

Program:	<p>Indicate which legislative appropriation this plan addresses.</p> <p><i>Innovative Staffing Models</i></p>
Problem Statement:	<p>Use this space to write a succinct problem statement the program is attempting to address.</p> <p><i>According to the 2024 New Mexico Educator Vacancy Report released in October, there were 737 teacher vacancies last year, 34% of which were special education teacher positions and 24% were elementary positions. Even though the most recent vacancy rate showed a slight improvement over 2023, educator recruitment and retention remain critical issues for the state.</i></p>
Overarching Goals:	<p>Use this space to list three to five overarching goals for the program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Increase teacher job satisfaction.</i> <i>2. Increase teacher retention.</i> <i>3. Increase student engagement.</i> <i>4. Increase student academic outcomes.</i>
<p>Underlying Assumptions and Research Base:</p> <p><i>Why do you think this program will work?</i></p>	<p>Use this space to include a brief summary regarding whether the program has been shown to work and whether the program is classified as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or does not yet have rigorous research. For definitions of these terms, see below and Section 6-3A-3 NMSA 1978.</p> <p><i>Innovative staffing models are a research-based strategy. There are two national models most well-known for innovative staffing: Opportunity Culture and the Next Education Workforce. The Opportunity Culture innovative staffing models help pre-K–12 districts and schools restructure to extend the reach of excellent teaching to more students, for more pay, within recurring school budgets.</i></p> <p><i>According to results from third-party studies, the Opportunity Culture® initiative meets ESSA requirements for an evidence-based intervention for schools in need of improvement (Opportunity Culture® Teams Lead to Strong Student Learning Gains, Research Shows Opportunity Culture, n.d.). Opportunity Culture cites two rigorous studies conducted by Texas Tech and AIR-Brookings. When they apply the method of Stanford researchers (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2020) to the results of these studies to convert the data into years of learning, they concluded that the results equate to an extra half-year of learning for students each year, on average—when an educator in the Multi-Classroom Leader® role with prior high growth leads the team. Some MCL™ teams in these studies had teachers in the Team Reach Teacher™ role, as well. Additionally, according to a 2024 survey conducted by Opportunity culture, 99% of educators in the Multi-Classroom Leader® role and 91% of educators in all Opportunity Culture® roles wanted Opportunity Culture® implementation to continue.</i></p> <p><i>The Next Education Workforce (NEW) models reimagine the typical classroom of one teacher with one class of students. Instead, the models enable teams of teachers to teach a larger group of students together. One goal of NEW is to</i></p>

develop deeper student learning across both academic and non-academic outcomes. Another purpose is to provide more support to educators, allowing teachers to specialize and develop expertise within their teams.

ASU partnered with the Johns Hopkins Institute for Education Policy to conduct a teacher survey to better understand the thoughts and experiences of teachers who participate in NEW, particularly as compared to other teachers in their same school district. In March 2022, the Institute for Education Policy at Johns Hopkins University administered a survey to all teachers in Mesa Public Schools, Arizona (Johns Hopkins University, 2022).

- 1,418 teachers responded, a 69% response rate
- 247 (17%) identified as working in team-based models
- 1,171 (83%) identified as working in traditional classroom models

Survey results indicate that NEW teachers do have significantly higher job satisfaction. Specifically, there was a significant difference between NEW teachers ($M=3.55$, $SD=0.76$) and non-NEW teachers ($M=3.42$, $SD=0.8$) in responses about teacher job satisfaction. NEW teachers also report a statistically significant higher amount of teacher collaboration. Similarly, there was a statistically significant difference between the NEW teachers and their Mesa colleagues in responses for the teacher-student interaction construct. [Based on data shared](#) by the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College at ASU, in one large urban district, a correlational study of student reading scores demonstrated 1.4 more months of reading growth for students served by NEW educator teams than students in a traditional model in the same district. Additional studies of the impact of NEW on student outcomes are in progress.

