projects for varied federal, state, and local agencies; hundreds of school districts; colleges and universities; and nonprofits. MI also has a team of more than 35 full-time programmers, statisticians, and web-developers, who can quickly meet the needs of clients.

**Professional Memberships and Recognition.** MI has an active corporate membership with the American Evaluation Association and is listed as an approved evaluator in *What Works Clearinghouse*. Several of our senior staff are members of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the American Educational Research Association, and the American Psychological Association, and frequently present their research at annual meetings.

**Networking Capabilities.** MI employs a strategy for network infrastructure that focuses on redundancy, scalability, maintainability, and performance. We have **90+ servers** that are redundant at critical points. Our base assets also include approximately 400 desktop PCs, which we supplement with hundreds of leased machines built to our specifications to meet demand during peak times.

**Web Hosting Services.** MI currently hosts more than 20 websites for a variety of purposes. Our websites are designed to be simple and easy to use by individuals at all skill levels and typically require minimal training and technical assistance support. These websites can incorporate PDF documents, video, and email links to facilitate inquiries for additional information. Secure data is made available only to approved users through password protection. MI's web hosting systems are designed to handle tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.

**Security.** At the heart of MI's security system is our firewall implementation that allows us to block, audit, and respond both to internal and external threats. MI currently employs 15 separate firewalls to provide layered and redundant protection. To further enhance security, MI deploys software that detects, removes, and destroys viruses, spyware, and other forms of malicious software. This software is updated at least daily, and constantly monitored by our network staff.

## Relevant Project Experience

Over the past 40 years, MI professionals have successfully implemented numerous evaluation studies using innovative designs tailored to meet clients' needs. Most of our studies call for rigorous research designs, mixed-methods data collection, advanced statistical analyses, and high-quality reporting. The current or recently completed projects highlighted in **Exhibit 7** illustrate MI's expertise in managing comprehensive evaluations of federal, state, and local programs including studies of teacher incentive programs, teacher/principal evaluation systems, school reform programs, and educational programs in wide ranging content areas.

### Exhibit 7. Summary Table of Recent MI Projects

Recent MI Projects
<i>Teacher Incentive Fund, Educator Effectiveness</i>
<b>AFT Innovation Fund, PAR PLUS:</b> Two-year evaluation of a new teacher evaluation system. Client: <i>New York State United Teachers</i> , Completed 2010
<b>Apprenticeships Supported by Partnerships for Innovation and Reform in Education:</b> Five-year study of a Teacher Quality Partnership program designed to prepare teachers to teach in high-need schools/subject areas and support them during their first few years. Client: <i>Youth Policy Institute; Ohio State University</i> , Current Project
<b>Financial Incentive Rewards Program for Supervisors and Teachers (FIRST):</b> Two-year impact study of a TIF grantee operated by the second largest school system in Maryland. Client: <i>Prince George's County Public Schools</i> , Current Project
<b>Partnership for Innovation in Compensation for Charter Schools (PICCS):</b> Evaluation of three Teacher Incentive Fund projects located in New York City and Buffalo, NY. Client: <i>Center for Educational Innovation – Public Education Association</i> , New York, Current Project
<b>Performance Outcomes with Effective Rewards (POWER) Teacher Incentive Fund Program:</b> Five-year evaluation of a rural western Maryland TIF grantee. Client: <i>Washington County Public Schools</i> , Current Project
<b>Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Project Evaluation:</b> Two-year evaluation of a PLC project funded by the National Education Association. Client: <i>New York State United Teachers</i> , Completed 2010
<b>Schools for Excellence (SFE) Teacher Incentive Fund Program:</b> Five-year evaluation of a TIF program operating in five rural districts in Maine and the Richmond, Virginia school district. Client: <i>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)</i> , Arlington, Virginia, Current Project

