

**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: Scott County School District (U411C190173)

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

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Scott County School District (U411C190173)

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 may produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations, because it will use an external evaluator and incorporates a quasi-experimental research design. The applicant included a plan for baseline equivalence, based on school size, demographics, and previous academic performance (pages e47-e50). This will meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

The applicant provided one research question specifically geared toward replicability. It focuses on fidelity of implementation and elements of the proposed project that facilitate implementation as well as possible impediments (pages e47, e50). This will help ensure that the proposed project is implemented as designed and will provide valuable information for replication.

The evaluation plan incorporates methods and assessments that are likely to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes, because it includes measures that have been previously validated, such as the Research Assessment Package and Force Concept Inventory (pages e50-e51).

The proposed project's components, mediators, and outcomes are well-aligned. The evaluation plan includes an appropriate acceptable threshold for implementation (pages e46-e48, e51).

Weaknesses:

Insufficient funding has been allocated in the budget to support an independent evaluation (page e107). Without adequate funding for the evaluation, it cannot be determined if the proposed project will meet What Works Clearinghouse standards and if it will provide a valid model for replication.

The applicant did not thoroughly describe how it plans to conduct a power analysis of the evaluation for the proposed

project (pages e48-e49). Because of this, the extent to which methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Scott County School District (U411C190173)

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Scott County School District (U411C190173)

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, multi-site study collecting baseline data from matched treatment schools and comparison schools in years 2 and 3 (pg. e47). If the evaluation plan is implemented with fidelity, using the mixed measures indicated in the study (pg. e48), the evaluation should produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations.

2. One of the goals of the project evaluation is to conduct an implementation evaluation (pg. e46). To that end, the applicant intends to examine the fidelity of implementation, barriers to successful implementation and outcomes, and findings for future replication and scaling up (pg. e47). The applicant also proposes to disseminate evaluation findings through the project's website, peer-reviewed publications, conferences, workshops and public forums (pg. e51).

3. The applicant proposes a high-quality evaluation that includes a multi-pronged approach using baseline equivalence measures. The research questions are specific and measurable (pg. e46-47). The evaluator will draw upon College Board data for tracking performance and participation in AP courses (pg. e35). The evaluator will also use validated tools to assess different factors: non-cognitive (Research Assessment Package for Schools), content knowledge (Force Concept Inventory and FSCI) (pg. e50). This methodology, if followed, should provide valid and reliable performance data on initial and end of project outcomes (pg. e 51).

4. The project components, mediators and outcomes are clearly articulated (figure 4, pg. e51). A clear threshold for acceptable implementation is provided (minimum 80% student attendance, pg. e51). Additional material is provided in the management plan (figure 2, pg. e43) regarding goals, objectives, measures, activities and milestones, as well as a timeline.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

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