References:

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2020). Education, knowledge capital, and economic growth. In Elsevier eBooks (pp. 171–182).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-815391-8.00014-8>

Johns Hopkins University. (2022). Results from the Year One Survey of Next Education Workforce (NEW) Teachers.

https://workforce.education.asu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/ASU_NEW_Technical_Report_13July22.pdf

Opportunity Culture® teams lead to strong student learning gains, research shows | Opportunity Culture. (n.d.).

<https://www.opportunityculture.org/research/>

Logic Model- Innovative Staffing

Building a logic model helps clearly articulate what a program aims to accomplish. It shows the relationships between program resources, activities, outputs, and expected outcomes, and serves as a framework for planning, implementation, and evaluation. In the logic model below, fill in the boxes to identify who is responsible for implementation, the activities each actor will carry out, how you will measure whether activities are implemented as intended, and the expected short- and long-term outcomes. See the [Institute for Education Sciences](#) for more information about logic models.

Actors	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes
<p>List the entities will be responsible for implementing the program (one row per actor).</p> <p><i>Examples: PED, school districts and charter schools, schools, educators, evaluators.</i></p>	<p>List the specific activities each actor will be responsible for carrying out during implementation.</p> <p><i>Examples: Awarding funding, providing technical support, collecting and cleaning data, training staff.</i></p>	<p>List the measures used to determine whether activities are being implemented as intended.</p> <p><i>Examples: Number of participants, attrition rate, number of times an activity was carried out, engagement metrics.</i></p>	<p>List the short-term and long-term measures that may be used to provide evidence that the program is making a difference.</p> <p>Short-Term: Benefits for participants. Long-Term: Benefits for the entire program.</p> <p><i>Examples: Knowledge, skills, proficiency rates, graduation rates, chronic absence rates, additional outcomes for participants.</i></p>
<p>Innovative Staffing Model Vendors</p>	<p>Services and Supports for Administrators and Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide professional learning opportunities to assist educators in delivering personalized learning experiences for all students ● Provide coaching to schools implementing staffing models <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Execute partner agreements, data sharing agreements, and other programmatic documents with LEAs ● Collaborate with LEAs to identify schools to implement staffing models ● Collect and review data to inform evaluation and continuous improvement efforts, and share with LEAs 	<p>Services and Supports for Administrators and Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agendas and rosters for professional learning ● Coaching logs that reflect implementation support <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partner and data sharing agreements executed ● List of participating schools ● Program evaluation and continuous improvement data shared with LEAs 	<p>Short-Term Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students participating in innovative staffing models demonstrate increased engagement in school resulting in improved attendance rates and academic proficiency ● Educators participating in innovative staffing model report increased job satisfaction ● Schools participating in the innovative staffing model have reduced vacancy rates
<p>School Districts and Charters</p>	<p>Services and Supports for Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support schools to recruit and hire educators who are committed to working with students in a team dynamic ● Ensure adequate fiscal and material resources to support alternate classroom 	<p>Services and Supports for Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● # of educator participants by role ● Budgets to reflect cost of necessary fiscal and material resources 	