Recent MI Projects
<b>State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness Project:</b> A study to determine state readiness to implement comprehensive, statewide teacher and leader evaluation systems and to identify best practices in these areas. Client: <i>Council of Chief State School Officers</i> , Washington DC, Current Project
<b>Transformational Leadership in Education Institute Evaluation:</b> Two-year evaluation of a program to prepare principals to meet educational challenges in high-need schools. Client: <i>Canisius College</i> , New York, Current Project
School Reform and Extended Learning Opportunities
<b>Comprehensive School Reform Program:</b> Two statewide evaluations of whole school reform models: Massachusetts and New York. Client: <i>Massachusetts State Education Department; New York State Education Department</i> , Completed 2006
<b>Galileo Instructional Data System Pilot:</b> Two-year evaluation of ATI's Galileo online benchmark assessments implemented in 25 Massachusetts schools. Client: <i>Massachusetts State Education Department</i> , Completed 2008
<b>GEAR UP:</b> Five-year statewide evaluation of a program designed to increase the number of at-risk students prepared for postsecondary education. Client: <i>New York Higher Education Services Corporation</i> , Current Project
<b>Illinois Regional System of Support Providers Evaluation:</b> One-year study of a network of 10 regional providers of educational services to low-performing schools and districts in Illinois. Client: <i>Illinois State Board of Education</i> , Completed 2009
<b>Maryland 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21 CCLC) Evaluation:</b> Four-year statewide evaluation of Maryland's 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Program. Client: <i>Maryland State Department of Education</i> , Current Project
<b>Project NEXUS Maryland Advanced Placement Incentive Program (APIP):</b> Two-year statewide evaluation of Maryland's APIP for at-risk youth. Client: <i>Maryland State Department of Education</i> , Completed 2008
<b>New York State School Incentive Grant (SIG)/Differentiated Accountability Evaluation:</b> Three-year study of New York's approach for turning around persistently lowest achieving schools. Client: <i>New York State Education Department</i> , Current Project
<b>Successful Practices Network:</b> A set of research activities aimed at examining the progress and outcomes of 75-targeted high schools in 10 states. Client: <i>International Center for Leadership in Education</i> , New York, Completed 2010
<b>Supplemental Educational Services (SES):</b> Three-year statewide evaluation of New York's SES Program. Client: <i>New York State Education Department</i> , Current Project
Content-Related Projects
<b>Career and Technical Education State Self-Assessment System:</b> Development of a tool enabling state CTE offices to assess the progress of their efforts. Client: <i>U.S. Department of Education, OVAE</i> , Completed 2006
<b>Civics Mosaic Project:</b> Evaluation of a five-year federal program designed to connect civics education in the schools and civics engagement in the community. Client: <i>Russell Sage College</i> , New York, Past and Current Projects
<b>Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) Program:</b> An evaluation designed to assess the implementation and impact of EETT programs in two large city school districts. Client: <i>Buffalo Public Schools; Niagara Falls Public Schools</i> , Completed 2006
<b>Expanding the Reach of Scientifically Based Reading Research:</b> Three-year evaluation of a federally funded reading program conducted in six states. Client: <i>DTI Associates/U.S. Department of Education</i> , Completed 2008
<b>New York State Mathematics Science Partnership (MSP) Evaluation:</b> Five-year statewide project to assist MSP grantees in conducting rigorous evaluations. Client: <i>New York State Education Department</i> , Current Project
<b>North Dakota Early Reading First Project:</b> Final year evaluation of the <i>Minot North Dakota Preschool Literacy Acquisition Collaborative for Education</i> , an Early Reading First grantee operating in three rural areas of North Dakota. Client: <i>North Dakota Department of Public Instruction</i> , Current Project
<b>Reading First: New York Statewide Evaluation:</b> Three-year statewide evaluation to assess the implementation and impact of Reading First in New York. Client: <i>New York State Education Department</i> , Completed 2009

### Recent MI Projects

**Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS), Cayuga County:** Evaluation of multiple SS/HS programs in New York. Client: *Cayuga County Partnership; Other New York Partnerships, Past and Current Projects*

**Special Education Parent Survey:** Administration, analysis, and reporting of annual surveys to parents of children with disabilities. Client: *Illinois Board of Education; New Hampshire State Education Department, Current Projects*

**Student Achievement in Reading (STAR) Evaluation:** Three-year study of a nationwide federally funded pilot program to translate adult education reading research into practice. Client: *DTI Associates/U.S. Department of Education, Completed 2006*

**West Virginia AA-MAS:** Study to determine the characteristics of students with disabilities for whom the current state assessments do not yield an adequate measure of progress. Client: *West Virginia Department of Education, Completed 2009*

