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QUALITY OF PROJECT EVALUATION:
PRODUCING EVIDENCE OF PROMISE
Ginger Stoker, Ph.D.
Abt Associates
WEBINAR LOGISTICS

• **Record session** – Understand the session will be recorded.

• **Mute phones** – Press *6 on your phone to speak.

• **Chat** – Use the chat feature to send comments and questions to everyone.
OVERVIEW OF THE SESSION

- Competitive Preference Priority 2
  - What factors are considered for Competitive Preference Priority 2?
  - What is an Evidence-based component?
  - How do applicants apply for CPP 2?
  - How can applicants find studies to submit for CPP 2?

- Quality of Project Evaluation
  - What factors are considered when assessing the Quality of the Project Evaluation?
  - What is meant by Evidence of Promise?
  - How can applicants design evaluations that are able to produce Evidence of Promise?
  - Can applicants propose evaluations that meet Moderate or Strong Evidence standards?
What factors are considered for Competitive Preference Priority 2?
COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 2
NEW OR REVISED MAGNET SCHOOLS PROJECTS AND STRENGTH OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT PROPOSED PROJECTS
(0 TO 3 ADDITIONAL POINTS)

The Secretary determines the extent to which the applicant proposes to:

1. Carry out a new, evidence-based magnet school program;

2. Significantly revise an existing magnet school program using evidence-based methods and practices, as available; OR

3. Replicate an existing magnet school program that has a demonstrated record of success in increasing student academic achievement and reducing isolation of minority groups.
What is an Evidence-based component?
DEFINITION OF AN EVIDENCE-BASED COMPONENT FOR MSAP

20 U.S.C 7801

1. **Demonstrates a statistically significant effect** on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on:
   - **Strong evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study;
   - **Moderate evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; or
   - **Promising evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias.

   OR

2. **Demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation** that such activity, strategy or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes; **AND includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects** of such an activity, strategy or intervention.
## Definition of an Evidence-Based Component for MSAP

### ESSA Tiers of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1: Strong Evidence</th>
<th>Tier 2: Moderate Evidence</th>
<th>Tier 3: Promising Evidence</th>
<th>Tier 4: Demonstrates a Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed and implemented experimental study,</td>
<td>Well-designed and implemented quasi-experimental study,</td>
<td>Well-designed and implemented correlational study, statistically controls for selection bias</td>
<td>Well-defined logic model based on rigorous research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWC Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets WWC Standards Without Reservations</td>
<td>Meets WWC Standards With Reservations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
<td>An effort to study the effects of the intervention is planned or currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings from Related Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size and Overlap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 350 participants, conducted in more than one district or school</td>
<td>At least 350 participants, conducted in more than one district or school</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from experimental and quasi-experimental studies that either (a) meet the first four criteria for Tiers 1 and 2 but not the sample size and overlap requirement, or (b) do not meet WWC standards but statistically control for selection bias between the treatment and comparison groups are eligible to meet Tier 3 Promising Evidence.
How do applicants apply for CPP 2?
CPP 2 REQUIREMENTS

