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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/31/2023 04:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need		20	17
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		25	25
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Resources		30	25
	Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2			
1. Diverse Workforce		5	5
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - TSL Panel - 5: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **Need for Project (20 points)**

   The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (i)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.
   (ii)   The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

   (iii)   The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

   (iv)   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:

   Overview: Overall, the applicant presented a project that is fairly adequate; however, it has some limitations. The application addresses specific gaps and weaknesses in services, by identifying the effect the pandemic had on Arizona's school districts statewide. The application demonstrates the project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported from multiple partners in the community and LEA's. The application provides a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for student with their co-plan instruction for teachers and Learning Acceleration Specialist (LAS). However, the application provides limited demonstration on how they will successfully address the needs of the target population.

   i. The application adequately addresses the needs of the target population by providing high needs data for Maricopa County referencing that 4,000 educators reported on how the pandemic affected gaps in learning for students (e. 27). The project demonstrates how they will address those gaps by increasing student access to high quality instruction, instituting career advancement opportunities, providing resources, and use LEAs to improve HR (e. 27). Lastly, the application Learning Acceleration Partnership Logic Model (e. 44) addresses the challenges from pandemic related failures with underserved students.

   ii. To improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams, the applicant adequately discusses their Classroom Site Fund (CSF) and their Human Capital Management Systems (HCMS) efforts to strengthen educator workforce and instruction (e. 38). The applicant also uses Title II funding for a variety of professional development activities to improve teachers and leaders (e. 38). Furthermore, the LESD utilizes Title II funding for recruitment and retention for hard to fill teaching positions (e. 38).

   iii. The application elaboratively discusses LAS and teachers' formative assessments to identify students who need additional support (e. 40). The application plans to provide support by using two a Two-tier approach to instruction and interventions to support student learning (e. 40).

iv. No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

i.No weaknesses noted.

ii. Although the application provided a few existing funding streams to determine relevant outcomes, the application notes that the state of Arizona Department of Education for Project Momentum is a potential funder. Providing data on the application that has not been verified creates confusion as to what funding is received or expected. There isn't sufficient enough data to determine if they were currently awarded funding or are they applying (e.41).

iii.No weaknesses noted.

iv. Although the application states that the Learning Acceleration Partnership will address the needs of three target populations, the application doesn't clearly identify how they will address the needs of the target population. The application provided data throughout the application that focused primarily on statewide data instead of data that was particular to the targeted population (e. 41).

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Quality of the Project Design (25 points)

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:

(i)   The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
(ii)   The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives.
(iii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Overview: Overall the application proposed an exceptional project that demonstrates a rationale. The application provides an exceptional design of the proposed project including a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives. The application provides exceptional methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

i.The rationale for the project is to disrupt educator turnover and to ensure underserved students receive a comprehensive and rigorous instruction (e. 43). The application's Learning Acceleration Logic Model sufficiently addresses the rationale by providing inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes that will improve learning conditions (e.44). The application also present research findings that is proven to impact instructional and identify effective leadership in educators (e.44).

ii. The application provides a rigorous literature review that illustrates evidence for methodological tools to improve learning on Appendix F (e. 304 – e313). Many articles focus on student achievement, mastering grade level concepts, and learning accelerations. The applicant provided a chart of evidence to accelerate learning that adequately provides additional support for demonstrating how thorough the project was designed. (e. 45)

iii. The application illustrates a subset of methodological tools (e. 58) that provide objectives and timelines of the project. The methodological tools were results based coaching, end of cycle summary, and HCMS self-assessment that provides content, records, and indicators to encourage teaching and learning strategies (e.58).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted.

ii. No weaknesses noted.

iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Management Plan (25 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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:

Overview: Overall, the quality of the management plan is exceptional. The applicant's plans to achieve the objectives of the proposed project is on time and within budget. The application also includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