	<p>models, including lead teachers, mentor teachers, and team teaching</p> <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Execute grant agreements, data sharing agreements, and other programmatic documents with PED/REC ● Execute partner agreement with vendor ● Disburse associated funding to LEAs/schools to support implementation, i.e., educator stipends. ● Collaborate with vendor to identify schools to implement innovative staffing models ● Identify district or charter liaison to vendor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify liaison to PED/REC ● Engage in regular check-ins with PED/REC 	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grant agreement and data sharing agreement executed ● Partner agreements with identified vendors ● List of participating schools ● # of liaisons identified ● # of check-ins and other engagement (text, email) with PED/REC ● Program evaluation and continuous improvement data shared with PED ● Budget documentation 	
Schools	<p>Services and Supports for Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create master schedules that strategically match students with educators most suited to their learning styles and needs ● Provide additional school-day time for educator planning, coaching, and collaboration to support optimum student outcomes ● Provide time for educators to attend professional learning given by the vendor <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collect and review data to inform evaluation and continuous improvement efforts, and share with the vendor 	<p>Services and Supports for Educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Master schedules ● # of minutes of collaborative planning time for teachers per day/week ● Substitute teacher documentation and/or evidence of time provided for professional learning <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program evaluation and continuous improvement data shared with vendor 	
Educators	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organize students to maximize academic and other supports 	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom rosters that reflect student placements aligned with academic and other needs 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with other educators to plan and implement standards-based lessons focused on student engagement and personalized learning opportunities • Foster strong teacher student relationships • Engage the community and families to increase student’s access to caring adults with various expertise <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect student data, including attendance, assessments, student engagement, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of minutes per day/week for collaboration with other educators • Qualitative student data indicating that students feel they are in a safe and supportive learning environment • Agendas and sign-in sheets for community and family engagement <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student data including attendance, assessment performance, student engagement, etc. 	
Regional Education Cooperative	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop RFA, review and rate applications, and award funds to LEAs • Develop grant agreements, data sharing agreements, and other programmatic documents with LEAs to outline responsibilities and expectations • Coordinate and collaborate with PED to support program implementation 	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of grant agreements executed • \$ amount of grant funds provided to LEAs • \$ amount of grant funds spent by LEAs • # of check-ins and other engagement (text, email) with PED 	
PED	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate PERF funding with other teacher workforce programs • Engage in regular check-ins with REC and LEAs on program administration and implementation • Provide technical assistance to LEAs to support program implementation 	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of check-ins and other engagement (text, email) with REC and LEAs • Documentation of technical assistance provided 	<p>Long-Term Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention rates increase for educators participating in innovative staffing models • Academic proficiency rates increase for students participating in innovative staffing models • Graduation rates increase for students participating in innovative staffing models at the secondary level

Program Evaluation Plan and Description of Methods

Innovative Staffing

A program evaluation plan provides a roadmap for determining whether a program is achieving its expected outcomes. It should include information about the target population, data collection methods, and planned data analysis. If needed, refer to the [World Bank pre-analysis plan checklist](#) for additional guidance.

Target Population and Sampling

- What is the target population of the program? (For example, is the program run at a classroom level, a school level, or a districtwide level? Is the program predominantly for a specific demographic or at-risk group?)
 - Innovative staffing models are implemented at the classroom level and supported at the school and district levels. LEAs/schools will choose which innovative staffing model they will implement—Opportunity Culture or Next Education Workforce. LEAs/schools may use PERF funds to begin implementation of innovative staffing models or expand existing implementation efforts.
 - Participating schools may have one or more grade levels choosing to implement innovative staffing models. The level of implementation (school wide or grade level) will depend on LEA/school preference, capacity, and preparation. As described by the model vendors, most innovative staffing models begin with implementation at one grade level or grade band (e.g. K-3) and then expand to additional grade levels over the course of multiple years. This allows schools to learn what is needed to implement the model successfully. Some LEAs in New Mexico have been implementing innovative staffing models and may be ready for school-wide implementation. Implementation decisions will be tracked in the data using variables to indicate which staffing model was selected, which grade levels were added in which years, or if school-wide implementation was used. Comparisons of the characteristics of grouped LEAs using different implementation models will also be generated to understand any differences between groups.
 - Innovative staffing models target both new and experienced educators, with different educator roles across the multidisciplinary team, i.e. lead teacher, associate teacher, paraprofessional, community educator, etc.
 - Innovative staffing models target all students, with special attention given to the supports for at-risk student populations.
- What are the eligibility criteria for applying and participating in the program?
 - LEAs will be funded for three years to provide innovative staffing models. All LEAs are eligible to apply but must demonstrate:
 - District need (i.e., student population, teacher turnover, teacher vacancies, student outcomes)
 - District commitment to implementation (i.e., leadership support, teacher support, board support)
 - Existing resources/structures