HOW TO EARN POINTS FOR CPP 2

- Complete Table 5: Evidence Supporting New or Revised Projects
- Submit evidence and Optional Evidence Form (or similar information) for the evidence-based component of your MSAP project
### Table 5: Evidence Supporting New or Revised Projects - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**Instructions:**
- If all of the schools participating in the project are new magnet schools, indicate “No Revised Magnet Schools Participating in the Project” in the first box below: “Nature of Revision or Change to the Magnet School.”
- For each existing magnet school the applicant proposes to revise, briefly describe the nature of the change that is being made to the magnet school program at that school (for example, expansion of program from PWS serving 50 students to whole-school program serving 400 students; adding medical sciences within school to complement other PWS and serve greater total number of students; upgrade thematic curriculum to maintain program attractiveness; replace existing magnet program, etc.); and
- Explain the significance of the revision to the magnet school. Relevant information might include, for example, discussion of diminishing effectiveness of the existing program; what would be accomplished or achieved as a result of the revision to the magnet program; changes in the number of students participating in the existing program; the expected benefits or effects that would result from implementation of the revision; the need, if appropriate, to expand from a within-school program to a whole-school program; etc.
- Provide evidence as described in the Application Package to demonstrate that the school(s) are evidence based.
- Use additional sheets, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Name:</th>
<th>Magnet School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Revision or Change to the Magnet School:</td>
<td>No Revised Magnet Schools Participating in the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expansion of program from PWS serving 50 students to whole-school program serving 400 students</td>
<td>• Expansion of program from PWS serving 50 students to whole-school program serving 400 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adding medical sciences within school to complement other PWS and serve greater total number of students</td>
<td>• Adding medical sciences within school to complement other PWS and serve greater total number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade thematic curriculum to maintain program attractiveness</td>
<td>• Upgrade thematic curriculum to maintain program attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace existing magnet program</td>
<td>• Replace existing magnet program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of How or Why the Revision is Significant:**
- Discussion of diminishing effectiveness of the existing program
- What would be accomplished or achieved as a result of the revision to the magnet program; Changes in the number of students participating in the existing program
- The expected benefits or effects that would result from implementation of the revision
- The need, if appropriate, to expand from a within-school program to a whole-school program.
CPP 2 APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS
SUBMIT EVIDENCE AND THE OPTIONAL EVIDENCE FORM

- Applicants applying for Competitive Preference Priority 2 should specify the intervention(s) in the study or studies that you plan to implement and the findings within the citations that you are requesting to be considered as evidence-based, including page number(s) of specific applicable tables in those citations. No more than two studies may be submitted under this part.

  NOTE: The Department will not consider a study citation or citations that you fail to clearly identify for review for CPP 2.

- You MUST include a LINK to a publicly available, FULL TEXT copy of the original study in your application.

  NOTE: References to the citation or citations to the study without a link to a publicly accessible, full text copy of the study or studies are NOT, in and of themselves, sufficient.
It is suggested that you address the following pieces in your response to satisfy this CPP:

- **Research/Citation.** Provide the full citation for each study you are putting forth for consideration. If the study has been reviewed by the WWC, please include the rating it received. Remember to include a [LINK](#) to a publicly available, full-text version of each study.

- **Relevant Outcome(s)/Findings.** Describe: 1) the outcomes in the study presented and how those outcomes are statistically significant; and 2) how the outcomes in the evidence relate to the outcomes in your project. Include page numbers for findings and related tables.

- **Relevance to Proposed Project.** Briefly describe the intervention used in the study presented as evidence. How does the evidence relate to your proposed project? Will your proposed project measure the same outcomes? What link is there between the study presented and your proposed intervention and/or study? If applicable, explain how the population in your proposed project is similar to that used in the cited study.
### U.S. Department of Education
### Evidence Form

**1. Level of Evidence**
Select the level of evidence of effectiveness for which you are applying. See the Notice Inviting Applications for the relevant definitions and requirements.

| Demonstrates a Rationale | Promising Evidence | Moderate Evidence | Strong Evidence |

**2. Citation and Relevance**
Fill in the chart below with the appropriate information about the studies that support your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Research/Citation</th>
<th>B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)</th>
<th>C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C.B., &amp; Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). Teaching secondary students to write effectively (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/22">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/22</a>. This report was prepared under Version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook (p. 22).</td>
<td>(Table 1, p.4) Recommendation 1 (“Explicitly teach appropriate strategies using a Model–Practice–Reflect instructional cycle”) is characterized as backed by “strong evidence”.</td>
<td>(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the “strong evidence” supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 were conducted on students in grades 6 through 12 in urban and suburban districts in California and the Mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. These study samples overlap with both the populations and the setting proposed for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMEMBER:** You **MUST** include a link to a publicly available, **FULL TEXT copy** of the study in your application.
How can applicants find studies to submit for CPP 2?
FINDING STUDIES THAT MEET CPP 2 REQUIREMENTS

- The Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) contains a searchable digital database of studies, many with full text
- What Works Clearinghouse™
- OESE Technical Assistance Centers
- Regional Educational Laboratories
- State intervention lists
- Other online journals and reports
- Academic and non-academic researchers
- Professional associations
WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE (IES.ED.GOV/NCEE/WWC)
ERIC (ERIC.ED.GOV)

How does the ERIC search work?
ERIC will look for your search terms across a set of key ERIC fields: title, author, source, abstract and descriptor. You can also enter an ERIC accession number (ERIC ID) to search for the ERIC document itself, as well as documents that mention or cite the document by ID. An ISBN, ISSN or IES Grant/Contract Number may also be entered directly into the search box.

