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

Technical Review

Applicant: IPS Enterprises, LLC (U411C170162)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	20	19
Total	20	19

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: IPS Enterprises, LLC (U411C170162)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

    (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

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

    (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

    (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

    Strengths:

    •   Applicant has submitted a plan that is "excellent" (p.20).
    •   The evaluators for this program appear to have the expertise and resources to successfully conduct an evaluation of this size and scope (p. 20).
    •   A three-phase design; impact, implementation, and exploratory phases will be conducted to adequately measure and evaluate the program's fidelity of implementation, impact upon student success and any confounding effects on subgroups (p. 20).
    •   The plan calls for a quasi-experimental design and if carried out properly, it will meet WWC standards with reservations (p.21).
    •   The groups will be established through acceptable methods using propensity score matching with covariates consisting of Free Reduced lunch, ELL, student academic assessments, ACT scores, depending on the grade level (p. 21).
    •   An analysis for the impact phase will use HLM. A regression model was provided on p. 21, that appears to use pre-implementation or propensity scores, which is appropriate in this case.
    •   Implementation phase evaluation will include the evaluators developing a measure of fidelity based on five key dimensions (p. 22). Description of the validation of the measurement instrument is provided.
    •   The exploratory phase of the evaluation includes additional qualitative and quantitative measures and analyses that seek to determine impacts on subgroups that could impact scale up to other types of school environments (p. 23)
    •   Sample size at the student level appears to be adequate to achieve the desired effect size anticipated (p. 21).

    Weaknesses:

    •   A power analysis would have verified the adequate sample size for the plan.
    •   A clearer description of the group assignments would have alleviated any ideas of selection bias.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2017 02:46 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: IPS Enterprises, LLC (U411C170162)
Reader #2: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	20	20
	Total	20	20

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 3: 84.411C

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

Applicant: IPS Enterprises, LLC (U411C170162)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

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

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

   (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

   Strengths:

   The proposed project is likely to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations, because the applicant plans to evaluate the project using a well-qualified external evaluator (Appendix C). The applicant proposes a quasi-experimental design to evaluate the project's impact with treatment and comparison groups matched on key covariates (page 21). The applicant described an appropriate plan to avoid selection bias,

   The evaluation is likely to provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings, because the applicant described a thorough plan for assessing fidelity of implementation that includes five key dimensions: adherence, duration, quality of delivery, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation (page 22). This will help ensure that the proposed project is implemented as designed and will provide valuable information to others who wish to replicate it.

   The applicant plans to disseminate information about the proposed project through national and regional education networks, institutes of higher education, local organizations, site visits, and conference presentations (pages 19-20). These venues will provide opportunities for a broad range of organizations to become aware of the proposed project.

   The methods of evaluation are likely to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes, because the evaluation plan is well-aligned with the project goals, uses varied data to determine the impact of the project (pages 11, 20-24).

   The applicant provided a logic model aligned with the proposed project's goals, activities, and evaluation plan (pages 10-11, 20-25, Appendix B).

   The applicant provided a thorough plan for data analysis to assess the impact of the proposed project for student groups that will also provide information on specific indicators within the project to help determine key mediating factors (pages 24-25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **20**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 09:04 PM