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A plan for implementing innovative staffing ● Preference will be given to LEAs with high proportions of Martinez Yazzie student populations (English Learners, low-income students, Native American students, and students with disabilities). ● Based on the number of applications, the quality of applications, and the additional considerations below, funding levels will be determined for each LEA award to cover the costs of model implementation, professional learning and training, staff, materials, and/or facilities. The considerations for funding include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Numbers of students to be served ● Number of teachers participating in the model ● Previous implementation experience or startup ● Grade-level(s) model or schoolwide model ● The success of an innovative staffing model is dependent on the support of the district and the school. Therefore, in order to be eligible a district must commit the necessary resources (e.g. time to engage in professional learning, facilities that support flexible learning models) and a participating school must commit the required leadership, collaborative planning time for educators, and modified scheduling for students. ● How will you select participants? (For example, random selection, stratified sampling, propensity score matching)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Using propensity score matching, all PERF-funded schools implementing innovative staffing models will be matched with similar schools that are not implementing innovative staffing models for the purpose of the evaluation. The comparison group will be generated as a 1:1 matched comparison sample using schools that did not implement the program but are otherwise similar (e.g. student demographics, student achievement, teacher retention rates). The method for matching will follow What Works Clearinghouse guidelines for appropriate matching characteristics and determinations of baseline equivalence. Sub-sampling will be considered to examine differences in the level of implementation (whole school or grade level) and innovative staffing model (Opportunity Culture or NEW).
<p>Evaluation Approach and Methods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Describe how your evaluation will be conducted. ● Specify what methods and statistical tests PED plans to use. See UNM's research hierarchy for information on reliable research methods. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The evaluation will use a matched comparison design using propensity score matching on key variables (e.g. student demographics, student achievement, teacher retention rates) to examine the outcomes of participating grade levels in schools implementing innovative staffing models with the same grade levels in similar schools who did not receive PERF funding to implement innovative staffing models on key outcomes targeted by the program: educator-retention and student attendance. Given that LEAs may implement innovative staffing models at the school level or grade level, the analysis of results at the grade level will ensure all funded

schools can be included in the evaluation. The evaluation will use appropriate consideration of different levels of implementation (e.g. whole school or grade level), length of implementation, and type of innovative staffing model, such as statistically controlling for implementation characteristics or subsampling, depending on final student participant counts and statistical power considerations.

- The evaluation will also examine differences in longer-term student outcomes including academic proficiency between the participating grade levels in funded schools and the same grade levels in the matched comparison schools.
- Analyses will include linear regressions and mixed effects models to compare key outcomes from the PERF funded innovative staffing model schools and the matched comparison group. LEAs and staffing model vendors will collect and report implementation data that will be used as a covariate in the analysis. The evaluation will, as appropriate and available, include statistical controls for model variation or level of implementation in the analysis.
- Two additional outcomes will be measured using descriptive (measures of central tendency) and inferential (t-tests) analyses, without a matched comparison group. An intended short-term outcome of the program is that student feelings of engagement, belonging, and safety in school increase. Participating schools will administer the Student Well-Being and Competency survey. The survey results for students in participating grade levels at funded schools will be analyzed descriptively and, when appropriate, inferentially to document changes in students' feelings of engagement, belonging, and safety. Further, teacher job satisfaction will be assessed by vendor-developed surveys and analyzed descriptively and, when possible, inferentially to document changes in teachers' job satisfaction.
- If you are planning to assess the program's causal impact on student achievement, explain exactly how this will be done (for example, randomized control trials, matched comparisons).
 - This quasi-experimental design will assess the program's causal impact on teacher and student outcomes from grade levels in participating schools with the same grade levels in matched comparison schools. Given the nature of the funding there may be limitations in the sample size to reach sufficient statistical power and, therefore, affect the reliability and generalizability of the findings. In that case, alternatives will be explored to evaluate the outcomes using descriptive and/or inferential analyses.
- If you cannot assess causal impact: Provide a clear rationale for your proposed evaluation design.
 - The key intended outcomes of the program are being assessed in a causal design if there is a sufficient sample size of teachers and students. However, the evaluation will not be able to assess causal impact of the innovative staffing models on students' feelings of engagement, belonging, and safety and teacher job satisfaction because it would be burdensome on