Ranking of results is determined by many factors including the publication date (more recent publications are favored).

This video helps users understand how to find information in an intuitive way and, in most cases, without the need for advanced search logic. The video demonstrates how simple search strategies can be an effective way to search the ERIC database.

How do I create more specific searches?
- Use quotes to group words into specific phrases:
  - "no child left behind"
  - "mayvland "no child left behind"
  - "west virginia" "no child left behind"
- Use the Field/term syntax to target specific ERIC fields:
  - author: virginia
  - author:"snoop doopy"
  - "regression analysis" title: "test scores"
  - abstract:"no child left behind" pubyear: 2002
- Add a filter:value to further restrict search results by a publication year range:
  - abstract:"no child left behind" pubyear: min: 2016
- Use the field/term syntax to target IES Funded and/or What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Reviewed documents:
  - fundedby: will show IES Funded documents.
  - For WWC Reviewed documents:
    - wwcov: Meets Evidence Standards without Reservations
    - wwcrr: Meets Evidence Standards with Reservations
    - wwcnr: Does Not Meet Evidence Standards

What other advanced options are available?
- For exact, case-sensitive field searches, you may use: descriptor, source, locations, law and assessments. For example, while source: "higher education" would include results with the source "Chronicle of Higher Education", the exact search for sources: "Higher Education" would only return results with the source "Higher Education".
- You can use AND/OR to limit the search, with parentheses if required. For example, (prekindergarten OR kindergarten) AND literacy will return findings with either the term prekindergarten or kindergarten that also contain the word literacy.
- You can require search terms using the + symbol in front of one or more words or phrases in your search. For example, +title: regression multivariate hierarchical linear would return only results with the term regression, with the terms multivariate, hierarchical, and linear being optionally searched in all fields.
- You can exclude search terms using the - symbol in the same way you would use a + symbol. For example, information on bullying, but not focused by sexual orientation, search bullying -gay.
- You can combine any advanced syntax into a single search: regression/autism OR autism - descriptor: "regression analysis" - descriptor: "regression statistics" descriptor: autism

* Note: filters must be combined with at least one other search term and cannot be used with AND/OR/+, etc.
COMBINING SOURCES TO FIND EVIDENCE

Reviews of Individual Studies

Use this search page to find individual studies that have been reviewed by the WWC and categorized into ESSA evidence tiers. Select options from the filters or enter author/title information into the search box. The resulting list of studies connects you to more information, including whether the study has been included in a WWC publication that summarizes evidence from more than one study.

Filter options include:
- All Ratings
- All Topics
- Evidence Rating (All options selected)

Displaying 1 - 10 of 11580 results
USING WWC AND ERIC

The impact of career and technical education on postsecondary outcomes in Nebraska and South Dakota. REL 2021-087.


https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED612630

QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN EXAMINING 112,764 STUDENTS, GRADES 9-PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement Index</th>
<th>Evidence tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attaining Up to</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tier Moderate" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Associate's</td>
<td>career and</td>
<td>classes of</td>
<td>2012/13 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>2013/14;</td>
<td>42,398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td>42,398</td>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course sequence vs. Business as usual</td>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement Index</th>
<th>Evidence tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College degree attainment outcomes—Statistically significant positive effects found</td>
<td>High school career and technical education course sequence vs. Business as usual</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>Full sample: 112,764 students</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tier Moderate" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement Index</th>
<th>Evidence tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduation</td>
<td>High school career and technical education course sequence vs. Business as usual</td>
<td>0 Months</td>
<td>Full sample: 112,764 students</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tier Moderate" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Impact of Career and Technical Education on Postsecondary Outcomes in Nebraska and South Dakota. REL 2021-087

Brodersen, R. Marc; Gagnon, Douglas; Liu, Jing; Tedeschi, Steven
Regional Educational Laboratory Central

