

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 01:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Touro College (U411C190279)

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 #11 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 9: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Touro College (U411C190279)

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 proposes a randomized-controlled trial (RCT), clustered on the teacher/classroom level and blocked by school that, if well implemented, could produce evidence about the project's effectiveness and could meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (p. 18). For example, two cohorts of kindergarten students will be randomly assigned to receive either the proposed intervention or business-as-usual mathematics instruction (p. 18). The applicant provides power analyses to demonstrate that the sample is of sufficient size to detect minimal effects of the intervention (p. 19). The use of hierarchical linear modeling is appropriate in order to avoid overestimation of statistical significance of the effect size (pp. 21-22).

The applicant convincingly describes how the evaluation will provide adequate guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. For example, during the formative evaluation phase, the evaluator will conduct focus groups, interviews and surveys of the pilot teacher participants regarding how to maximize engagement and participation of teachers, administrators, and students (p. 18). Classroom observation data will be reviewed by the evaluator to support ongoing program improvement (p. 18). The applicant will develop and analyze an implementation fidelity matrix that will provide guidance for how the program might be implemented in other settings (p. 23). The applicant will conduct artifact analyses, site visits, and examine contextual factors to provide detailed information on factors that support or inhibit successful replication, as well as variations in implementation and adaptation to local needs (p. 23).

The applicant successfully demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the applicant provides psychometric data to demonstrate the validity and reliability of the student social-emotional competence measure (p. 21) and the student mathematics achievement measure (p. 20). The applicant describes a process for establishing internal consistency for the computational thinking and music student assessments (p. 21). The four student assessments are closely aligned and relevant to the four identified student outcomes (pp. 20-21).

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes. For example, the summative evaluation includes an exploratory analysis of student-level mediators such as disability status and other

student demographic characteristics (p. 17); teacher/classroom-level moderators such as teacher experience, class size, and classroom average prior achievement; and school moderators such as school size and demographic composition (p. 20). The applicant will use structural equation modeling to test the effects of the improved quality of teacher practice mediator (p. 22). Moderators will be added as covariates and as grand-mean centered interactions so that the analyses can determine if moderation effects are present (p. 22).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not suggest a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation, but states that this will be incorporated into the summative evaluation (p. 18).

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/17/2019 01:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 02:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Touro College (U411C190279)

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 #11 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 9: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Touro College (U411C190279)

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:

A randomized controlled trial will be employed that could meet WWC standards without reservations, if the evaluation is implemented well (pg. 16).

A power analysis was conducted and identified the minimum sample size needed (pg. 19). Research question seven focuses on mediators (pg. 20). Evidence of validity and reliability were provided for the student measures (pg. 21).

Student background variables such as demographics, free or reduced lunch status, and English Language Learner status, will be used in the impact evaluation and moderation analyses (pg. 21). Test scores will be converted to Z-scores because the student populations will be in two different states with different state tests (pg. 22). Mediators were clearly identified with a plan to use structural equation modeling to test for mediation (pg. 22). If well implemented, the evaluation could produce evidence on the project's effectiveness. The comprehensive plan proposed including variations of implementation which should provide guidance for implementation in other settings (pg. 23). Methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data for students social and emotional competence measures and a process for establishing internal consistency (pg. e19).

Weaknesses:

A plan for analysis of the qualitative data was not sufficiently provided.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 02:24 PM

