

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/18/2019 07:29 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winchester School Board (U411C190012)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 17 |
| Sub Total | 20 | 17 |
| Total | 20 | 17 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 11: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Winchester School Board (U411C190012)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

(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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The applicant plans to use an experienced, qualified independent evaluator to conduct a short interrupted time series evaluation (pages e36, e40-e41, e59-e62). A well-implemented evaluation using this design can meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

The applicant described a plan to identify comparison schools similar to those that will implement the proposed project to establish baseline equivalence based on demographics and achievement (page e41). This will help ensure that the evaluation is likely to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that will meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards.

The evaluation is likely to provide guidance about effective strategies, because the applicant included a thorough plan to assess for fidelity of implementation for each goal, including targeted participation (pages e42-e44, e105). Assessment of fidelity of implementation is necessary to determine if the project has been implemented as designed and will provide valuable information for those wishing to replicate the project.

The applicant plans to use a variety of quantitative and qualitative data gathered from several sources (pages e43-e44). It is likely to provide valid and reliable performance data on project implementation and relevant outcomes, because it incorporates a plan for feedback and continuous improvement and has a sound plan for evaluating its impact (pages e34-e35).

The evaluation plan for the proposed project clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes (pages e30-e31, e44). This will be beneficial in determining the project's impact.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear why the applicant plans to use two schools within the targeted school district as comparison schools (along with eight other schools in the state) while conducting comparative short interrupted time series evaluation design (page

e41).

The sample size may not be adequate to determine the impact of the intervention, since the proposed project will only be implemented at two schools with 914 students (pages e17, e41). The applicant stated it expects little to no school attrition, because it plans to collect publicly available data (page e41); however, it did not indicate plans to address possible attrition of students. This is critical since there are only a small number of schools that will implement the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/18/2019 07:29 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 10:39 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winchester School Board (U411C190012)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 17 |
| Sub Total | 20 | 17 |
| Total | 20 | 17 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 11: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Winchester School Board (U411C190012)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

(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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

1. The applicant proposes a formative evaluation to assess the fidelity of implementation and provide an impact study on a quasi-experimental project with a treatment and comparison group with interrupted time series (pg. e40-41). The evaluator will collect baseline data. If the methods are implemented as described, they would most likely produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservation.

2. Replicability of the project is reference throughout the application, specifically regarding the guidance that will be created as a result of the formative assessment. The implementation study will respond to research questions about the project (fidelity, effective components, challenges, pg. e42). A fidelity index will be created, and a detailed sample is included in the Appendix (pg. e105). The study will examine adherence (dosage), exposure (# of units implemented), quality, and responsiveness (student engagement) with final documents available for replication in the final year of the grant (pg. e43). If carried out as planned, these measures would provide extensive guidance about effective strategies suitable for effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

3. The evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach looking at qualitative and quantitative data. The project uses valid and reliable assessments including standardized state standards and validated surveys. The evaluation will also include rubric based observations (pg. e43-44). The project will incorporate a comprehensive feedback loop for continuous improvement that consists of an advisory council, Plan-Do-Study-Act to monitor the program implementation, and assessment of program availability for all students. Benchmarks are built into the logic model and short-term performance indicators will be assessed (pg. e34-35).

4. The applicant articulates the key project components. Goals and objectives are provided in a chart, grouped by implementation, teacher development, and student curriculum (pg. e30-31) and tied to the logic model (pg. e89). The outcomes are specific and measurable (pg. e 32) and aligned with the evaluation research questions (pg. about the impact of the project on implementation fidelity, and student impact (pg. e40). Mediators are identified (teacher knowledge and practices, student engagement (pg. e44) and little to no attrition is expected (pg. e42).

Weaknesses:

1. NA

2. NA

3. The sample size for the study is extremely small. The project will be implemented in only two K-4 schools with 914 students and 4 teachers across each grade level (20 teachers) (pg. e17). The comparison schools will include 10 schools of similar demographics. The sample size estimated for the study is 8, but it is unclear if that is schools, classrooms, or teachers. A second sample is listed as 12 schools, but this includes the control sites (pg. e104).

4. Guidance for estimating thresholds is included (minimum thresholds for implementation, i.e., teacher hours of PD participation, number of CS units implemented per classroom), but actual thresholds for the study are not provided (pg. e42, e89).

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 10:39 AM