Education leaders in Nebraska and South Dakota partnered with the Regional Educational Laboratory Central to examine how completing a sequence of career and technical education (CTE) courses in high school affects students' rates of on-time high school graduation and their rates of postsecondary education enrollment and completion within two and five years. The study found that CTE concentrators (students who complete a sequence of CTE courses aligned to a specific career field such as manufacturing or education and training) were 7 percentage points more likely than non-CTE concentrators to graduate from high school on time and 10 percentage points more likely to enroll in any type of postsecondary education within two years of their expected high school graduation year. The study also found that CTE concentrators were 3 percentage points more likely than non-CTE concentrators to earn a postsecondary award, such as a professional certificate, diploma, or associate's or bachelor's degree, within five years of their expected high school graduation year. CTE concentrators were 4 percentage points more likely than non-CTE concentrators to obtain an associate's degree as their highest postsecondary award within five years of their expected high school graduation year but 1 percentage point less likely to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher. [For the appendixes, see ED612631; for the study brief, see ED612632; for the study snapshot, see ED612633.]

Descriptors: Vocational Education, High School Students, High School Graduates, Graduation, Postsecondary Education, College Attendance, College Graduates, Time to Degree, Occupations, Educational Certificates, Academic Degrees, Associate Degrees, Bachelors Degrees, Student Characteristics, Majors (Students), Course Selection (Students)

NOTES ABOUT WWC STUDY FINDINGS

- The WWC ratings (e.g., Meets Standards Without Reservations) are applied to each study finding, NOT the intervention itself. CLICK on the FINDINGS tab to see how each outcome is rated.

- The study as a whole receives the rating of the highest-rated finding reviewed by the WWC, which may be different from the finding relevant for your project. Again, CLICK on the FINDINGS tab to see how each outcome is rated.

- A high study rating is not the WWC’s endorsement of an intervention or a determination that either an intervention or a finding is relevant for your project! Make sure that the study you select focuses on similar outcomes to those in your logic model.

- The sign, size, and statistical significance of the estimated effect are reported by the WWC but do not affect the WWC study rating, so a study rating of “Meets WWC Standards” does not mean that the intervention is effective. Make sure that the study you select demonstrated a statistically significant, positive effect on your outcome of interest.

- The ESSA Tier ratings within the WWC can help direct you to findings that will meet CPP 2 standards. Check for designations of Tier 1, 2 or 3 next to your outcome of interest.
QUESTIONS?
What factors are considered when assessing the Quality of the Evaluation for MSAP applications?
QUALITY OF PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERION

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) How the applicant will assess, monitor, and evaluate the impact of the activities funded under this part on student achievement and integration. (ESEA section 4405(b)(1)(D)) (up to 6 points)

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. (34 CFR 75.210) (up to 7 points)

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project’s effectiveness. (34 CFR 75.210) (up to 7 points)
What is meant by Evidence of Promise?
Evidence of Promise is “empirical evidence to support the theoretical linkage(s) between at least one critical component and at least one relevant outcome presented in the logic model for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice.”

This must include one study that is either a—

- **Correlational study** with statistical controls for selection bias (regardless of whether it meets WWC Evidence Standards);
- **Quasi-experimental design (QED)** study that meets WWC Evidence Standards with reservations; or
- **Randomized controlled trial (RCT)** that meets the WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations.
## ESSA TIERS OF EVIDENCE REVISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong Evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderate Evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promising Evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demonstrates a Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design</strong></td>
<td>Well-designed and implemented experimental study,</td>
<td>Well-designed and implemented quasi-experimental study,</td>
<td>Well-designed and implemented correlational study, statistically controls for selection bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well-defined logic model based on rigorous research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWC Standard</strong></td>
<td>Meets WWC Standards Without Reservations</td>
<td>Meets WWC Standards With Reservations</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable Effects</strong></td>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
<td>Statistically significant and positive effect on a relevant outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An effort to study the effects of the intervention is planned or currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings from Related Studies</strong></td>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
<td>No strong, negative findings from experimental or quasi-experimental studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size and Overlap</strong></td>
<td>At least 350 participants, conducted in more than one district or school</td>
<td>At least 350 participants, conducted in more than one district or school</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar population AND setting to your study</td>
<td>Similar population OR setting to your study</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from experimental and quasi-experimental studies that either (a) meet the first four criteria for Tiers 1 and 2 but not the sample size and overlap requirement, or (b) do not meet WWC standards but statistically control for selection bias between the treatment and comparison groups are eligible to meet Tier 3 Promising Evidence.
How can applicants design evaluations that are able to produce Evidence of Promise?
MEETING PROMISING EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

At a minimum MSAP evaluations MUST meet promising evidence standards: a well-designed and implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias.

