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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	21
Sub Total	100	21
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	21

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #1:   **********

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

   Sub

   1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

      Strengths:

      N/A

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

   Sub

   1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

      Strengths:

      N/A

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

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

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

   1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

      Strengths:

      N/A

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score: **0**

   2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

      Strengths:

      N/A

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score: **0**

   3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

      Strengths:

      N/A

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 21

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

   Strengths:

   The applicant presents a good project evaluation plan. The University of New Mexico has identified Basis Policy Research as the independent intervention evaluator (pg. e32) and will submit the evaluation findings to the What Works Clearinghouse for consideration (pg. e32). The evaluation proposed is a fuzzy regression discontinuity design (RDD) in which teacher quality ratings are categorical and applications are submitted to increase teacher "levels" (pg. e41). As the independent evaluator, Basis has also identified one of the threats to reaching the What Works Clearinghouse standards – attrition, and how that will be addressed (pp. e41-42). The outcome measure is student academic achievement as measured by the state of New Mexico standardized student assessments (pg. e43). The applicant presents two linear regression models which should account for many internal errors (pg. e42).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant does not present a clear and consistent lead evaluator responsible for conducting the project effectiveness evaluation. Additionally, there is a gap in evidence that the independent evaluator is familiar with the What Works Clearinghouse standards using a regression discontinuity design. Additionally, there are more threats to the RDD evaluation and thus the applicant does not identify or proposed solutions to those additional implementation and evaluation threats other than attrition.

   Reader's Score: 9

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant's evaluation will provide very good guidance about replication of this intervention. The evaluation and project teams will establish an implementation rubric based on the first year of fidelity data to support replication in other settings. The applicant addresses a detailed and strong fidelity data and analysis for the New Mexico Residencies (NM Residencies) program which will create a strong proposal for this intervention to be evaluated for use by other school districts and institutions of higher education on pages e43-44. The documentation of fidelity and variation of implementation provided is very good and should support future replication models. Additionally, Basis will provide teacher and co-teacher survey results quantifying perceptions around the project (pg. e45).

   Weaknesses:

   The evaluation plan does not address a cost effectiveness study to measure the intervention compared to the costs. This analysis would also add to considerations by future adopters.

   Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has an excellent explanation of the project's components, mediators, and outcomes as aligned with the goals and objectives of the project (pp. e36-39), which is also further detailed in sections D.1 and D.2 on pages e43-45. Teacher preparedness to teach, classroom environment, classroom instruction, and professional responsibilities, collected by teacher surveys, will provide feedback on the key project components and serve as

Sub

mediators in the evaluation (pg. e45). The mediators also strongly support the implementation decisions by administrators considering the adoption of this intervention. The applicant has provided minimum thresholds for the key project components and evaluation data targets, which is a strong dedication the project evaluation success.

Weaknesses:

The mediators identified by the application are weak in their collection of this data. The application would be strengthened through a stronger identification of the mediation variables and how those will be incorporated into the evaluation model.

Reader's Score: 4

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

The integration of Basis into regular feedback and formative evaluation provides a very good foundation to ensure that the intervention will provide performance and ongoing feedback of the project. Basis will also collect surveys and conduct focus groups, which is a good practice for fidelity and feedback from the intervention deliverers. Basis will provide annual Discovery Day session feedback (pp. e47-48), implementation metrics and analysis (pg. e48), interim annual reports (pg. e48), and an end-of-project summary report (pg. e48).

Weaknesses:

The application does not identify how the implementation fidelity data will be used by the project implementation team to correct areas of concern during the project and what process will be used to make adjustments based on this implementation data. Additionally, it is unclear of the role the evaluators will play in discussions implementing project changes and how that might affect data in the evaluation.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

(a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
(b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	22
Sub Total	100	22
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	22

Technical Review Form

Reader #2: **********

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

> **Sub**
>
> 1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
>
> > **Strengths:**
> >
> > N/A
> >
> > **Weaknesses:**
> >
> > N/A
>
> **Reader's Score:** 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

> **Sub**
>
> 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
>
> > **Strengths:**
> >
> > N/A
> >
> > **Weaknesses:**
> >
> > N/A

