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

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

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

|  | **Points Possible** | **Points Scored** |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | |
| **Significance** | | |
| **1.** Significance | 20 | 20 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | |
| **1.** Project Design | 30 | 28 |
| **Quality of Project Personnel** | | |
| **1.** Project Personnel | 10 | 10 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | 10 | 10 |
| **Sub Total** | 70 | 68 |
| | | |
| **Priority Questions** | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority** | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 1** | | |
| **1.** Promoting Equity | 5 | 5 |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 2** | | |
| **1.** Workforce Diversity | 2 | 2 |
| **Sub Total** | 7 | 7 |
| | | |
| **Total** | 77 | 75 |

# Technical Review Form

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

**Applicant:**   COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

**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 factor:

**Reader's Score:**      20

   **Sub**

1. **(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. (20 points)**

**Strengths:**

The Osborn School District (OSD) successfully offers evidence to expand its Nurturing Responsive Connections project. The project is innovative and aims to (1) to recruit diverse educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds and/or the communities they serve; (2) to thoroughly prepare and certify effective educators in culturally responsive teaching to adequately serve high-needs students in hard-to-staff schools; and (3) to retain fully-certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-needs schools through early career support, mentoring, financial incentives, and additional leadership roles and responsibilities in the district (page e19). The Nurturing Responsive Connections project advances and extends existing residency structures for recruitment, preparation, and retention and builds on these with innovative and/or novel approaches to better serve the high-needs students in the state Arizona (page e20). The applicant demonstrated a significance of the project by citing robust research that provided a rationale for need of the project (pages e16-e21).The OSD's Nurturing Responsive Connections will address educational equity and adequacy in resources related to Arizona's teacher shortage for underserved students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:**      20

**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:     28**

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The Osborn School District (OSD) meticulously outlines the structure of its Nurturing Responsive Connections project. The project is unique in that it is the first and only teacher residency program in Arizona affiliated with the National Center for Teacher Residencies (page e22). The conceptual framework is grounded in the work of the teacher residency model identified by the Learning Policy Institute that includes strong district and university partnerships, coursework aligned with clinical practices, full year teacher residency teaching alongside an expert mentor, and ongoing mentoring support (page e22). The Logic Model that OSD provides on pages e22 – e27, highlights resources, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes of the project that are aligned with the priorities mentioned above. Overall, the conceptual framework is designed in a way that will advance teacher preparation and retention, such as preparation through a teacher residency.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:     10**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   Osborn School District (OSD) includes a framework that outlines the extent to which it goals can be achieved through the " Nurturing Responsive Connections project. The goals of the project are to: (1) recruit teachers from underrepresented groups, especially teachers of color, in multiple high-needs and hard to staff districts, (2) thoroughly prepare effective teachers in culturally responsive teaching practices, especially the development of responsive relationships, (3) advance the retention of new and experienced teachers, especially teachers of color, and (4) conduct a program evaluation and disseminate program findings (pages e27-e29). The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved are clearly specified and measurable, demonstrating that the project will be implemented successfully and with full fidelity.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:     5**

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. (15 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The Osborn School District (OSD) designed a project that successfully addresses the needs of its population. The total number of students to be served by the Nurturing Responsive Connections project is 38,136 diverse, high-needs students in grades Kindergarten through 8 from Title-I schools in partner elementary school districts (page e29). On page e167 – e168, the applicant shared demographic data from the resident cohort. Nurturing Responsive Connections helps the targeted group of students to access such teachers by recruiting diverse teachers from underrepresented backgrounds.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant provided demographic data from the resident cohort of teachers, it fails to provide student achievement data to describe the needs of the target audience. The project is not connected to a specific content area of need, such as ELA or Math. This represents my professional judgement.