The applicant effectively discusses four main objectives (promote equity in students, implement career opportunities for educators, hire and retain diverse educators, and strengthen educator workforce) in their logic model (e. 62). The application LAP Management Plan has key activities that are coherent and clearly align with staff responsibilities (e. 62). The applicant's timelines and milestones for monitoring and managing grants and include short term and long-term goals through 2026 (e. 62) are sustainable. The applicant provides a robust program evaluation with deliverables that will ensure successful completion of project tasks within three years (e. 69). The applicant also provides that their Learning Acceleration Partnership evaluations will be completed by TNTP through a learning series in Year 1 (e. 68). The application also plans to partnership with Basis Policy Research (BPR) to provide technical evaluation for the term of the grant until 2026 (e. 68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
(ii)   The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
(iii)   The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

Overview: Overall, the applicant presented a project that is fairly adequate; however, it has some limitations. The application addresses specific gaps and weaknesses in services, by identifying the effect the pandemic had on Arizona's school districts statewide. The application demonstrates the project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported from multiple partners in the community and LEA's. The application provides a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for student with their co-plan instruction for teachers and Learning Acceleration Specialist (LAS). However, the application provides limited demonstration on how they will successfully address the needs of the target population.

i. The applicant provides a project plan that will result in system change or improvement (e.70). For example, the application Learning Acceleration Logic Model and Theory of Change are in place to create improvement in performance measures (e. 70). The applicant provides a breakdown of the theory of change that correlates to high-need schools student achievement and HR practices for educators (e. 70).

ii. No strengths noted.

iii. The application demonstrates resources beyond the grant year with providing a sufficient multi-year financial and operational model on page e. 452. The plan is expected to continue the grant to year 2030 (e. 452). The applicant demonstrates LEA's that are committed to implementation of career advancement (e. 76).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted.

ii. The proposed project provides limitations to provide and improve services that address the needs of the target population. For an example, the application states that as a partner of LAP they will ensure school districts are equipped to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population but doesn't elaborate on their plan to equip staff with such tools (e. 75).

iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**
   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 5 points).

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

   a.   **In one or more of the following educational settings:**
   (1)   **Elementary school.**
   (2)   **Middle school.**
   (3)   **High school.**
   (4)   **Career and technical education programs.**

   b.   **That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or more of the following:**
   (1)   **Increasing the number and proportion of experienced, fully certified, in-field, and effective educators, and educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds or the communities they serve, to ensure that underserved students have educators from those backgrounds and communities and are not taught at disproportionately higher rates by uncertified, out-or-field, and novice teachers compared to their peers.**
   (2)   **Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas.**

   Strengths:

   Overview: The applicant's proposed plan to promote equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities is exceptional. The application demonstrates equity in a high needs educational setting. The applicant illustrates plans for effective educators, and educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds or the communities they serve, to ensure that underserved students have educators from those backgrounds and communities and are not taught at disproportionately higher rates by uncertified, out-or-field, and novice teachers compared to their peers. The applicant demonstrates a focus for improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas.

   a. The project will be implemented across 16 low performing elementary and middle schools in the district (e. 22).

   b. The application will promote educational equity by focusing on three main strategies (career advancement, support to educators to implement learning acceleration, and build efficacy) that illustrate their efforts to improve the retention of effective educators in their high needs' schools (e.24).

   Weaknesses:

   a. No weaknesses noted.

   b. 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 5 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, by developing data systems, timelines, and action plans for promoting inclusive and bias-free human resources practices that promote and support development of educator diversity.

Strengths:

Overview: Overall, the applicant proposed an exceptional plan to improve a 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, by developing data systems, timelines, and action plans for promoting inclusive and bias-free human resources practices that promote and support development of educator diversity.

The application is designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students with their HCMS. The Learning Acceleration Partnership focuses on hiring and retention to diversify the workforce to match the study body (e. 28). The applicant's goal is to launch the HCMS self – assessment tool to build a foundation for leadership to retain effective and diverse educator workforce (e. 28). The application provides four focus areas (attention to performance, job description redesign, onboarding, interviews) to effectively retain and improve the workforce (e. 29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/31/2023 04:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need	20	17
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	30
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	5	4
Sub Total	10	9
Total	110	106

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Need for Project (20 points)

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.
(ii)   The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

(iii)   The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

(iv)   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:

Overview: Overall, the applicant's need for the project is adequate. The application provided an adequate design of the proposed project that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. The applicant provided information that suggests the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.. However, the application documented specific gaps and weaknesses in services that will be addressed by the proposed project in limited ways.

1-   The applicant documented specific gaps and weaknesses in services that will be addressed by the proposed project. For example, the applicant identified gaps related to teacher stress and inexperienced teachers. The gaps identified by the applicant relate to student access to high-quality Tier 1 instruction. In addition, the applicant included a table that demonstrates the magnitude and impact of the pandemic on student growth by subject and student group.(e36-38)

2-   The applicant provides a reasonable strategy that demonstrates that the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs. For example, the applicant's narrative states that funds from this project will integrate with the Classroom Site Fund and the implementation of LEA Human Capital Management System. In addition, the applicant will use project funds to integrate with Title II-A funding. All of the integrated funding sources support the increase in student academic achievement through strategies to improve the quality of effective educators. (e38-39)

3-   The applicant provided information that suggests that the proposed project is a part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the applicant cites a 2007 study support their tier1 and tier 2 instruction and intervention efforts. (e40)

4-   The applicant's proposal outlines strategies that suggest that the project will successfully address the needs of the target population and other identified needs. For example, to address the needs of teachers, the applicant proposes to implement job-embedded professional learning for teachers by partnering with a Learning Acceleration Specialist (LAS) in

student-centered coaching cycles that include co-planning and co-teaching. To support school leaders, the applicant proposes to include job-embedded meetings at school sites where the Leadership Administrator will provide support. (e40-42)

Weaknesses:

1. The nature and magnitude of the applicant's identified gaps and weaknesses are unclear. For example, the applicant identified gaps in their infrastructure related to teacher stress and inexperienced teachers. However, the applicant's narrative is unclear as to the causes of these problem areas and the magnitude of the problem within the district. The data provided is statewide data rather than data as it relates to their specific area. (e36-37).
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. No weaknesses noted.
4. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Quality of the Project Design (25 points)

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:

(i)   The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
(ii)   The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives.
(iii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Overview: Overall the applicant's project design is exceptional. The application demonstrated a rationale and presented a project that includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure the successful achievement of project objectives. The applicant documented the methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

1-   The applicant provided a rationale for the proposed project design. For example, the applicant provides a highly detailed logic model that clearly states the inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant cited several research best practices to support their efforts. Lastly, the applicant provided researched evidence to demonstrate positive outcomes for the proposed project activities. (e44-46)

2-   The applicant's narrative clearly demonstrates a high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives. For example, the applicant provided relevant literature and a review of the literature for each key component of the proposed project. The applicant's narrative includes a detailed project implementation plan that is broken down by the year. The applicant's narrative includes a detailed tabled that outlines project activity by year. The applicant's project includes collaborating with the New Teacher Project to provide professional learning. Lastly the applicant's plan includes multiple methodological tools to be used such as student data, self-assessments, and various rubrics. (e50-59)

3-   The applicant adequately described the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance

feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant will partner with Basis Policy Research to implement a program evaluation plan. The program evaluation plan will include formative measures. Lastly, the applicant provided multiple formative and summative evaluation measures that will be used to track progress of the project. (e60-62)

Weaknesses:

1- No weaknesses noted.
2- No weaknesses noted.
3- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **Quality of the Management Plan (25 points)**

   The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

   In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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:

   Overview: The applicant's quality of management plan is exceptional. The applicant's proposed management plan demonstrates a high level of ability amongst project staff to ensure the success of a project of this magnitude. The applicant provides a detailed budget table and narrative that is aligned with achieving the proposed project objectives. In addition, the applicant provides a detailed narrative that describes their proposed project timeline, and milestones for accomplishing tasks. The applicant's management plan provides a quality blueprint that can lead to a successful implementation of the proposed project to produce positive outcomes.

   The applicant provides a detailed table that demonstrates the tasks that are delegated to each project staff person and the timeline for each project activity. The proposed project will be led by the Project Director. The proposed staff appears to be professionals with the right educational background and experiences to implement a project of this magnitude. The applicant's management plan is detailed and well-developed. The applicant's management plan provides a quality blueprint that can lead to a successful implementation of the proposed project to produce positive outcomes. In addition, the applicant provided a detailed narrative that describes their proposed project timeline, and milestones for accomplishing tasks. (e62-66)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **Adequacy of Resources (30 points)**

   The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following

factors:

(i)   The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
(ii)   The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
(iii)   The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

Overview: Overall, the applicant documents the adequacy of resources exceptionally. The application demonstrates the likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement and is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population exceptionally. The applicant's narrative is exceptional as it relates to funding resources beyond the project grant. The applicant provided multiple research best practices to support their efforts. The applicant demonstrated a strong likeliness of system change with their proposed Logic Model and Theory of Change Model.

1-   The applicant clearly demonstrates a strong likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. For example, the applicant's narrative includes a Theory of Change model that presents four if-then statements. The applicant's narrative includes relevant research to support their if-then statements. Thus, demonstrating a strong likeliness of system change. In addition, the applicant provided a detailed Logic Model. The applicant's Logic Model systematically demonstrates how the proposed project will produce changes and improvements within their schools. In addition, the applicant provided multiple research best practices to support their efforts. (e71-73)

2-   The applicant demonstrates the ways in which their proposed project will build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. For example, the applicant cites that as a result of the proposed project efforts related to instructional coherence training and principal coaching, school and district leaders will be able to identify and eliminate barriers that impede student access to grade-level instruction. The applicant's narrative describing the ways which the proposed project will expand services is comprehensive. The applicant provided data to support their claims. The applicant's plan is supported by data that shows the needs of the target population will be meet through the implementation of the proposed project. (e74-76)

3-   The applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. For example, the applicant asserts that LEAs will perpetuate learning acceleration programming into their organizational operations so that stakeholders will continue to benefit from the work post-grant. The applicant's application includes several letters in support of the proposed project from multiple partners and community stakeholders. The applicant clearly documented that their efforts are supported by the community which they serve. The applicant's narrative includes a detailed multi-year operating model. (e76)

Weaknesses:

1-   No weaknesses noted.

2-   No weaknesses noted.

3-   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**
   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 5 points).

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

   a.   In one or more of the following educational settings:
   (1)   Elementary school.
   (2)   Middle school.
   (3)   High school.
   (4)   Career and technical education programs.

   b.   That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or more of the following:
   (1)   Increasing the number and proportion of experienced, fully certified, in-field, and effective educators, and educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds or the communities they serve, to ensure that underserved students have educators from those backgrounds and communities and are not taught at disproportionately higher rates by uncertified, out-or-field, and novice teachers compared to their peers.
   (2)   Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas.

   Strengths:

   Overview: The applicant provides significant evidence that demonstrates their proposed project exceptionally meets the criteria for this competitive preference priority. The applicant documents the educational setting for the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project outcomes and activities are aligned to promote equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project will be implemented in multiple elementary and middle schools.

   A-   The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project will be implemented in multiple elementary and middle schools. (e11-14)

   B-   The applicant's proposed project includes several components that provide career advancement opportunities, support educators through professional development and build collective efficacy. The applicant's proposed project includes a learning acceleration plan and strengthens the educator workforce within their district through a comprehensive teacher training and development plan. To promote educational equity the applicant proposes to review and update the hiring practices of teachers and provide greater mentorship to new educators to increase retention. (e11-14)

   Weaknesses:

   A – No weakness noted.

   B. 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 5 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, by developing data systems, timelines, and action plans for promoting inclusive and bias-free human resources practices that promote and support development of educator diversity.

   Strengths:

   Overview: The applicant provided an adequate plan to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students.

   The applicant's proposed project seeks to hire and retain educators in high-need schools. In addition, the applicant's proposed project incorporates a plan to implement data-driven hiring and selection of new educators. (e17-18)

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant's plan to hire a diverse educator workforce is limited. The applicant's plan seeks to use data-driven hiring and selection of new educators. However, limited information is provided as to how and where they will recruit teachers from diverse backgrounds into their high-need schools. For example, the applicant does not provide a clear plan as to how they will recruit teachers. The methods of advertising and attracting a diverse talent of educators is unclear. (e17-18)

   Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/31/2023 11:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)

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

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need		20	17
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		25	25
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Resources		30	30
	Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2			
1. Diverse Workforce		5	5
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	107

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (S374A230003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Need for Project (20 points)

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.
(ii)   The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

(iii)   The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

(iv)   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:

Overview:
The application adequately demonstrates the need for the proposed project. To achieve the goal for the proposed project, the application describes how the proposed project will promote equity in student access to educational resources. The application describes the strategies and programs that will be provided by the proposed project; how the proposed project will integrate and build on similar efforts; and how the project design will address the needs of students, teachers, and school leaders. However, the application does not clearly describe the specific gaps and weaknesses in services, infrastructure, and the opportunities of the target population.

Strengths:
(i) The Learning Acceleration Partnership (LAP) will address the gaps and weaknesses by promoting equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities via learning acceleration; implementing career advancement opportunities for educators; hiring and retaining diverse educators in high-need schools; and strengthening the educator workforce by improving and expanding Human Capital Management Systems (HCMS) with increased human resource alignment. (pgs. e36-e38)

(ii) The application demonstrates how the proposed project will integrate with and build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources. The proposed project staff will review their current Classroom Site Fund (CSF), a state-level funding stream established by Arizona Revised Statute §15-977 that includes a provision that monies going to educators be based on performance; integrating with the LEA Human Capital Management Systems (HCMS); maintain LEA policies that are in place that are supported by Arizona Revised Statutes, the legislation that informs LEA policies related to HCMS implementation; integrating state-level funding from the Arizona Department of Education for Project Momentum, which is a school improvement initiative that supports educators with the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies; integrating funding from the Liberty Elementary School District (ESD), a funding sources that will integrate with the implementation of learning acceleration; and utilizing Title II-A funds that are used to support the increase in student academic achievement through strategies to improve the quality and effectiveness of educators. (pgs.

(iii) The application demonstrates how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students, building on the foundation for systems change. The proposed project demonstrates system change through the alignment of every component of the instructional program with a design for equitable student academic experiences and outcomes with core grade-level instruction; teachers partnering with a Learning Acceleration Specialist (LAS) and collaborative teacher teams, with will co-plan instruction using specific learning acceleration techniques that are critical for diverse learners with differentiated needs. The LAS and teachers will continually examine the alignment and coherence of their planned Tier I instruction with supplemented Tier 2 interventions. The application demonstrates that the Learning Progressions and Learning Targets will inform the pre-assessments, direct daily and weekly lesson planning, and assist teachers in creating lessons for students to have a clear roadmap for where the are and where they need to continue to learn. (pg. e40)

(iv) The proposed project will implement learning acceleration to provide underserved students equity of access to core, grade-level instruction with proven techniques (scaffolding, success starters vocabulary instruction, and motivation). The proposed project will provide teachers and teacher leaders job-embedded professional learning by partnering with a Learning Acceleration Specialist (LAS) in student-centered coaching cycles that include co-planning and co-teaching, and the use of formative assessments to plan instruction. (pgs. e41-e42)

Weaknesses:

(i) The application does not provide local data for the needs of the target population. For example, the application provides state data, but not local data of the target population. It is difficult for the application to describe how the needs will be addressed in the proposed project without including the data on the specific needs of the target population. (pgs. e36-e38)

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **Quality of the Project Design (25 points)**

   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:

   (i)   The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
   (ii)   The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives.
   (iii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Overview:
The application demonstrates the quality of the project design in an effective way. The proposed project is designed around a consistent rationale and includes a detailed logic model that aligns project activities with intended outcomes. The application describes a review of the literature and a plan for project implementation. There is evidence that the proposed methodological tools and methods of evaluation are appropriate to ensure successful achievement of project objectives. Additionally, the application demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:
(i) The application effectively describes a clear rationale that is informed by research indicating that components are likely to improve relevant outcomes. The application includes a detailed Logic Model that includes a problem statement, goal, resources (inputs), core components (activities), evidence of implementation and participation (outputs), and evidence of change (outcomes, including short-term, medium-term, and impact). The application demonstrates that the Learning Acceleration Partnership will boldly improve learning conditions by accelerating learning for underserved students and supporting the educator workforce by creating the conditions to disrupt educator turnover and to ensure that underserved students receive comprehensive and rigorous Tier I instruction. The application demonstrates how the proposed project is informed by research findings, providing the evidence of support study, including the citation, What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Rating, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Rating, Evidence, and Study Outcomes in the key components of accelerated learning, instructional coherence, student-centered coaching, career advancement, and human resource alignment. (pgs. e41-e49)

(ii) The application demonstrates that the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature (88 references), a high-quality plan for project implementation (goals, objectives, and outcomes; key activities for each year of the project organized in three project periods with assigned personnel; work teams required for collaborative efforts; and fiscal resources that will be applied to meet project objectives); and the use of the appropriate subset of methodological tools (alignment of the identified tool, year of implementation, description, and how the tool will help meet objectives) to ensure successful achievement of project objectives. (pgs. e50-e59)

(iii) The application demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant organization will partner with an External Evaluator to implement a program evaluation plan that includes formative measures of evaluation, including evaluation questions aligned with project objectives; the use of the Logic Model to help the management team identify implementation metrics during Year 1; the collection of data using a subset of the identified methodological tools; and monthly implementation reports that include an implementation scorecard aligned to rounds of student-centered coaching cycles; resulting in refinements being made to key activities in the management plan to achieve project objectives. The evaluator will also conduct an analysis to identify best practices that can be used to guide training and support. (pgs. e60-e61; e304-e313)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Management Plan (25 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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:

Overview:
The application demonstrates the quality of the management plan in an exceptional way. The application includes a clear management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The application includes an alignment of activities that includes the grant year, period, and persons responsible; and a set of milestones for each year of the project that will be used to communicate specific deliverables and signify project checkpoints to validate program progress. The application describes the training, experience, time commitments, and responsibilities of the key personnel.

Strengths:
The application demonstrates a strong management plan to achieve the measurable objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The application thoroughly aligns key activities, the grant year, period, and persons responsible. The application includes a set of milestones for each year of the project that will be used to communicate specific deliverables and signify project checkpoints to validate program progress. These factors provide accountability and will lead to the success of the project in achieving the intended outcomes. The application describes the training, experience, time commitments, and responsibilities of the following key personnel: Assistant Superintendent/Project Director), Project Leader, HCMS Administrator, Field Specialist Data Management, Professional Development Coordinator, Professional Development Resource Coordinator, Leadership Administrator, Field Specialist Performance-Based Evaluation, Field Specialist HCMS Implementation (TBD), Videographer, Media Specialist Administrator, Financial Business Systems Specialist (TBD), and Learning Acceleration Specialists. The Insight Team will serve as the operational and planning team, ensuring monitoring and completion of program activities. (pgs. e61-e71; e496-e508; e509-e520)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
(ii)   The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
(iii)   The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model

and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

Overview:

The application clearly demonstrates the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. The application demonstrates that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement; is likely to build capacity to address the needs of the target population; and demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The application includes a clear multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; and broad support from stakeholders, such as the SEA and teachers' union from each participating school district.

Strengths:

(i) The application demonstrates how the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The proposed project will partner with The New Teacher Project (TNTP) to implement a professional learning series. The application describes the Theory of Change, including a set of if-then statements that inform objectives, outcomes, performance measures, and necessary resources to ensure the 'then' statement is realized. If high-need schools ensure the student academic experience is aligned; if high-need schools are able to retain a diverse educator workforce and accelerate equitable access to teaching and leading; if leadership opportunities support academic success for students while creating career ladders to support teacher retention; and if human resources practices are aligned to motivate educators with the needed performance competencies; then instructional coherence will increase; learning conditions and outcomes will improve; effective educators will be retained; and the performance-based evaluation system will be seamlessly integrated into human capital processes. (pgs. e70-e74)

(ii) The proposed project is clearly focused on building local capacity to provide, improve, and expand services that address the needs of the target population. The implementation of the Learning Acceleration Partnership will build LEA- and school-level capacity to improve learning conditions through human capital management systems and human resource alignment from the LEA-level down to the individual student level. For example, as a result of engaging in continuous HCMS improvement, LEA- and school-level staff will have identified activities and processes that can result in a high-quality HCMS leading to an improved workforce and improved student outcomes; and as a result of instructional coherence training and principal coaching, school and district leaders will be able to identify and eliminate barriers that impede student access to grade-level instruction (across core instruction, interventions, and extended time); and principals will be equipped to identify, equip, and provide teacher leaders with professional development opportunities to be able to employ adult learning theory and to develop a school culture of motivation and a shared purpose which cause teachers to want to stay to provide services that will address the needs of the target population. (pgs. e74-e76)