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

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

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

    Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

    Strengths:

    N/A

    Weaknesses:

    N/A

    Reader's Score: **0**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

    Strengths:

    N/A

    Weaknesses:

    N/A

    Reader's Score: **0**

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

    N/A

    Weaknesses:

    N/A

    Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **22**

     Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

   Strengths:

   The proposed project plans to contract with Basis Policy Research (Basis) to conduct an independent rigorous evaluation (e40). The applicant clearly described its method of evaluation which involves a regression discontinuity design that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations for effects on student academic performance (e40-41). Teachers would be identified and assigned based on their quality ratings to either a comparison group (i.e., Level I teachers) or a treatment group (i.e., Level II and Level III teachers) (e41).

   Weaknesses:

   The proposed project provides inadequate evidence that would demonstrate the project's effectiveness. For example, it discusses that Basis will monitor attrition as a means of providing formative feedback (e41). The applicant failed to provide additional evidence to demonstrate continual feedback.

    Reader's Score: **10**

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The proposed project clearly describes the use of multiple regression models to examine the relationship between New Mexico Residencies implementation fidelity and teacher and student outcomes (e44). Basis plans to test for significant relationships and report the strength and direction of the relationships between implementation and outcome measures, which would inform future replication efforts (e44).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant failed to clearly articulate a cost analysis, which would provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

    Reader's Score: **4**

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

   Strengths:

   The evaluation plan articulates the key project components (i.e., year-long teacher residences (e21), and the evidence-based approach New Mexico Residences uses is pre-service co-teaching (e22). The outcomes are discussed in detail in section C.2 Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes (e36-39). For instance, Outcome Measure 2.4: By Year 5, a total of 1,000 new residency-prepared teachers will have graduated, been hired, and remained teaching in New Mexico (e38). The applicant clearly articulated that the implementation fidelity analysis will provide thresholds for acceptable implementation (e46).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant states mediating factors and referenced Sections D.1 and D.2 but failed to identify and describe the mediators in the proposed project (e46).

Sub

    Reader's Score: **4**

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant provides five types of deliverables (i.e., Discover Day sessions, implementation metrics reports, etc.) that demonstrate clear and specific methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes (e46). For example, the implementation metrics reports are intended to provide the most recent and cumulative prior data from the fidelity of implementation analyses. These data reports should provide timely performance feedback to inform programmatic decisions (e47).

    Weaknesses:

    The applicant provided detailed methods of evaluation that should provide performance feedback and periodic assessment. On the other hand, the applicant failed to articulate how the methods of evaluation would help them progress toward achieving the intended outcomes (e47).

    Reader's Score: **4**

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

    Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

    Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

    (a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
    (b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
    (c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
    (d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

    Strengths:

    N/A

    Weaknesses:

    N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	15
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		40	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		15	11
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		30	0
	Sub Total	100	61
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
	Total	105	66

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #3: * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 15

> **Sub**
>
> 1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**
>
>   **Strengths:**
>
>   The applicant will build on existing strategies of teacher training using the Prepare to Teach program. The applicant plans to refine the recruitment and selection process to increase program participation in the state. Additionally, the applicant will create a consistent teacher training program for the state, which follows state guidelines. To support the sustainability of the program, the applicant will create sustainable funding with paid residences for teachers to remove the financial obstacle that prevents minority teachers from going into the teaching profession. (e19-20)
>
>   **Weaknesses:**
>
>   No weaknesses noted.
>
>   **Reader's Score:** 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 35

> **Sub**
>
> 1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**
>
>   **Strengths:**
>
>   The applicant describes the three barriers that prevent scalability for their program. For example, recruiting efforts have not been attracting enough candidates for the program to be successful. To address this barrier, the applicant

proposes to use a Grow-Your-Own approach that will reach out to local community members and career changers. Additionally, the state allows teachers to come into the profession untrained, which leads to a high turnover rate; however, the reallocation of state resources to support teacher training will remedy this issue. (e24-27)

Weaknesses:

The applicant relies on a change in state allocations for education to provide ongoing support to the program and provide additional teacher incentives as a part of a permanent line item for the state's budget. The applicant's plan can include only what resources are currently in place or that will be provided by project partners. (e24-27)