## References

<b>Name</b>	Frank San Felice
<b>Title</b>	Director, Partnership for Innovation in Compensation for Charter Schools (PICCS)
<b>Company Name</b>	Center for Educational Innovation – Public Education Association (CEI-PEA)
<b>Address</b>	28 West 44 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 New York, New York 10036
<b>Phone</b>	(212) 302-8800 (914) 475-6056 (cell)
<b>Fax</b>	(212) 302-0088
<b>Email</b>	Franksanfelice@optonline.net

<b>Name</b>	Stacy Henson
<b>Title</b>	TIF POWER Project Manager
<b>Company Name</b>	Washington County Public Schools
<b>Address</b>	820 Commonwealth Ave. Hagerstown, Maryland 21740
<b>Phone</b>	(301) 766-8722
<b>Fax</b>	(301) 766-8733
<b>Email</b>	hensosta@wcboe.K12.md.us

<b>Name</b>	Wendy Russell
<b>Title</b>	Project Manager, Teacher Incentive Fund
<b>Company Name</b>	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
<b>Address</b>	1525 Wilson Blvd., Suite 500 Arlington, VA 22205
<b>Phone</b>	(703) 465-8869
<b>Fax</b>	(703) 465-2715
<b>Email</b>	wrussell@nbpts.org

<b>Name</b>	Janice Poda
<b>Title</b>	Strategic Initiative Director
<b>Company Name</b>	Council of Chief State School Officers
<b>Address</b>	One Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20001
<b>Phone</b>	(202) 336-7057

**RFP #2013-28**

*Professionally Rewarding Outcomes and Growth \* Raising Effectiveness and Student Success*

<b>Fax</b>	(202) 408-8072
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:janicep@ccsso.org">janicep@ccsso.org</a>

## Key Personnel

**M**easurement Incorporated has assembled an exceptional team of professionals to manage this important evaluation study, comprehensively and effectively. Our proposed project staff brings a wide range of experience in all aspects of evaluation, both formative and summative. We have strategically proposed a broad-based team that

- can conduct and manage process and impact evaluations of teacher incentive programs;
- can design and implement rigorous research methodologies, and use advanced statistical techniques to analyze the relationship among complex variables and student outcomes;
- can work collaboratively with educators, parents, and other important stakeholders, and maintain an open flow of communication with all members of the school community;
- has working knowledge and experience completing TIF Annual Performance Reports (APRs) and ED Form 524-B (GPRA results);
- can communicate highly technical information in user-friendly ways; and
- can be placed “in the field” immediately to initiate all requirements of the evaluation.

The project management team will be led by a Principal Investigator and Project Manager: *Drs. Shelly Menendez* and *Kavita Mittapalli*, respectively. These seasoned researchers have considerable **evaluation experience involving TIF programs**, and have demonstrable ability to manage large-scale projects and communicate the results to key stakeholders effectively. Dr. Menendez is a respected authority in educational evaluation and research, and has served as the lead evaluator on a number of high-profile federal and statewide studies. She currently directs four TIF program evaluations. Dr. Mittapalli has extensive experience managing and conducting statewide, regional, and local evaluations of NCLB-related initiatives and currently is the Associate Director of Field Research for the NBPTS *Schools For Excellence* TIF evaluation. Serving as Technical Advisor will be *Dr. Marilyn Musumeci*, a senior researcher who has played an advisory role on the New York City TIF evaluation for the past four years. Also assisting on the project will be one of our top data analysts, *Mr. Anthony Cinquina*, who will manage the extraction and analysis of data obtained from CPSS databases. MI support staff will assist the professional team on all tasks, as necessary. We are confident that this multi-disciplinary team will manage project expectations in an effective and timely manner as the project moves forward. The following bios offer a description of each individual’s role and the qualifications they bring to the PROGRESS evaluation. Detailed resumes are provided in **Appendix B**.

- **Principal Investigator** – *Shelly Menendez, Ph.D., Senior Research Associate, Measurement Incorporated*. As Principal Investigator (PI), Dr. Menendez will supervise the overall study and ensure that the evaluation activities are of the highest quality and carried out according to schedule. She will interface with the PROGRESS/TIF grant manager through all phases of the project and have major input into the development of the final evaluation plan, data collection instruments, data analysis, and evaluation reports.