**Reader's Score:** 13

## Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

Key personnel for this project cover a wide range of areas of expertise (pages e29-e30). The applicant demonstrates that members of this team are highly qualified to adhere to the requirements of this project and provide the necessary support to ensure the successful implementation of the project. The biographies provide a detailed explanation of each person's role as it pertains to the intricacies of the grant (pages e46-e84). Finally, OSD places a high priority on hiring diverse educators who have extensive experience in mentoring and coaching, grant management, and teacher preparation. Finally, the proposal provides statements of work and memoranda of understanding from partners, such as the Center for the Future of Arizona, Tempe School District, and Northern Arizona State University, that highlight the high level of technical support that will be provided throughout the span of the grant (pages e86-e159). Finally, the applicant provided a thorough descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of personnel from its partnering schools (pages e186-e197).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**Reader's Score:** 10

> Sub

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

   **Strengths:**

   OSD successfully provides a management plan that demonstrates its commitment to achieving the objective of the Nurturing Responsive Connections project. The applicant outlines goals for each year of the program (pages e32 and e34). In its budget, the applicant addressed how resources will be allocated for the five years, and provided a narrative with an itemized breakdown of resources, including personnel with clearly defined responsibilities (p. e33-34), training, curriculum, travel, resources, and meetings (pages e205-e224). There were goals and milestones to be met throughout the five-year project (page e32-e34). OSD leverages it relationships with partner organizations, such as the Arizona Teacher Academy, AmeriCorps, and others (page e34). Each organization has the experience, expertise, personnel, and infrastructure to perform the proposed project work on time and on budget, as evidenced through their longstanding and impeccable reputations as educational institutions in Arizona (pages e33-e34).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:** 10

**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:**

   OSD maintains a strong partnership with Northern Arizona University (NAU), through the NAU Foundation. NAU is a public university and a Hispanic-serving institution (page e16). OSD provides information about its partnership with the university, including demographics for the teacher cohort, and how NAU supports the Nurturing Responsive Connections teacher residency program (page e137-e143).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Competitive Preference Priority  - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

   **Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (up to 2 points)**

   **Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through building or expanding high-poverty school districts' capacity to hire, support, and retain an effective and diverse educator workforce, through adopting or expanding comprehensive, strategic career and compensation systems that provide competitive compensation and include opportunities for educators to serve as mentors and instructional coaches, or to take on additional leadership roles and responsibilities for which educators are compensated.**

   **Strengths:**

   OSD's, Nurturing  Responsive Connections project supports a diverse educator workforce by creating a research-based partnership between a university and a school district with a significant proportion of high-needs students to thoroughly prepare, support, and retain diverse and effective new teachers, while also training and financially compensating the Supervising Teachers (STs) who mentor residents.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      2

---

**Status:**          Submitted
**Last Updated:**   09/13/2023 06:18 PM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:**      COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)
**Reader #2:**      **********

|  | | **Points Possible** | **Points Scored** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | | |
| **Significance** | | | |
| **1.** Significance | | 20 | 20 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | | |
| **1.** Project Design | | 30 | 30 |
| **Quality of Project Personnel** | | | |
| **1.** Project Personnel | | 10 | 10 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | | 10 | 8 |
| | **Sub Total** | 70 | 68 |
| | | | |
| **Priority Questions** | | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority** | | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 1** | | | |
| **1.** Promoting Equity | | 5 | 5 |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 2** | | | |
| **1.** Workforce Diversity | | 2 | 2 |
| | **Sub Total** | 7 | 7 |
| | | | |
| | **Total** | 77 | 75 |

# Technical Review Form

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

**Applicant:** COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

**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 factor:

**Reader's Score:** 20

### Sub

1. **(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. (20 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The applicant thoroughly describes the proposed Nurturing Responsive Connections project proposed by the Osborn School District (OSD). The goals of the project are to recruit diverse educators from underrepresented backgrounds; to prepare and certify effective educators in culturally responsive teaching to serve high needs students in hard to staff schools; to retain teachers through early career support, mentoring, and financial support; and to disseminate the results of the project to advance the education of high-needs and underserved learners (e16). In partnership with Northern Arizona University, the proposed project will serve 2800 K-8 learners in Phoenix, Arizona. The proposed teacher residency program will build on existing teacher residency programs to recruit more teachers of color, to advance retention of teachers, and to improve outcomes for the students they serve (e20). A detailed chart (e20-e21) identifies residency structures, Arizona Teacher Residency (AZTR) replications, AZTR innovations, and AZTR novel approaches that underlie the proposed project.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:** 20

**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:** 30

### Sub

**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. (10 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The applicant provides a specific conceptual framework that outlines the existing AZTR (e22). The Nurturing Responsive Connections project proposed by OSD will replicate existing research by adding new recruitment strategies, innovate on existing coursework and field placement by focusing on high leverage practices in education, and build a new package of incentives and supports to aid in retention (e22). A chart that details high leverage practices is provided (e25). A logic model is provided that includes resources, activities, outputs, and short- and long-term outcomes (e22).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:**      10