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a general project timeline. The applicant demonstrates that the project partners have experience with the management of large projects and have demonstrated the capacity to manage a project of the size and scope of the proposed project. (e28 -29, 76-77)

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents a timeline, and identifies responsible parties; however, most project tasks have several positions responsible for their completion, making no one clearly in charge of any specific activity. Project tasks require a specific position in an organization that is responsible for the completion of each task to ensure the project will reach its milestones. (e58-59, e75-78) The applicant's project budget includes the expense of paying a Prepare To Teach salary and travel expenses to a project position that will pursue sustainability of funding for residencies. The travel expense of having a person traveling to the capital who is working with the state to align teacher certifications does relate to the overall project goal of training teachers and examining the success of project implementation. (e428-431)

Reader's Score: 2

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

Strengths:

The applicant presents the resumes of project personnel to effectively demonstrate that the personnel chosen for project roles are well qualified for their positions in the project. For example, one project lead has experience with leading projects and project management. (e132-187, e190-193) The applicant provides a letter for a project 10% cost match and an indirect cost match (e422-426). The applicant provides a list of state schools eligible for participation in the proposed program (e53-56) and letters of support from four project partners. (88-126)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant clearly defines what mechanisms they will use to disseminate project materials for replication. The project will host a web page that will contain archives of project materials that will support replication efforts. The applicant will also promote the project in the Prepared to Teach monthly newsletter, which has 2,000 subscribers. The applicant will post information about the project on LinkedIn and Instagram, through webinars, and virtual and in-person meetings. The applicant will also attend research conferences and post articles in peer-reviewed journals. (e31-32)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant explains that the program they are using for the project, Prepared to Teach, has materials that were developed using a Creative Commons license which allows users to freely rebrand, repurpose, and reuse materials to adjust to their own settings. The applicant will add lessons shared from the project's implementation across rural, bilingual, and Indigenous contexts to enhance the potential use in other settings. The applicant also discusses the application of social media, like LinkedIn. (e32-34)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 11

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant clearly explains the logic model for the program and provides a chart with inputs, activities, and strategies that align with project outputs and outcomes. For example, the logic model incorporates the three objectives for the program. The logic model is based on the conceptual framework of an established program, Prepare to Teach. (e34-36, e420)

Sub

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses noted.

    Reader's Score: **5**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant provides project objectives and milestones. (e37) (e420)

    Weaknesses:

    The applicant presents some project objectives that are not clearly achievable within the project's timeframe. (e36-39) Objective two states that by project Year 5, 1,000 new teachers will have graduated and remain in teaching. There is no breakdown by project year of how this will be accomplished or any details explaining how the figure of 1,000 teachers was determined

    Reader's Score: **2**

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant fully explains how the program residents will be selected to match districts and commitments to students and communities in which they live. There is a co-teaching instructional intervention during each teacher's residency, which has been documented as being effective for teacher training, especially for high-needs students. This preparation design is appropriate to the needs of project teachers and the students that they will serve. (e39-40)

    Weaknesses:

    The applicant explains they will select schools for the program that have a supportive environment. (e39) There was no discussion of the process or the criteria that will be used to select project schools.

    Reader's Score: **4**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

    Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Sub

    Strengths:

    NA

    Weaknesses:

    NA

    Reader's Score: **0**

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

    Strengths:

    NA

    Weaknesses:

    NA

    Reader's Score: **0**

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

    Strengths:

    NA

    Weaknesses:

    NA

    Reader's Score: **0**

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    NA

    Weaknesses:

    NA

    Reader's Score: **0**

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

    Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

   (a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
   (b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
   (c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
   (d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly explains that eight institutions of higher education are committed to the implementation of this project, and all are Minority-Serving Institutions. Six institutions are Hispanic-serving institutions, and the other two are community colleges. (e23) Further, the applicant will focus on recruiting, preparing, placing, and supporting aspiring teachers from local communities. This program's aim is to prepare underserved populations to become teachers, teachers who can support their students, thus disrupting teaching inequities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)
Reader #4:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	36
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #4: **********

