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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	45
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	0
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Total	107	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 17: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **We will consider 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.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project provides a significant and very detailed plan for providing a high impact human capital management system that contains an "evaluation and support system" (pg. 22) to effectively provide support to the students and faculty of the seven (7) local educational agencies. The project demonstrates multiple collaborative efforts to meet the "needs of students, teachers, school leaders, and district-office staff" (pg. 22).

   The project establishes an effective 'learning management system" in order to "connect resources, courses, and videos to the educator's observation data reports" (pg. 23). The learning management system provides a valuable resource for educators with continuous "improvement" (pg.23).

   Additional strategies are developed to provide strong support for the transition from "best practice to daily practice, improving observer training, assisting local educational agencies in managing educator workforce decisions, and expanding teacher leadership roles while keeping students in direct contact" (pg.23).

   The project documents the extensive and growing needs of the target population: Arizona's free or reduced lunch rate "increased by 12% over the past six years" and a "growing Hispanic student population in communities" with the "highest poverty" (pg. 23). The project has a great significance and importance in the retention of effective teachers where "students of color receive instruction at disproportionally higher rates from inexperienced, developing or ineffective, and out of field teachers than their economically advantaged, non-minority peers" (23). To support these massive concerns, the project proposes very bold and impressive human capital projects to retain, provide incentives, and professional development in the seven local educational agencies.

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: **20**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

   In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors --

Reader's Score: 45

1. **(1) 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.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project illustrates a very clear and focused vision in achieving student academic progress though a human resource alignment "Focus and Fit" (pg. 27) that cultivates a cooperative and collaborative environment for teachers. It connects Human Resources activities to assist with "focused acts of improvement" (pg. 27). The project develops seven (7) detailed systems of improvement that are focused on improving student academic progress. The project engages multiple measures for improving educator effectiveness (pg. 29), which triangulates many data points.

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project provides substantial evidence of high quality and beneficial collaborations in services to maximize effectiveness. Maricopa County Education Service Agency represents a viable regional educational agency that has "six years of experience in supporting local educational agencies in the development and implementation of human capital systems" (pg.34). The Maricopa County Education Service Agency justifies this strong collaboration through the support of their staff with "specialized expertise in a wide variety of areas" (pg.34) that can be a great asset to the seven (7) targeted local educational agencies.

   The project documents a critical collaboration with the Arizona Department of Education's technology department, which will enable the sharing of valuable information systems in "data extraction", "subject matter in performance based evaluation reporting systems" (pages 34-35). This collaboration provides valuable access to the "Highly Qualified Teacher database to assist with roles and permissions and the Student Accountability Information System to manage student-teacher course connections" (pg. 35).

   The project also provides a partnership with Basic Policy Research for the performance based evaluation and compensation systems, as well as Public Impact to ensure that local educational agencies "implement high-fidelity models to meet the goals of the project" (pg. 35-36).

   The collaboration with REIL-Extend partners provides a justified service to "minimize costs and increase impact" (pg. 36).

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

   Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The project presents a very strong theory "Extending REIL Change (Theory of Change)" with a logic model. The theory was developed in "collaboration with project partners and stakeholders"; this demonstrates a streamlining effort to ensure consistency and understating of the strong theory by all stakeholders.

There are multiple theories presented to address the various aspects of improving student learning and teacher effectiveness.

The human capital management system theory presents a very important theory of "building a stronger teacher workforce, requiring the thoughtful orchestration of multiple processes working together in a human capital system" (pg. 37).

The project provides evidence of a theory to support "equitable access to effective educators" (pg. 38).

WEAKNESSES:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

4. **(4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

General:

STRENGTH

The project utilizes resources from the State of Arizona's Equity Plan during the cycle of the project. This includes significant resources, such as delivery of on-line hybrid professional development, professional development for principals on the implementation of observation instruments, and teacher mentoring.

The project documents that local educational agency Title I funds will be in "professional development in support of individualized Educator Goal Plans, based on effectiveness" (pg. 41).