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The applicant provides a detailed chart that outlines objectives, outcomes, and performance measures for each goal: recruitment, preparation, retention, evaluation (e27-e29). The objectives are specific and measurable when appropriate. The performance measures are well matched to the stated outcomes and objectives.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:**      5

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. (15 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The proposed project will appropriately address the needs of the target population of K-8 learners in OSD and learners in Title I partner schools in surrounding districts (e29). The demographic data of the students served indicate that they represent high needs groups who will benefit from having teachers who provide culturally responsive teaching. Current partners include 38,136 students, of whom 89% are people of color, 71% receive free/reduced lunch, 21% are English language learners, and 13% are students with disabilities. The needs of these students will be addressed by recruiting and training qualified, experienced, and diverse teachers. The student population of OSD is 88% people of color, 77% from low-income families, and 13.9% English language learners. The needs of future teachers who will be served by the teacher residency program will be met by the program through the mentoring and financial support it provides

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:**      15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

**Reader's Score:**      10

    Sub

     1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

        **Strengths:**

        The applicant clearly states their commitment to hiring diverse staff that come from traditionally underrepresented groups. (e29-e30). A chart outlines the various teams that will lead the project. The Leadership Team includes the AZTR Director, the Superintendent, the OSD District Program Coordinator (DPC), and the Project Coordinator. The Coursework Team includes NAU College of Education Faculty. The Fieldwork Supervising Team includes the DPC from each partner district. The Recruitment and Operations Team includes an Operations Coordinator and a Recruitment Coordinator (to be hired). The Induction and Professional Advancement Team includes Program Director from the Arizona K12 Center. The Independent Evaluation Team (AIR) includes the Principal Investigator, Project Director, and point of contact between AIR and OSD; the Evaluation Impact Study Lead; and the Qualitative Data Analysis and Implementation Study Lead. Resumes that include relevant training and experience are provided for most key personnel (e46-e84)

        **Weaknesses:**

        No weaknesses noted.

        **Reader's Score:**      10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score:**      8

    Sub

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

        **Strengths:**

        The applicant provides a detailed chart that outlines goals, objectives, measures for the proposed project. Start and end dates are provided, along with the personnel responsible for each one. (e32-e34).

**Sub**

### Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the teams described as key personnel will interact during the implementation of the proposed project. This reflects my professional judgment.

**Reader's Score:** 8

## 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 proposes a project that will partner with NAU through the NAU Foundation. NAU is a Hispanic-serving institution. (e16). A Memorandum of Understanding between the Arizona Teacher Residency and NAU outlines the details of the partnership (e87-e92).

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (up to 2 points)**

**Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through building or expanding high-poverty school districts' capacity to hire, support, and retain an effective and diverse educator workforce, through adopting or expanding comprehensive, strategic career and compensation systems that provide competitive compensation and include opportunities for educators to serve as mentors and instructional coaches, or to take on additional leadership roles and responsibilities for which educators are compensated.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a comprehensive teacher residency program that will recruit, prepare, and support diverse educators to meet the needs of underserved students in high-poverty schools. Teachers will be trained in culturally responsive teaching. Mentoring programs and financial incentives will increase the likelihood of teachers remaining in the profession.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/13/2023 06:46 PM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)
**Reader #3:** **********

| | | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | | |
| **Significance** | | | |
| **1.** Significance | | 20 | 20 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | | |
| **1.** Project Design | | 30 | 29 |
| **Quality of Project Personnel** | | | |
| **1.** Project Personnel | | 10 | 10 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | | 10 | 10 |
| | **Sub Total** | 70 | 69 |
| | | | |
| **Priority Questions** | | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority** | | | |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 1** | | | |
| **1.** Promoting Equity | | 5 | 5 |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 2** | | | |
| **1.** Workforce Diversity | | 2 | 2 |
| | **Sub Total** | 7 | 7 |
| | | | |
| | **Total** | 77 | 76 |

**Panel #18 - EIR Early-Phase - 18: 84.411C**

**Reader #3:**　　＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊

**Applicant:**　COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

**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 factor:

**Reader's Score:**　　　20

　　**Sub**

　　1. **(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. (20 points)**

　　　**Strengths:**

　　　The project presents a well-justified vision, and plans to recruit diverse educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds; prepare teachers in culturally responsive teaching; and retain educators in high needs schools (e16). There is a large teacher shortage in high-needs schools in the Phoenix metropolitan area; data is provided to support the need. The teacher residency model is clearly described, has been successful in supporting teachers from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds (e17), and includes year-long clinical apprenticeships for teacher residents. The project seeks to extend the residency model and examine new approaches that are effective with high needs students to improve academic achievement of these students (e20). The field-initiated innovations are clearly explained.

　　　**Weaknesses:**

　　　No weaknesses noted.

　　**Reader's Score:**　　　20

**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:**　　　29

　　**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. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

A logic model (e22) presents a clear description of the structure of the project and areas of potential impact. Strategies for recruitment of teachers from underrepresented backgrounds are innovative. The plan for the inclusion of culturally responsive teaching is articulated and tailored to improve outcomes for high-needs students, including students of color (e24). The High Leverage Practices will integrate culturally responsive teaching into coursework, fieldwork, and induction. The induction program will continue to support teachers in their first two years of teaching.

**Weaknesses:**

Issues associated with preparing teachers for the span of grades K-8 are not described. This represents my professional judgement.

**Reader's Score:** 9

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Four clearly stated goals provide structure for the project. A chart (e27-28) provides details on outcomes and performance measures that include realistic targets for assessing success. The outcomes are clearly linked to the objectives and provide details on the major components of the project including how the residency program will recruit teachers from underrepresented groups, and how new teachers will be retained and prepared in culturally responsive teaching practices.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The schools to be served by the project include a very high percentage of students of color (e8). The current partner schools include many high-needs and underserved students and have the highest rates of teacher shortages. The program will support and incentivize new teachers to stay in these schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

1. **(1)  The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.  In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.   (10 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   Osborn School District and Northern Arizona University encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. The project provides evidence that reflects a history of hiring underrepresented groups (e30). The Leadership Team includes individuals who have backgrounds in teaching in grades K-12. The listed personnel are well-qualified to conduct the project (e30-31). The personnel have professional experience and training directly related to the project goals and objectives. The team has collective experience in project and grant management in teacher residency programs.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:** 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.  In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

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

   **Strengths:**

   A cohesive management plan is described, and the partnership members have a strong record of collaboration. A chart (e32-34) provides a detailed plan of project activities related to the goals and objectives. The personnel associated with the activities and the timelines are presented. The partnership will leverage other funding as needed.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

   **Reader's Score:** 10

**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 project will partner with Northern Arizona University (NAU), a Hispanic-Serving Institution (e16). NAU faculty are included on the leadership team, indicating a strong partnership

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5


**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

   **Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (up to 2 points)**

   **Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through building or expanding high-poverty school districts' capacity to hire, support, and retain an effective and diverse educator workforce, through adopting or expanding comprehensive, strategic career and compensation systems that provide competitive compensation and include opportunities for educators to serve as mentors and instructional coaches, or to take on additional leadership roles and responsibilities for which educators are compensated.**

   **Strengths:**

   The project plans to recruit at least 50% of candidates who identify as members of underrepresented backgrounds. Financial incentives will be created to retain diverse teachers. Opportunities will be available for all teachers who are qualified to serve as supervising teachers and to assume a leadership role.

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:**      Submitted
**Last Updated:**   09/14/2023 12:43 PM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:**     COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)
**Reader #1:**     **********

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** | | |
| **1.** Project Evaluation | 30 | 30 |
| **Sub Total** | 30 | 30 |
| **Total** | 30 | 30 |

# Technical Review Form

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

**Applicant:**   COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

**Questions**

**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:**      30

> **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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)**

> **Strengths:**

> The applicants aim to assess the Arizona Teacher Residency (AZTR) program using a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) method, utilizing two-stage propensity score matching (e35, e37). They have specified the variables they will use for this analysis (e37). One of the primary challenges with this design is ensuring baseline equivalence; to address this, the applicants have developed a thorough strategy to account for key variables and manage any baseline differences during their analysis (e37-38, e203). Outcomes will be determined through administrative records, surveys, and standard tests (e36, e38). Many of these measures have robust psychometric attributes (e199), making it probable that many outcomes will adhere to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards. The evaluation will be conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) (e9, e31, e50-57, e104). Specifically, AIR is not involved in any tasks related to the design or implementation as per the management plan (e32-34) and is depicted as independent in the organizational chart (e195). For these reasons, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations is high.

> **Weaknesses:**

> No weaknesses noted.

> **Reader's Score:**      20

> 2. **(2)  The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)**

> **Strengths:**

> The application outlines a robust strategy for the consistent collection of feedback. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, they plan to gather annual insights from teachers, school leaders, and mentors, among others (e40). This feedback will be presented by the evaluation team in regular meetings (e42). The details of this plan are clearly presented in a table that connects them with relevant program outcomes, research questions, and data sources (e40). Given the comprehensive and detailed nature of this approach, it stands out as a major strength of the

application. Moreover, the application has clearly articulated its objectives, outcomes, and performance indicators (e27), underscoring the applicants' capacity to monitor and assess their progress effectively.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**　　**5**

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. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The application clearly lists the outcomes, which encompass teacher-related factors like retention and student-related factors such as scores in mathematics (e36, e39). It also proposes mediators and moderators that align with the conceptual framework and the research questions (e38-39, e42). Furthermore, the applicants effectively detail their approach to establish a quantifiable threshold for implementation, ensuring they monitor how well the elements in the logic model are being executed (e42).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**　　**5**

---

**Status:**　　Submitted
**Last Updated:**　　09/29/2023 11:07 AM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)
**Reader #2:** **********

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** | | |
| **1.** Project Evaluation | 30 | 30 |
| **Sub Total** | 30 | 30 |
| **Total** | 30 | 30 |

# Technical Review Form

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

**Applicant:**   COUNTY OF MARICOPA OSBORN SCHOOL DISTRICT #8 (S411C230247)

**Questions**

**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:**      30

### 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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)**

   **Strengths:**

   The applicant described the proposed program as one to support the diverse educator workforce and growth to strengthen the learning of 38,136 students who are identified as high-needs in grades K through 8. The applicant described the independent evaluation using a matched comparison quasi-experiment design (QED), with a process to establish a baseline equivalence and use valid and reliable measures that meet WWC standards with reservations (e 35). The applicant's proposed study will provide timely evidence of the implementation quality and fidelity. The proposed project uses of the matched comparison (QED), with a process to establish baseline equivalence, and use valid and reliable outcomes to ensure the impact study produces evidence of effectiveness (35). The applicant identified the research questions for the impact evaluation that are tied to the program outcomes and proposed data sources. The proposed project will use propensity score matching of completers and comparing teachers and students. The applicant described the strategies for establishing baseline equivalence and mitigating attrition and missing data. The proposed project provides details of the power analysis that indicates the study will be able to detect an estimated MDES of 0.10 and .18 for student outcomes. As part of the study the evaluation will consist of identifying the outcomes and completing an impact analysis of research questions concerning: (1) teacher knowledge and practice of culturally responsive and relational teaching, (2) teacher retention, and (3) student outcomes.

   **Weaknesses:**

   None noted in this section.

   **Reader's Score:**      20

2. **(2)  The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant described the AIR providing evaluation services and meeting with AZTR quarterly to share results for continuous program improvement. Reports will be shared with ED, the partner districts, and the AZTR Advisory Board. The AIR and AZTR faculty will present the results of the evaluation locally, to the state, at national conferences, and publish in peer-reviewed journals. A final report highlighting longitudinal data on teacher recruitment, preparation, and retention of students' academic achievement in the state of Arizona will be published in ERIC and WWC (e 35). The evaluation will include an in-depth, mixed-methods implementation study that includes regular collection of implementation data from a variety of sources that will permit the periodic assessment of progress toward the program's intended outcomes and formative feedback. AIR will monitor implementation progress and report performance feedback to AZTR staff during scheduled meetings, sharing informal findings on at least a quarterly basis (e 42). AIR will create annual implementation briefs that summarize findings across the implementation questions and provide recommendations for improvement (e 42).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted in this section.


**Reader's Score:**    5

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. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The design of the proposed evaluation and the research questions are informed by the logic model that is presented in the application. The evaluation will examine whether the outcomes are mediated by participants' diverse backgrounds, their sense of self-efficacy, and the use of RRT and HLPs (e 42). The teacher and student outcomes rely on standardized administrative records; therefore, are considered valid and reliable by WWC standards. In determining the fidelity of implementation of the proposed project, quantifiable indicators for all program activities in the Logic Model will be established. The Logic Model identified the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, with measurable thresholds explained.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted in this section.


**Reader's Score:**    5

---

**Status:**      Submitted
**Last Updated:**   09/29/2023 04:25 PM