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant proposes to positively transform the New Mexico teacher preparation ecosystem into funded residencies across the state (pp. e19-20) using a preservice co-teaching model (p. e4). Both residencies (pp. e21-22) and the co-teaching model (p. e4) have data to support them as research-based practices. The applicant proposes to build upon these strategies.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 36

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

   Strengths:

   Three reasonable barriers, based on previous pilot studies, are provided that are associated with three goals and comprehensive strategies to address those barriers and support the identified goals (pp. e24-27). For example, recruiting minority teachers was difficult for the partnership. In response to that barrier, the partnerships co-

designed recruitment and selection processes that use Grow-Your-Own approaches to identify current classified staff for resident candidacy and nearly doubled the number of minority applicants (p. e25). Additionally, data provided for the Grow-Your-Own program showed how minority recruitment went from 43% to 81%, more than doubling bilingual applicants. Additionally, data was provided to support the other proposed strategies as well (pp. e24-27).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear as to how the applicant will continue the program with the stipend after federal funding has ended.

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to work collaboratively with Prepared to Teach, both of whom have a strong track record of managing complex, multi-million-dollar, multi-site projects (pp. e27-28). A detailed management structure is provided to include a Steering Committee and a grant project lead for each of the objectives to ensure they are met on time and within budget (p. e28). There are also Institutes of Higher Education directors responsible for coordinating and leading local efforts across the project goals (p. e29). A detailed timeline and milestone chart is provided (pp. e76-77). Responsibilities for key parties are provided (p. e79).

Weaknesses:

Detailed information on how the partners will work together along with specific responsibilities would strengthen the application.

Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

Strengths:

The applicant identified qualified personnel to lead the project based on the three goals (p. e28). There is strong legislative support with financial commitments to funding residencies across the state of New Mexico (p. e29). The program is a part of the Educator Pathways Bureau, taking a "grow your own" approach (p. e30). Finally, working with Prepared to Teach, the state is working to reallocate existing dollars so that residencies can become sustainable and meet the teacher hiring needs (p. e30).

Weaknesses:

Identifying and providing information on all key personnel to be hired with requirements for the positions would be helpful. This represents my professional judgement.

Reader's Score: 9

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive dissemination plan that includes archiving developed materials on the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) and the Prepared to Teach websites (pp. e31-32). Prepared to Teach will curate and archive resources that are relevant to its national mission (p. e31). Information will be disseminated through webinars and meetings, learning networks and through Basis Policy Research, the external evaluator, where information will be shared with policy makers and practitioners through research conferences and peer-reviewed journals (p. e32). Social media postings include LinkedIn and Instagram (p. e32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   Prepared to Teach innovatively allows users to rebrand, repurpose and reuse materials developed for the program (p. e33). Resources provided will specifically reference variations across rural, bilingual, and Indigenous contexts on which it is often difficult to gather data because of the low number of participants (p. e33). Residency partnership standards will be codified and provided so that they might be applied across diverse geographies and populations (p. e33).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 13

   Sub

   1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

      Strengths:

      The applicant uses the Science of Learning and Development as the basis for the conceptual framework (pp. e34-35). A logic model is provided (p. e420). Articles are provided to support the Science of Learning and Development requirements (p. e34).

Sub

    Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

    Reader's Score: 5

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

    Strengths:

The applicant provided 11 project objectives with performance measures (pp. 434-438). The goals, objectives and outcomes are comprehensive and include all schools in the state of New Mexico and all teacher preparation programs. Performance measures have targets or percentages associated with them (pp. 434-438).

    Weaknesses:

The applicant states for outcome measure: 2.4 that by year 5 a total of 1,000 new residency-prepared teachers will have been graduated, hired, and remain teaching in New Mexico, however, no baseline information is provided such as information as to how many teachers are currently being produced annually and how long they are remaining in the field (p. e38).

    Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

The applicant provides data to support the programming they would like to implement that includes data to support residencies and curricula alignment (p. e39). For example, paid co-teachers, who work in high needs schools, are not only appropriate for meeting high-need, diverse student needs but also for meeting the co-teacher's pre-service licensure requirement need during the residency year (p. e39), resulting in a better prepared teacher.