Shelly Menendez holds a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology from Fordham University. She has expertise in research design, instrumentation, data analysis, and technical writing and

serves as one of MI's in-house statisticians. Dr. Menendez directed the evaluation of the three-year *Expanding the Reach Project* for the U.S. Department of Education; and the multi-year statewide evaluations of the Illinois' *Regional School Improvement System*, Maryland's *21st CCLC Program*, Massachusetts' pilot study of the *Galileo Instructional Data System*, and New York's *Supplemental Education Services* and *Reading First* programs. She currently directs the evaluations of the *PICCS*, *POWER*, *FIRST*, and *Schools for Excellence* TIF projects (refer to **Exhibit 7**).

- **Project Manager** – *Kavita Mittapalli, President, MN Associates* Dr. Mittapalli will have primary responsibility for managing all major evaluation tasks and preparing study deliverables. She will contribute to the development of the evaluation plan, review documents and existing data, develop the surveys and site visit protocols, conduct site visits, analyze the qualitative data, and assist in the preparation of the annual and final evaluation reports. In addition, Dr. Mittapalli will attend all relevant PROGRESS/TIF grant staff meetings, and will be available for technical assistance and support as needed.

Kavita Mittapalli has a Ph.D. in Research Methodology from George Mason University and brings to this project 10 years of experience in educational research, program evaluation, and health communication. She currently directs field research for the *Schools for Excellence* TIF project evaluation and has served as a data analyst for the *FIRST* TIF program. Dr. Mittapalli also has evaluated numerous federal and state-funded programs including MSP projects, EETT projects, Even Start programs, SIG grants, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants, and Smaller Learning Communities grants. She is adept in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.

- **Technical Advisor** – *Marilyn Musumeci, Ph.D., Senior Research Consultant, Measurement Incorporated*. Dr. Musumeci will work closely with the PI and Project Manager on the design and execution of the evaluation. She will also contribute to the development of the final evaluation plan, educator surveys, and annual and final reports.

Marilyn Musumeci earned a Ph.D. in Psychology from Fordham University and specializes in program evaluation, research design, measurement, and organizational planning. She has had extensive experience designing and conducting comprehensive evaluations and has managed studies for the U.S. Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the State Education Department's of Connecticut, Maine, Missouri, New Jersey, and New York. Dr. Musumeci has prepared hundreds of reports and publications and has presented her work before the American Psychological Association and the American Educational Research Association.

- **Data Analyst** – *Anthony Cinquina, Technology Solutions Manager, Measurement Incorporated*. Mr. Cinquina will develop the database structures and user interface for any online surveys that may be developed. He also will clean and merge all databases as required for the evaluation and conduct preliminary descriptive analyses of the data.

Anthony Cinquina graduated from Baruch College with a B.B.A. in Computer Information Systems and has continued his training through completion of courses in advanced statistics. Mr. Cinquina has been with MI for 15 years, serving as a technology specialist and data

analyst. He has worked on numerous federal and statewide projects and currently serves as an analyst for the Illinois and New Hampshire Parent Surveys, New York State's GEAR UP project, and evaluation of TIF projects in New York City, Buffalo, and Maryland. He will work very closely with the other members of the MI team to ensure continuity and effective, reliable, and efficient data management.

## Budget

**Calcasieu Parish School System  
Teacher Incentive Fund (PROGRESS) Initiative  
Program Evaluation Budget**

	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	
Personnel	\$19,440	\$19,828	\$20,055	\$20,355	\$20,762	
Fringe Benefits	\$5,443	\$5,551	\$5,615	\$5,699	\$5,813	
Contractual	\$17,971	\$18,330	\$18,604	\$18,883	\$19,260	
Supplies/Postage	\$910	\$625	\$275	\$320	\$175	
Travel	\$4,992	\$4,400	\$4,161	\$3,422	\$2,640	<b>Grand</b>
In-direct	\$1,240	\$1,258	\$1,287	\$1,321	\$1,345	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$49,996</b>	<b>\$49,992</b>	<b>\$49,997</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$49,995</b>	<b>\$249,980</b>