A correlational study looks at associations or relationships between participation in the intervention and the outcomes. A correlational study does not demonstrate causation.

For MSAP, correlational studies need:

- A defined intervention included in your logic model and related to at least one specified outcome
- A comparison group who does not receive the intervention
- Statistical controls for selection bias, which are the covariates included in the outcomes analysis to account for pre-existing differences between intervention and comparison groups
An intervention is a critical component of the “process, a product, strategy, or practice being proposed” designed to improve a relevant outcome... consistent with the specific goals of a program.
DEFINING THE INTERVENTION FOR A STUDY OF EVIDENCE OF PROMISE

CONSIDERATIONS

1. Which intervention will you study that, according your project logic model, is supposed to affect a relevant outcome?

2. Is this an intervention received by all students in your project, or only some students?

3. What services will be received by students in the comparison group, and do they offer a service contrast with the intervention?

NOTE: The intervention you select and who receives it will influence who is in your intervention and comparison groups.
DEFINING YOUR INTERVENTION AND COMPARISON GROUPS

- To demonstrate evidence of promise, MSAP evaluations MUST include an intervention and comparison group.

- Groups can be identified in a number of ways as long as subjects in the intervention and comparison groups are exclusive – subjects are a member of the intervention OR comparison group.
  - You cannot compare the same students to themselves either in the same school year (e.g., beginning of year pretest vs. end of year posttest) or in subsequent school years (e.g., grade 3 pre-intervention pretest vs. end of grade 4 post-intervention posttest). No single group pre/post designs.

- Your comparison group is intended to estimate what would have happened in your intervention group, if they had not received the intervention.

NOTE: The goal is to identify a comparison group that is as similar as possible to students in the intervention group.
SELECTING A COMPARISON GROUP

DEFINE ELIGIBILITY

1. Define eligibility criteria for **both** the intervention and comparison groups
   - **School example**: Schools in same district that include grades 3-5 and are not implementing (or have not recently implemented) the selected or similar intervention.
   - **Student example**: Students in grades 3-5 who are struggling in reading and not currently receiving or have not previously received the selected or similar intervention.
SELECTING A COMPARISON GROUP

CONSIDER DATA NEEDS

2. Assess availability of **pre-intervention** (baseline) and **outcome data** for students

- Pre-intervention and outcome data **MUST** be the same for students in the intervention and comparison groups
  - Can you obtain the **same** pre-intervention and outcome data for students in the intervention and comparison groups?
  - Will you be able to use **extant data** (e.g., administrative data), or will you need to **collect** preintervention or outcome data for students in the intervention and comparison group?
  - Can you obtain preintervention and outcome data for students in **non-MSAP** schools, if necessary?
SELECTING A COMPARISON GROUP

SELECT YOUR COMPARISON GROUP

3. Determine how to select your comparison group, taking into account eligibility criteria.

Potential ways to create comparison groups:

**Random assignment**

- Use a lottery to select students to enroll in the MSAP schools (intervention group) with students not selected serving as the comparison group
- Use a statistical program to randomly assign students within MSAP schools to participate in the intervention (intervention group) or continue business-as-usual (comparison group)

**Non-random assignment: Matching or weighting**

- Match MSAP schools (intervention group) with other schools (comparison group) in the same (or other) district using propensity score matching or other formal matching procedures
- Match students within MSAP schools who receive the intervention (intervention group) with other students in the same MSAP schools or non-MSAP schools who do not receive the intervention (comparison group) using propensity score matching
SELECTING A COMPARISON GROUP

SELECT YOUR COMPARISON GROUP, CONTINUED

Potential ways to create comparison groups:

**Non-random assignment: Convenience**

- Identify similar schools in the same (or other) district as MSAP schools without formal matching procedures
- Identify students in the same MSAP schools who participated in the intervention and did not participate in the intervention without formal matching procedures

**NOTE:** How you select your comparison group will determine the highest level of evidence your study can meet.

- Studies can use *non-random assignment* to meet *Moderate or Promising Evidence* standards.
- Studies **MUST** demonstrate *baseline equivalence* to meet *Moderate Evidence* standards, which may be easier to achieve using matching or weighting.
- Studies **MUST** use *random assignment* to meet *Strong Evidence* standards.
STATISTICAL CONTROLS FOR SELECTION BIAS

INCLUDE COVARIATES IN ANALYSES

Typically, outcomes analyses are conducted as single- or multi-level regression analyses with

- A dummy variable as a treatment indicator (1 = treatment, 0 = comparison) at the level of assignment, and

  - The inclusion of a pretest (or other baseline measure) and student background characteristics as statistical controls in the model. For example:
  - Achievement test scores in math and/or reading (or other pre-intervention measure of the outcome)
  - Gender
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Socioeconomic status
Applications should include the statistical model to be used to analyze the data. For example:

\[ Y_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(Treat)_j + \sum_{m=2}^{M} \gamma_{0m}(School)_j + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \gamma_{1n}(Student)_{ij} + u_0j + r_{ij} \]

- Where School indicates the school-level covariates to be included in the model, including percent of economically disadvantaged students, percent historically underrepresented minority students, average school-level reading achievement
- And Student indicates student-level covariates including, reading pretest, gender, economically disadvantaged, grade-level, race/ethnicity, and English learner status.
EVIDENCE OF PROMISE SUMMARY

CHECKLIST FOR YOUR EVALUATION DESIGN

✓ Define your intervention
✓ Specify eligibility for your intervention and comparison groups
✓ Describe how you will obtain your intervention and comparison groups
✓ List your pre-intervention and outcome measures
  • Describe how you will obtain data on the same preintervention and outcome measures for your intervention and comparison group
✓ Describe your outcomes analyses, including the analytic model
  • Specify the statistical controls for selections bias (i.e., covariates such as pretest, demographics, etc.) that will be included in your analytic model
Can applicants propose evaluations that meet Moderate or Strong Evidence standards?
MEETING STRONG OR MODERATE EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

At a minimum, MSAP evaluations are required to meet *Promising Evidence* standards. However, many applicants opt to propose studies that can meet *Strong* or *Moderate Evidence* standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Strong Evidence</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Moderate Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design</strong></td>
<td>Uses an experimental design (e.g., lottery, random assignment)</td>
<td>Uses a quasi-experimental design (e.g., includes a similar comparison group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attrition</strong></td>
<td>Meets WWC criteria for low attrition</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Equivalence</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Meets WWC criteria for baseline equivalence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joiners</strong></td>
<td>Does not include joiners (i.e., schools or students that enter the intervention group after random assignment)</td>
<td>Does not have confounds (i.e., a component that is completely aligned with either the intervention or comparison group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confounds</strong></td>
<td>Does not have confounds (i.e., a component that is completely aligned with either the intervention or comparison group)</td>
<td>Does not have confounds (i.e., a component that is completely aligned with either the intervention or comparison group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid and Reliable Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Uses valid, reliable outcome measures that are not overaligned with the intervention</td>
<td>Uses valid, reliable outcome measures that are not overaligned with the intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes Aligned with WWC Domains</strong></td>
<td>Uses outcomes that fit into WWC outcome domains</td>
<td>Uses outcomes that fit into WWC outcome domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td>Includes at least 350 students in more than one school or district</td>
<td>Includes at least 350 students in more than one school or district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Include statistical controls for selection bias in your outcomes analyses even if you plan to meet Moderate or Strong Evidence standards. This way your evaluation will still be able to meet *Promising Evidence* even if you do not meet all the criteria for Moderate or Strong Evidence.
RESOURCES FOR MEETING STRONG OR MODERATE EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

- What Works Clearinghouse Handbooks
  https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks

- WWC Study Review Protocol

- WWC Webinars on Evidence Tiers and Study Ratings
  https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Resources/Evidence
QUESTIONS?
THANK YOU

Direct questions about the grant application to the MSAP Team at the U.S. Department of Education at msap.team@ed.gov.