    Weaknesses:

The applicant notes that schools have been selected because of their supportive professional environment (p. e39), however, no criteria for what constitutes a supportive professional environment is provided.

    Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

    Sub

    1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Sub

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

    Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

    (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
    (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
    (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
    (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The applicant is partnering with eight Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), all of which are minority-serving institutions. By providing better trained, diverse teachers to underserved and high-needs students, equitable services through high quality teachers will be better provided throughout the state (p. e23). Additionally, New Mexico residencies focuses on recruiting, selecting, intensively preparing, and placing teachers who come from local communities (p. e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)
Reader #6:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	15
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		40	37
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		30	0
	Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
	Total	105	70

Technical Review Form

Reader #6: **********

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S411B230039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 15

    Sub

    1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

    Strengths:

    The project's focus on teacher shortage (page e19), particularly for children of color, in New Mexico is a strength. The application persuasively presents research that paid residencies will be effective (page e21), and high-need students are currently underserved by qualified teachers. The proposed project outlines an innovative plan to grow the pool of qualified teachers.

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses noted.

    Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 37

    Sub

    1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

    Strengths:

    The barriers listed are plausible, as are the solutions (page e27). The ways in which the proposed plan addresses the barrier of limited numbers of teachers who want to and can become certified to teach in underserved communities is a strength. The use of local candidates is likewise a strength (page e24).

Weaknesses:

The proposed program does not account for post five-year attrition. It is further unclear how the program will continue after the grant funding ends (page e24-e27).

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The specified timelines, milestones, and responsibilities of key personnel (page e79) are clearly described in multiple levels of detail (i.e., high level and highly detailed) (page e76-77). The timeline is realistic, the milestones are specific, and the responsibilities of key personnel are detailed. Each project goal and objectives has a lead who manages efforts to meet the goal's timelines and milestones, and to ensure the project stays on budget (page e28). The steering committee is a strength (page e28).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

Strengths:

The plan proposed for this project reflects a strong and well-qualified team that is necessary to perform the program tasks. The proposal clearly provides the qualifications of the key project personnel. It includes credentials which demonstrates they are well-positioned to implement the project successfully. The partnership with Prepared to Teach is a strength that will enhance the scalability of the program (page e30). The substantial existing legislative commitment for funding is a strength (page e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths:

The plan includes specific plans for research dissemination (page e30-31). There are plans to research the program and publish results in peer reviewed journals and academic conferences (page e33). Additional strategies that are likely to contribute to appropriate dissemination include the program website (page e31), webinars and in-person meetings (page e32), and social media (e275).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Strengths:

The application demonstrates that the teacher residency program is needed and is likely to be effective. Rural, bilingual, and Indigenous populations are specified as unique.

Weaknesses:

While rural and indigenous communities are specified in the application as areas of need, no specific plans for how the proposed program will be adapted to consider the complexities of teaching and learning in indigenous-majority communities and rural settings are included. This is my professional judgement.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Strengths:

The proposal includes appropriately cited research about teacher learning, which establishes a good quality conceptual frame (page e35). Principles identified in the conceptual frame on page e35 clarifies how the proposed program will return positive results. Each principle is integrated into the proposed plan.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

Objectives, outputs, and outcomes are measurable, thorough, and appropriate (page e35-37) For example goal 1.1 a is appropriate, connected to the goals, and measurable on page e36. Each are accompanied with numerical goals. The charts on page e434-488 is a strength because they state specific, measurable goals.

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how outcome measure "2.4: By Year 5, a total of 1,000 new residency-prepared teachers will have graduated, been hired, and remained teaching in New Mexico." (page e38) will be achievable.

Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

The application argues persuasively that the intervention will be successful, especially given the use of local mentor teachers and the selection of residents based on their match with districts and commitments to students and communities they will serve. (page e39)

Weaknesses:

While the site selection criteria are stated on page e39, "Schools have been selected for their supportive professional environments," details about what constitutes supportive professional environments are not identified in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Strengths:

n/a

Sub

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

(a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
(b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The application describes partnerships with Minority-Serving Institutions to better serve underserved and high-needs students. It attempts to rectify the issue of systematically underserved students from Indigenous and Hispanic/Latinx backgrounds, in addition to students with disabilities and students from low-income homes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM