

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2017 07:30 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Osage County Interlocal Cooperative (U411C170219)

Reader #2: *****

	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

Panel #5 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 5: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Osage County Interlocal Cooperative (U411C170219)

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 evaluation includes components that, if implemented well, would satisfy What Works Clearinghouse Evidence standards without reservations and What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations (p. 20-21). The first stage of the evaluation will involve a fully experimental randomized design (p. 20), while the second stage of the evaluation will utilize a longitudinal quasi-experimental design (p. 21).

The prominence of the reading intervention aspect of the project makes it unique and the evaluation appropriately addresses the investigation of the efficacy of this approach (p. 22).

Reliable and valid outcomes data are likely to be obtained, given the use of scores on the Woodcock-Johnson Basic Early Reading Skills cluster (p. 23), as well as the use of significance testing using MANOVA, post-hoc analysis, t-tests (p. 23), and hierarchical linear modeling to control for and explore potential nesting effects (p. 24).

Weaknesses:

Given the novelty of the reading/Positive Behavior Interventions and Support design, the extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies is unclear. Key components could be more clearly articulated in the project design, which would better inform the evaluation model (p. 22).

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2017 07:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2017 12:33 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Osage County Interlocal Cooperative (U411C170219)

Reader #1: *****

	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 #5 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 5: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Osage County Interlocal Cooperative (U411C170219)

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 proposal includes two phases that will use different designs that will both meet the requirements of the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations (p. 21). The randomization of subjects in phase 1 basing numbers on the result of a power analysis should produce the evidence needed to make decisions about tool choice in phase 2 (p. 22). The materials being created based on the evaluation should provide guidance to others who would be potentially replicating the model (p. 22). The data being collected would provide valid and reliable results that could be used to measure program performance (p. 23). For example, the use of the Woodcock-Johnson academic assessment in conjunction with the CBM assessment should provide state of the art reading results (p. 23). The project plans to continue with reading measurement but also adding student discipline data during phase 2 which would provide evidence of program impact (p. 23). The proposal includes a plan to measure all key components and to address the fidelity of implementation using appropriate thresholds (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2017 12:33 PM