	<p>comparison schools to administer the surveys that would allow causal comparisons of this outcome.</p>
<p>Data Collection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What data collection methods will be used? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The evaluation will primarily rely on data that is already collected by PED, i.e. educator vacancy rates, student attendance rates, and summative assessment data. These data will be collected on a consistent timeline across LEAs, following the existing data collection schedule. Depending on the extant data collection schedule, this may be quarterly, bi-annually, or annually. ● Additional data collection will include teacher and student surveys. These surveys will be consistent across the participating schools. PED, in collaboration with Panorama administers a student survey that will be used for data in this project. A teacher survey will be developed by the evaluation team and approved by PED. ● Who will be responsible for collecting the data? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PED will collect the already required data, per standard processes. ● The funded LEAs, in collaboration with selected vendors, will conduct and collect teacher and student survey data.
<p>Implementation Timeline</p>	<p>Outline a proposed timeline for activities across the appropriation period:</p> <p><i>Year One</i> (2025-2026):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finalize evaluation plan (by 9/1/2025) ● Identify participating schools (by 10/31/2025) ● Identify matched comparison schools (by 1/31/2026) ● Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2026) ● Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2026) ● Produce progress report with Year 1 outputs and outcomes (by 11/1/2026) <p><i>Year Two</i> (2026-2027):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review and revise evaluation plan (by 9/1/2026) ● Confirm participating schools (by 9/30/2026) ● Confirm matched comparison schools (by 9/30/2026) ● Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2027) ● Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2027) ● Produce progress report with Year 2 outputs and outcomes (by 11/1/2027) <p><i>Year Three</i> (2027-2028):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review and revise evaluation plan (by 9/1/2027) ● Confirm participating schools (by 9/30/2027)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirm matched comparison schools (by 9/30/2027)• Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2028)• Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2028)• Produce final report comparing key outcomes of funded schools with matched comparison schools over the three-year funding period (by 11/1/2028)
Contacts for Annual Progress Updates	<p>Please use this space to provide primary points of contact at PED for progress updates, expected by November 1 of each year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Candice Flint, Education Quality Senior Manager, Candice.Flint@ped.nm.gov• Amanda DeBell, Deputy Secretary, Amanda.DeBell@ped.nm.gov

Topic	Innovative Staffing	Resolutions
Reviewers	Tim Bedeaux and Jessica Hathaway, LESC Rachel Mabe and Sarah Dinces, LFC Lori Sciacca and Andrew Miner, DFA	
Requested Changes	<p>Requested changes are below, organized by section.</p> <p><i>Within the Underlying Assumptions and Research Base, provide more detail regarding Next Education Workforce:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on Opportunity Culture includes evidence of student outcome improvements, but the Next Education Workforce (NEW) section focuses primarily on teacher satisfaction and collaboration. Please include comparable evidence on student outcomes for the NEW model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated this section with additional in-progress research on the NEW model.

Within the Target Population and Sampling, provide more detail regarding intervention assignment and sampling and definitions:

- Clarify how Opportunity Culture and NEW models will be distributed across participating schools. Will schools self-select which Model to implement or will PED make assignments? Please also explain if outcomes across these models will be compared or analyzed separately.
- Define school eligibility, number of participating schools, and minimum sample size needed.
- “Necessary resources” should be defined. Specify the anticipated costs of implementation, how much funding schools will receive, and what expenses schools are expected to cover on their own.

