

## Texas Educator Excellence Grant Part I Plan Chart Examples

**Introduction:** The following are examples of each criterion in the chart. Applicants are not required to use these examples in their campus plans. They are intended to assist applicants in completing the Part I Plan Chart in Attachment 2 of the eGrants application. These examples assume possible individual teacher awards of \$5,000

### Criterion: Student Achievement

#### Example 1 - Qualitative Weighting (Prioritizing measures by setting base and supplemental awards)

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
1. Teacher has a record of improving student performance using objective, quantifiable measures (REQUIRED)	Yes	District- or campus-based benchmarks exams	Performance Level 1: 80%-89% of students meeting all performance objectives Performance Level 2: 90% or above of students meeting all performance objectives	Teachers must achieve Performance Level 1 to receive a base award Performance Level 2 receives a supplemental award	Base award: \$2,000 Supplemental award: \$1,000 (\$3,000 total)

#### Example 2 - Point Weighting (Assigning point values to different measures)

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
1. Teacher has a record of improving student performance using objective, quantifiable measures (REQUIRED)	Yes	SDAA II, TPRI, Tejas Lee, IRI's, Circle, ISM, portfolios	80% or more students achieving mastery	50 out of 100 possible points	\$2,500

#### Example 3 - Percentage Weighting (Assigning percentages of total possible award to different measures)

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
1. Teacher has a record of improving student performance using objective, quantifiable measures (REQUIRED)	Yes	TAKS	Performance Level 1: 80%-89% students passing Performance Level 2: 90% or more students passing	Performance Level 1: 40% of total possible individual award Performance Level 2: Additional 20% of total possible individual award	Performance Level 1: \$2,000 Performance Level 2: \$3,000

The following are examples of appropriate measures for the student achievement criterion:

- TAKS passing rates,
- Performance on local benchmark assessments,
- Student portfolio assessments that are scored quantitatively,
- End-of-course assessments,
- Performance on other summative assessments of students' subject matter knowledge (assessments used primarily for diagnostic purposes should not be used),
- Value-added measures and other measures of student growth in achievement

**NOTE:** Individual student TAKS scores should be compared from one year to the next (i.e., value-added measurement or growth modeling) ONLY if the scores have been statistically equated to allow for this type of analysis (often referred to as vertical scaling). TAKS results received from TEA are not vertically scaled and must be equated before directly comparing performance by a student in one year to performance in the next.

## Texas Educator Excellence Grant Part I Plan Chart Examples

### Criterion: Teacher Collaboration\*\*

#### Example 1 - Percentage Weighting

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
2. Teacher has a record of collaboration with faculty and staff that contributes to improving overall campus student achievement <b>(REQUIRED)</b>	Yes	Evidence of additional collaboration revealed through horizontal and/or vertical team instructional planning meeting minutes, Campus Leadership Team minutes, and meeting sign in sheets.	Performance Level 1: 80%-89% attendance and evidence of consistent participation Performance Level 2: 95% or greater attendance and evidence of consistent participation	Performance Level 1: 20% of total possible individual award Performance Level 2: Additional 10% of total possible individual award	Performance Level 1: \$1,000 Performance Level 2: \$1,500

#### Example 2 - Point Weighting

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
2. Teacher has a record of collaboration with faculty and staff that contributes to improving overall campus student achievement <b>(REQUIRED)</b>	Yes	Teacher mentoring and/or coaching	Mentoring/coaching at least one teacher in building on instructional issues at least once a month throughout the school year	30 out of 100 possible points	\$1,500

**\*\* Collaboration may not be measured by student test scores, tutoring, and/or individual planning time.**

The following are examples of appropriate measures for the teacher collaboration criterion:

- Participation in campus-based professional development activities,
- Participation in campus-based instructional or curricular planning,
- Team teaching and classroom observation activities
- Teacher mentoring, induction, and/or coaching,
- Collaboration with other teachers on the campus on development of lessons,
- Sharing student data with other teachers on the campus,
- Other measures or activities related to working with other teachers on the campus to improve instruction

## Texas Educator Excellence Grant Part I Plan Chart Examples

### Criterion: Teacher Initiative

#### Example 1 - Point Weighting

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
3. Teacher demonstrates on-going initiative, commitment, professionalism, personalization, and involvement in other activities that directly result in improved student performance <b>(Optional)</b>	Yes	Participation in after-school tutoring program	Participating at least once a week throughout the school year	20 out of 100 possible points	\$1,000

#### Example 2 - Percentage Weighting

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
3. Teacher demonstrates on-going initiative, commitment, professionalism, personalization, and involvement in other activities that directly result in improved student performance <b>(Optional)</b>	Yes	Teacher attendance	90% or greater attendance	10% of total possible individual award	\$500

The following are examples of appropriate measures for the teacher initiative criterion:

- Participation in student tutoring or after school programs focused on improving student learning,
- Participation in activities that involve parents in students' learning,
- Participation in district planning or leadership activities related to curriculum and/or instruction,
- Teacher attendance (student attendance is not an appropriate measure of teacher initiative),
- Other measures or activities that demonstrate initiative, commitment, personalization, and professionalism

## Texas Educator Excellence Grant Part I Plan Chart Examples

### Criterion: High Need Subject Area

#### Example 1 - Qualitative Weighting

Criteria	Included? (Yes or No)	Data sources and Measures	Performance levels that may be achieved (specify for each)	Weight of criterion in overall incentive plan	Amount of award associated with each performance level
4. Teacher works in subject that is experiencing a critical shortage of teachers or has had high turnover <b>(Optional)</b>	Yes	Math, Foreign Language	NA	Base amount - \$1,000	NA

Hard-to-staff subjects should be identified through district needs assessments or subject areas defined by TEA as hard-to-staff.

Indicate whether assignment in a hard-to-staff subject will be used in your incentive plan in the first column. In the second column, identify the hard-to-staff subjects for which assignments will be rewarded. In the fourth column, identify the weight of the criterion and award amount in your plan.