

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2019 12:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Center for the Future of Arizona (U411C190109)

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

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

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Center for the Future of Arizona (U411C190109)

## 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 proposed project is likely to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations, because the evaluation uses a quasi-experimental design and included plans to ensure baseline equivalence between treatment and control groups (pages e41-e43). The applicant identified a well-qualified, experienced external evaluator and has allocated sufficient funding for this (pages e40-e42, e111).

The evaluation plan includes a thorough plan for assessing fidelity of implementation. The applicant included plans to assess each activity and provided data sources and metrics for each, including contextual factors. The applicant plans to identify critical components of the proposed project that can be replicated and sustained by others (pages e45-e46). This will help ensure that the proposed project is implemented as designed and will provide valuable information for replication.

The evaluation is likely to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes, because it is based on five research questions that are aligned with the project's goals and logic model (pages e37-e39, e41-e42).

The applicant plans to collect a variety of data at the student, teacher, and school level that will provide valuable information on the impact of the proposed project (pages e42-e46). The evaluation plan includes a variety of outcome measures, including dual credit attainment, high school graduation, interviews, surveys, observations, program records, and focus groups (pages e41-e43). This will provide qualitative and quantitative information on the impact of the proposed project.

The applicant included a thorough plan for data analysis that will provide information on the project's impact by comparing treatment and control groups and on its impact for students (pages e42-e46). This is likely to provide important information on the project's impact that can benefit others wishing to replicate the proposed project,

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **20**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   07/15/2019 12:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2019 03:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Center for the Future of Arizona (U411C190109)

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

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

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Center for the Future of Arizona (U411C190109)

## 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 quasi-experimental design that will use an impact analyses to evaluate the two main proposed outcomes: high school graduation rates, and completion of dual enrollment credits for transition to college. The evaluation, if implemented as planned, is very likely to effectively meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations.

2. The strategies and resources developed for the project will be available through "Pathways to Prosperity Network" (pg. e30). The evaluator will document findings from the efficacy and implementation studies (pg. e41) with specific attention to documenting variation in implementation and adaptation to local needs (pg. e46). The data will be triangulated with an eye to identifying components that are replicable (pg. e46). This approach will effectively provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

3. Research questions are specific and measurable (pg. e41-42). Data sources for evaluating implementation fidelity are listed for each activity, along with the accompanying metrics (table, pg. e45-46). The impact study will respond to the research questions through the collection of baseline data from both a treatment and comparison group based on demographics and achievement using standardized assessments, course enrollment and graduation completion. If the evaluation is implemented as planned, it should provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

4. All components of the evaluation plan are clearly articulated. Milestones are provided in the project management plan under each goal for both the development and iteration phase, and the efficacy study phase (pg. e37-e40). The evaluator has a plan for propensity score weighting to ensure baseline equivalency and has outlined variables (pg. e42). The threshold for the impact estimates will be all students in the treatment group who enrolled in at least one dual enrollment class in 11th grade (2022-23 school year) (pg. e43). The power analysis assumes an average of 450 10th graders per school (24 treatment/26 comparison) with a 10% variation and a treatment size of 600 students who are enrolled in a pathway course (pg. e44). The implementation study will look at 5 staff from each participating school with 16 hours of training (table, pg. e45-46).

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:** 20

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/15/2019 03:07 PM