(iii) The application clearly demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including the demonstrated commitment of partners. During the project design stage, each LEA will be engaged in planning to identify human, fiscal, and technological resources required to sustain the implementation of learning acceleration. The application provides LEA-specific Multi-Year Financial and Operational Models in Appendix F, which outline the commitment of these types of resources (pgs. e127-e139). For example, each LEA has committed to implementation of a career advancement model in which the Learning Acceleration Specialist role will continue, either as additional positions or through a complete role redesign. The application describes other examples, such as performance-based compensation aligned to the common vision of instructional improvement; dedicated funding for the implementation of a Decision Support System to guide educator workforce decision-making. The applicant agency has committed to providing programmatic resources when updates are available (refresh observation instruments and handbooks; HCMS consultation services). The application provides Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) with both of the identified school districts, and letters of support from the Superintendent and Governing Board, and additional letters of support from five (5) school districts. The application includes a letter of support from the Phoenix Elementary Classroom Teacher Association (PECTA). (pgs. e76-e81; e84-e126; e452)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**
   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 5 points).

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

   a.   In one or more of the following educational settings:
   (1)   Elementary school.
   (2)   Middle school.
   (3)   High school.
   (4)   Career and technical education programs.

   b.   That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or more of the following:
   (1)   Increasing the number and proportion of experienced, fully certified, in-field, and effective educators, and educators from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds or the communities they serve, to ensure that underserved students have educators from those backgrounds and communities and are not taught at disproportionately higher rates by uncertified, out-or-field, and novice teachers compared to their peers.
   (2)   Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas.

   Strengths:
   Overview:
   The application demonstrates that the proposed project will promote equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities. The application demonstrates that the proposed project will be implemented across elementary schools and middle schools in 16 high-need schools. The application describes how the proposed project will improve the retention of full certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools.

   Strengths:
   (a) The application demonstrates that the proposed project will be implemented across elementary and middle schools.

   (b)(2) The application describes the data on the sources of inadequacy and inequity, and implements responses, such as improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas. The proposed project will address the inequity and inadequacy through the following strategies: provide a career advancement opportunity; support educators with tools, tactics, and mindsets to implement learning acceleration; and build collective efficacy. The teachers in high-need schools will be supported to develop these tools, tactics, and mindsets, which will reduce stress and increase teacher efficacy, leading to better retention and more effective teachers. (pgs. e22-e27)

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were 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 5 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, by developing data systems, timelines, and action plans for promoting inclusive and bias-free human resources practices that promote and support development of educator diversity.

   Strengths:

   Overview:
   The application demonstrates that the proposed project will support a diverse educator workforce and professional growth to strengthen student learning. The application describes how the proposed project is designed to increase well-prepared, effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students in high-need schools.

   Strengths:
   The proposed project addresses this priority through the establishment of the goal and Objective 3: The Learning Acceleration Partnership will hire and retain diverse educators in high-need schools; and Objective 4: The Learning Acceleration Partnership LEAs and high-need schools will strengthen the educator workforce by improving or expanding Human Capital Management System with increased human resource alignment. The project will use the HCMS Self-Assessment Tool to lay a foundation for LEA- and school-level leaders to build their capacity to hire, support and retain an effective and diverse educator workforce. This instrument is designed to guide LEAs in examining their human capital practices identifying activities, tasks, processes, and collaboration that can result in a high-quality HCMS leading to an improved workforce and improved student outcomes. The applicant demonstrates that as an outcome of self-assessment processes, LEAs and schools will build capacity in the following prioritized areas: attention to performance competencies; job description redesign; Day Zero and onboarding; and stay interviews. The Day Zero support will provide training materials for principals with a timeline and roadmap on how to implement supports and techniques between the day a teaching offer as been accepted, and the day a new role begins. The application demonstrates that high-need schools will develop year-long onboarding plans aimed at ensuring the first year of an employee's experience is engaging and rewarding. The stay interviews are aligned to the Theory of Change and are a proactive teacher retention strategy that identifies triggers for educator attrition and provides school sites with data to implement evidence-based interventions. (pgs. e28-e36)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/28/2023 07:59 PM