WEAKNESSES;

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

1. **In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 15

1. **(1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The project supports a high-quality and focused professional development plan that addresses four areas, "observation processes, observer training, educator goal plans, and access to professional development resources" (pg. 43).

The plan presents a comprehensive and specific educator goal plan, which enables each educator to develop a measureable goal by a certain day (pg. 46).

Furthermore, the project details a "5-Year Support Plan for Educators" which is refined on a "yearly basics in collaboration with their assigned field specialist" (pg. 49).

WEAKNESSES:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

General:

STRENGTH

The project describes very meaningful and effective steps to not just "understanding how teachers are performing" but to "understand how to use that data to help all teachers improve their practice" (pg. 50) and student outcomes. The professional development learning management system provides teachers access to their evaluations and access to "click on any observation score, which will take them to videos and courses aimed at a particular element" (pg.51). In addition there are seven steps in addressing the evaluation and support system (pages 50-52).

WEAKNESSES:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The project describes a sound management plan that is tied to objectives, deadlines, and performance measures (pg. 54). In addition the management plan provides evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation process that supports "monitoring of project goals, objectives, and performance measures and implementation of program activities" (pg. 54).

The project illustrates "program management activities" (pages 60-68) in a chart that describes the staffing, timeline, and person(s) responsible. This management activity chart is crucial in organizing the multiple milestones and items to be carried out at a certain time during the grant cycle.

The budget corresponds with the size and scope of the seven (7) local educational agencies to be served. It takes into account adequate resources for "the three different stages of implementation" and to "carry out the full scope of work in the management plan" (pg. 68).

WEAKNESSES:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. **(1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project provides extensive documentation that the project was developed with the input of teachers and the seven (7) local educational agencies (pg. 69). The multiple measures developed to inform teachers of their effectiveness ratings were developed with the "input of central office staff, teachers, and leaders" and "alignment with Arizona's Measuring Educator Effectiveness Framework (pg. 69).

   The project recognizes a commitment to future input from teachers and local educational agencies by stating that their "input will be collected and utilized" (pg. 69).

   The project details school design teams, local educational agency teams, cross-educational agency teams, and advisory council input in the "stakeholder communication plan" (pg. 71).

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project provides substantial evidence of sustainability though offering the performance-based compensation as an "embedded component of educator base salary" (pg. 71). Each local educational agency has a sustainability plan (pg. 239). The project anticipates "access to the state's trust lands fund to public schools to be used for strategic compensation purposes.

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. **(1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**

   General:

   The applicant did not indicate that it is seeking points under Competitive Preference Priority 1 and is not eligible to receive eligibility points.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

1. **We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

   To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

   Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The project provides a very strong plan through linking the "Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators in Arizona" plan to the project's plan (pg. 13). The project develops three effective strategies to promote equitable access to low-income students and minorities. The project's equitable access to education plan focuses on the "disconnect across the state educator evaluation ratings and student achievement" (pg. 14). This demonstrates a comprehensive effort to provide more "authentic overall effectiveness ratings" (pg. 14).

   The second strategy, "Effective retention and Recruitment Strategies to Promote Equitable Access", (pg. 14-15) addresses four ways of addressing equitable access to high quality teachers. These strategies are extremely valuable as the high-need schools are expected to face a teacher shortage in Arizona with "62% of unfilled positions and 23% of teachers being eligible to retire" (pg. 14-15). The four strategies include attractive measures to retain effective teaches such as performance based compensation in advanced roles, principal advancement opportunities.

   The third strategy details effective ways of improving the perception of the field in teaching in high-needs schools though an aspiring "teacher pipeline, collaborative community of learning, and retention stipends" (pg. 16).

   WEAKNESSES:

   There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/10/2016 04:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	45
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	0
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Total	107	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 17: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **We will consider 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.**

   General:
   STRENGTHS:

   The Maricopa County Education Service Agency's proposed project is highly likely to build capacity to provide and promote equitable access to effective educators for the diverse group of LEA partners. This group spans rural, urban, and special populations ranging between 26 students to 9,614 students (see, Introduction section). Additionally, the proposed project will expand and offer services to serve high-need or disengaged youth that have experienced the justice system.

   WEAKNESSES:

   No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

   In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors --

Reader's Score: 45

   Sub Question

   1. **(1) 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.**

      General:
      STRENGTHS:

      The MCESA proposed project has demonstrated a comprehensive effort to support and improve teaching and learning in a robust and rigorous manner for all students within the targeted 44 high-needs schools. More specifically, the collaborative seeks to provide educators with easy to find PD that values coherence, and aligns PD to the needs of educators.

      MCESA's proposed project is designed to build upon and extend the previous work of REIL. In addition, the MCESA proposal calls for increasing the effectiveness and alignment of human resources as a way to nudges new hires,

educators and leaders into a system that can easily address the varied PD to develop needed competencies. Simply stated, MCESA has proposed a comprehensive design that includes HMCS, PBE, PBC, in order to provide salary compensation based on aligned PD, evaluation, and to address identified human management needs (see, pg. 26-42).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA's proposed project, Rewarding Excellence in Instruction and Leadership: REIL Extend, represents an alliance between seven (7) unique entities. Those entities represent charter district, traditional public school district, unified district, non-profit, and regional district. This collaboration will help the 7 educational entities retain talent, accelerate the work around equity, expand leadership, and reward excellence for effective educators across those 4 high-need schools (see, pg. 21).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.

General:

STRENGTHS:

This proposed project is supported and based on strong theory, research, and evidence-based practices. This proposal leverages theory, research and evidenced-based practices to guide and inform the design of their HMCS, PBE, and PBC, such that research used to support the work is organized by the following areas:

1.   career pathways (e.g. Schuermann et al.),
2.   measures of educator performance (e.g. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation),
3.   professional learning (e.g. CCSSO Intasc),
4.   teacher recruitment and retention and equitable distribution (e.g. Curtis & Wurtzel, Milankowski) and
5.   teacher growth (e.g. MET Project).

This body of theory is both current and relevant to the design work of the MCESA's HMCS, PBE, and PBC (see, pg. 461).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

4. **(4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The MCESA proposal will integrate and build upon the MCESA's specialization areas, and the Arizona Department of Education's Technology Department's HCMS. This work will contribute to relevant basic policy research and contribute to the field's understanding of performance-based evaluation and compensation systems.
This proposed project also builds upon the previous TIF award, between 2010 and 2012. The project proposes using funding from the following sources:

1.   The competitive base pay from prop 123, which allows for increasing payout from the state's trust land fund to public schools. The purpose is that this will support increases in the project's long-term core compensation package, as well as increase teacher retention.

2.   With prop 301 (fund 11), the MCESA project seeks to integrate REIL-Extend with Arizona's pay-for-performance, the state's Classroom Site fund (i.e. fund 11, fund 12, and fund 13). This resource allows for the following:
a.   base salary increase (fund 11),
b.   PBC (fund 12), and
c.   professional development (fund 13).

In addition, the Arizona Equity plan calls for gap analyses to gauge the comprehensiveness and alignment of LEA educator effectiveness, which is represented by Title I and Title II A funds. This view of and use of multiple state and federal resources, reflects the thoughtful use of existing streams from other programs and policies to improve outcomes for kids (see, pg. 69-73).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

1. **In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 15

1. **(1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA's proposed project seeks to connect evaluation data/results to individual educators PD needs (i.e. as a

theory of action to institute "job-embedded" PD offerings). The project also provides educators with access to timely and relevant data to guide decision making.

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The project describes the use of disaggregated information generated by the evaluation and support system to identify PD for clusters of staff, including; school leaders, principals and their leadership teams, school-level leadership teams, principal supervisors, and district-office administrators. This also includes offering PD based on the individual needs of the educator, based on his/her area of need based on the disaggregated data/information generated (see, pg. 43-52).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

The MCESA 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 are clear, consistent and robust. The management plan represents thoughtful analysis for the proposal project.

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. **(1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.**

    General:

    STRENGTHS:

    The applicant does offer a sample process (see, Appendix B, pg. 244-247) to develop teacher and principal evaluation instruments. This sample includes a statement of the design team's role, the purpose of the team and the goals for this team. The proposal specifically calls for the implementation of design teams at spotlight schools to ensure teacher and school leader input. In addition, they will use focus groups, structured interviews, and survey collection instruments as tools to gather additional input from teachers and school leaders.

    WEAKNESSES:

    No weaknesses found.

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.**

    General:

    STRENGTHS:

    MCESA's proposed project calls for performance-based compensation as a new form of salary structure. According to MCESA, five LEA's have begun to implement the new salary structures based on educator effectiveness in the SY2014-15. In addition, the MCESA's project states the voter approved prop 123 provides a new source of funding to increase payouts from the state's trust land fund to public schools. More specifically, MCESA's use of multiple state and federal resources, include the following: base salary increase (fund 11), PBC (fund 12), and professional development (fund 13). In addition, the Arizona Equity plan calls for gap analyses to gauge the comprehensiveness and alignment of LEA educator effectiveness, which is represented by Title I and Title II A funds. Put strategically and thoughtfully together, the aforementioned funding sources represent MCESA's best thinking to sustain the financial and programmatic obligations.

    WEAKNESSES:

    No weaknesses found.

    Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. **(1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**

General:

The applicant was not awarded points under competitive preference priority 1 because it is not seeking eligibility under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

1. **We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

   To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

   Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

   General:

   The MCESA's proposed project has focused on accurately identifying excellent educators and implementing Public impact's OC initiative. In addition, MCESA is strategically working to align their HCMS activities to the state's Equity Plan.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/10/2016 07:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)
Reader #3: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	45
Selection Criterion		
Professional Development Systems		
1. Development Systems	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	2	0
Improving Teacher Effectiveness		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Total	107	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 17: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Maricopa County Education Service Agency (U374A160041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **We will consider 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.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   The Maricopa County Education Service Agency (MCESA) has developed a comprehensive plan to meet the needs of its student population. Their proposal included three key components. One of the components focused on the management system. The second component focused on the tools and resources to assist in increasing achievement. The third area provided data regarding the changing demographics within MCESA, and the need for a plan to support disadvantaged youth. (pgs. 21 – 23)

   MCESA was able to build capacity through the mechanisms that have been put in place to support educators through professional development the evaluation process, and through equity. (p. 43) Furthermore, MCESA was also able to build capacity through its Management plan. MCESA has submitted a detailed plan to help move the school system forward towards building capacity. The school system has also allocated various funding streams to keep the plan on-going beyond the ending of the grant.

   WEAKNESSES:

   No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors --

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

1. **(1) 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.**

   General:

   STRENGTHS:

   MCESA built a comprehensive plan in order to provide services and to support students who were underserved in their school district. The school system focused on obtaining the resources to also meet equity guidelines for students and staff. (p. e11) In addition, the school system sought to recruit and retain effective educators in order to help move the school system forward. MCESA aligned its Human Capital Management System to align with the

educator evaluation system, the educator support system, and the performance-based compensation system (PBC) to help increase student achievement. (pgs. 2 – 3) The Performance-Based Educator Evaluation System was the evaluation tool that was utilized to identify and support teachers in need. Refer to the observation tools on page 28. The Educator Support System afforded educators the opportunity to take advantage of a variety or resources to assist with the learning process. Finally, the Performance-Based Compensation focused on creative ways to compensate educators. (pgs. 2 – 4) In addition, MCESA also incorporated the use of data to support decision making (p. 8). The systems were put in place in order to help produce student outcomes, and to promote equity within the school system.

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA has specified several agencies that have committed to providing services to the school system. These partners include the following:

- The Arizona Department of Education's Technology Department
- The Basis Policy Research
- Public Impact (pgs. 34 – 35)

These partners were selected based on the products and services they could provide to MCESA in order to enhance student achievement.

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA has documented evidence of several theories in support of its plan. One theory focused on the Arizona's Measuring Educator Effectiveness Framework. This framework focused on educator performance and fair performance of educators. (p. 30) Another theory focused on the logic model. This theory was titled the Theory of Change. This theory focused on retaining talent, promoting equity, expanding leadership, and rewarding excellence. (p. 36) The State's Equity Plan provided a framework titled ADE's Theory of Action. This model was based on the school system's Equity Plan. This model focused on three areas: 1) Professional Development; 2) Retention; Recruitment; and, 3) Change in the perception of the profession. (p. 40 – 42).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

4. **(4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA built on earlier efforts to improve academic achievement. Historically, MCESA faced challenges in servicing underserved populations, and the school system wanted to improve its efforts to meet the needs of all of its

students. MCESA faced a teacher shortage, and the retirement rate for the school system was projected to increase over the next few years. There was a need to recruit and retain teachers in order to help provide a productive and stable workforce. (pgs. 37 – 38) In addition, MCESA developed a detailed comprehensive plan based on ADE's Theory of Action. This theory utilized activities, funding sources, and the description, alignment and coordination in three targeted areas. These areas include: Professional Development; Recruitment; and, Compensation. These components were put into place to sustain the grant. (pgs. 40 – 42)
WEAKNESSES:
No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems

1. **In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

Reader's Score: **15**

Sub Question

1. **(1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

    General:
    STRENGTHS:
    MCESA has provided a comprehensive plan for professional development. The plan detailed the following:
    •   The Observation Process
    •   Observer Training
    •   Educator Goal Plans
    •   Extensive Access to PD Resources and a Robust Learning Management System
    In addition, the professional development plan has incorporated a 5 year support plan for educators. (p. 49) Finally, action plans will be utilized to support planning, instruction, and student learning, (p. 46)
    WEAKNESSES:
    No weaknesses were found.

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

    General:
    STRENGTHS:
    MECSA plans to disaggregate data. Data drives instruction, MECSA will utilize the data to help teachers to improve instruction and increase student achievement. (p. 50) MCESA has presented seven areas where data will be utilized in support of teacher quality and professional development. These area include: 1) Principals and Peer Evaluators; 2) School Leaders; 3) Principals and their Leadership teams; 4) School –Level Leadership Teams; 5) Principal Supervisors; 6) District-Office Administrators, and 7) The Professional Development Planning Report. (pgs. 50 – 52)
    MCESA has provided a strong plan of action helping to assist with student achievement.
    WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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.

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA has provided goals, objectives as well as performance measures for increasing student achievement through 2020. (pgs. 53 – 54.) Next, MCESA has developed a monitoring process in support of the plan. (p. 54) The management plan has also incorporated a comprehensive timeline for implementation. (pgs. 57 – 68.)

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.

General:
STRENGTHS:
MCESA utilized central office staff, teachers and leaders for input. (p. 69) In addition, the school system provided an example (table 17) of the collaboration between stakeholders in one school district. (p. 70) Finally, figure 5 and table 16 reference the communication that has been made between stakeholders. (p. 71)
WEAKNESSES:
No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.

General:

STRENGTHS:

A comprehensive sustainability plan has been documented on pages 239 – 243. MCESA has focused on strategic decision making to maintain its funding base upon the conclusion of the grant, and the school system has incorporated a guide to maintain stability once the grant has ended. MCESA incorporated a budget source that will maintain the cost of stipends after the grant ends; table 16 highlighted the funding for stipends. Other sources of funding, including Proposition 123 will aid in sustaining the plan. (p. 72).

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.

General:

STRENGTHS:

The applicant was not awarded points under competitive preference priority 1 because it is not seeking eligibility under this priority.

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.

To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:

Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.

General:

STRENGTHS:

MCESA provided equitable access by measuring educator effectiveness through data, evaluations, and through training. Effective recruitment and retention strategies were also factors in promoting equity. Incentives were also incorporated in helping to obtain and retain teachers in high needs areas. (pgs. 13 – 16) Finally, the plan includes a document titled, "Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators in Arizona," which addresses its plans for ensuring equitable access. (pgs. 345 – 417)

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: **5**