- Updated the section to:
 - Define that LEAs will receive the funds and not the innovative staffing model vendors.
 - Clarify that LEAs will choose which model to implement. Please note that this shift to funding LEAs directly resulted in changes to the Logic Model.
 - Included examples of necessary resources.
 - Added text that sub-sampling will be considered to examine differences in the implementation of the two innovative staffing models (Opportunity Culture or NEW).
 - Shared information on award eligibility criteria.

Within the Target Population and Sampling, require schoolwide participation:

- The plan currently allows for both schoolwide and classroom-level implementation. However, LFC, LESC, and DFA staff have expressed concerns about partial (classroom-only) rollouts. Please strengthen the rationale for allowing this approach by citing evidence. Also explain how implementation level (partial vs. full) will be tracked and how it will factor into both the analysis and interpretation of results.

Within the Evaluation Approach and Methods, provide clarity and consistency for implementation and outcomes:

- Explain the mechanisms that will be used to monitor fidelity of implementation across participating sites as

- Updated the section to:
 - Add rationale for grade level implementation.
 - Added text that sub-sampling will be considered to examine differences in the implementation (whole school or grade level).

- Updated the section to:

	<p>well as whether fidelity data will inform the analysis or interpretation of outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on Opportunity Culture includes evidence of student outcome improvements, but the Next Education Workforce section focuses primarily on teacher satisfaction and collaboration. Include comparable evidence on student outcomes for the NEW model. <p><i>Within the Evaluation Approach and Methods, provide additional details regarding comparison group creation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain how the evaluation team will ensure that the matched comparison group is truly comparable to participating schools. Include information on the matching criteria (e.g., school demographics, prior performance), and describe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add that LEAs and staffing model vendors will collect and report implementation data that will be used as a covariate in the analysis. ○ Included in-progress evidence of NEW on student outcomes in the Program Description (this was a repeated comment from the Program Description section). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated the Target Population and Sampling section to provide examples of matching variables (student demographics, student achievement, teacher retention rates) and the Evaluation Approach and Methods to include reference to propensity score matching. As noted in the sampling section, we will use the WWC standards which have strict guidelines to ensure the matching is appropriate and the
--	--	--

any safeguards in place to ensure fair and meaningful comparisons.

Within Data Collection, provide clarification regarding when data will be collected:

- Explain how and when teacher and student data will be collected and shared with PED as well as whether the timelines and protocols will be consistent across participating schools. For example, will all the same data be collected for both models? Will teachers and students in both an Opportunity Culture school and a NEW school complete the same surveys?

Within the Implementation Timeline include whether current schools implementing interventions will be

comparison schools have baseline equivalence to better isolate the impact of the model on outcomes.

- Updated the section to:
 - Add that data collection timelines will be consistent and follow the existing data collection schedule.
 - Clarified the survey data collection plan.

reviewed and if cohorts may be appropriate:

- The timeline suggests that full implementation might not begin until the 2026–2027 school year. Please explore whether the evaluation could include looking at New Mexico schools where innovative staffing models have already been put in place. Specifically, Opportunity Culture in Carlsbad and NEW in Albuquerque.
- Because most of the costs for innovative staffing models are in the initial year with support, this seems like a good opportunity for new cohorts to be added annually. Please explain if that's what the evaluation team has in mind and how that design will affect sample size and the

- The LEAs will be funded in Year 1. Some funded LEAs will be already implementing innovative staffing models and will use the funds to expand implementation. Other LEAs will use the funds to begin implementation of innovative staffing models. LEAs may phase in grade levels over the three years, but PED intends to fund one set of LEAs, determined in Year 1. All funded LEAs will be included in the evaluation and accounted for in the analysis.
- The implementation costs will be dependent on the model and existing resources. PED intends to fund one cohort of LEAs that can expand implementation over the course of the three years.

	statistical power needed to detect meaningful impact.	
--	--	--