

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2024 10:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	70
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - Early Tier 1 - 14: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The proposed project goes over and abroad to precisely link two evidence-based strategies to student learning outcomes. Notably, the authors paint an intentional picture of the need for an Early Warning System to mitigate chronic absenteeism in communities hit hard by the pandemic. The authors express how teachers/staff/schools currently purchase material ad-hoc with little buy-in from staff and even lighter convictions from students. Therefore, the intervention of implementing a strategy with buy-in promotes teacher self-efficacy, which is highly rated on the evidence-based WWC continuum as well as Hattie's research.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The framework is impressive in the fact that there are redundancies in oversight. There are multiple evaluators providing space for independent, non-biased reviews of the outcomes. Specifically, the external evaluator, currently an EIR evaluator leads the Virginia Ed Strategies. Table D.1 shows the progression from baseline to treatment, leading to the data comparison needed to scale up the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

There is good structure and procedures. The timeline shows commitment to prep work and shows the dedication the team has to the project. One thing that stands out among the many specific and measurable goals, is the logic model. The authors have explained the relationship between the logic model and evidence-based practices. The logic model will be used for short-term outcomes. Those outcomes will then build into evidence-based student achievement and teacher efficacy. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be used to triangulate data across tools/resources.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)

Strengths:

The application includes a thorough and thoughtful approach to supporting the target population. The authors have clearly defined their audience by including historical data for underserved students with low graduation rates as well as those lacking success in post-secondary settings. The authors further provided demographic data that tells a story of why they have chosen the innovative intervention and how it increases student achievement through conferencing and qualitative data. Support systems include multilingual approaches, extra curricula activities, and staff.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The application is particularly strong in its articulation of its hiring practices. Notably, the statements around the intentionality of its equity and inclusion commitment and published roadmap.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant's experience and expertise in these areas are evident in the high quality of the management plan. There is clear oversight, iterative design processes, and data collection. The inclusion of the long-standing research of Social Organization of Schools and participating partners boasts a heavy lift that is well-designed. The inclusion of the MOU too shows the thoughtfulness of the plan. Table D.2 clearly provides a visual of the numerous tasks that must be completed for fidelity along with staff expertise and a timeline serving as the checks and balances. The proposed budget is detailed and appears to be well-justified. CSOS has its own dedicated finance and grant management staff. They support this claim by including research and resumes with staff accomplishments, articles, and successful outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The project has a clear and logical structure, which is particularly important for underrepresented low-income and minority students. The research shared that the high rates of chronic absenteeism before COVID-19 were more prevalent in cities like Baltimore and surrounding communities hit hard by the pandemic. In addition, key team members who have contributed to scholarly articles and higher education panel forums in educational COVID-19 relief efforts bring their

expertise to the intervention.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2024 10:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2024 12:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	18
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	70	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - Early Tier 1 - 14: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The project will transform an existing, evidence-based early warning system to include social-emotional indicators and interventions focusing on school connectedness and belonging, building on current early warning system work happening at the high school level in the city. The proposed project will use the Early Warning System (EWS), which uses predictive indicators of student academic, educational attainment, and well-being outcomes to identify students who will likely need additional academic and/or social-emotional support as early as possible. Then, include a school-wide focus on increasing students' sense of school connectedness and belonging based on research.

Weaknesses:

The project failed to provide substantial evidence to support the innovation of strategies to be used with it. The narrative cites the consistent use of social-emotional interventions, which increases the impact of the Early Warning System (EWS) on social-emotional development and achievement. However, there was limited corroborating evidence or details to show strategies that build on or are alternatives to existing strategies.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Strengths:

The applicant suggests using four structural components to keep students on track for graduation. Included is a reliable system to monitor early warning indicators for students at high risk of dropping out of high school. Once at-risk students have been identified, interventions are proposed with monitoring to determine if adjustments are needed. Teachers are provided extensive professional development to ensure implementation fidelity and buy-in. Teachers would be further supported through the establishment of a community of practice. The project's logic model included inputs, activities, and short, mid, and long-term outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The narrative failed to provide specific strategies for developing students' sense of connectedness and belonging in school. Targeted interventions were not described, nor were the methods of employing those interventions. The Theory of Change on page e18 refers to student contacts during report card conferences and semester check-ins. It further indicates the use of Caring Conversations without providing the process through which these would occur. The limited amount of contact does not provide sufficient frequency to impact behaviors successfully.

Reader's Score: 8

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provided four detailed goals for the proposed project, each including outcomes and measures. The goals include developing materials and agreements with the target school districts, piloting Student Success Intervention Model (SSIM) materials, implementing SSIM, and examining high school outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed logic model integrating extensive training for teachers, including such approaches as professional learning communities, online training, summer workshops, and coaching sessions. The Baltimore Education Research Consortium began examining early warning indicator systems in partnership with Baltimore City Public Schools' Office of Achievement and Accountability-Knowledge Management. The target population has been identified with specificity relying on information from the Maryland Report Card which shows that in 2023, Baltimore City Schools had a (1) 83.6% attendance rate, (2) 70.57% graduation rate, (3) 71.6% of economically disadvantaged students, (4) 12.6% who are multilingual, and (5) 16,677 middle school students with 7.5% proficient in math, 28.5% proficient in English language arts, and around half chronically absent. The project has a commendable component for inclusion and support for multi-language learners and includes those teachers within the conferences and planning process. Students are encouraged to participate in self-reflection, conferences, and goal setting.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

Six well-qualified individuals will lead the project. Complete resumes, position roles and responsibilities, backgrounds, and qualifications were provided for all key personnel. The narrative included a statement indicating the applicant would ensure the representation of underrepresented groups by informing HBCUs and large urban districts of job openings and demonstrating a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant has had historic success implementing programs in businesses, non-profit organizations, institutions, and government. A team of qualified researchers is on hand to support the program's implementation and review. The applicant's approach will include an initial planning and development period, iterative development over three

Sub

years, and eventual full implementation. Professional development and customized technical assistance are woven throughout the program. The narrative provided a timeline and management chart on page e31, including persons responsible and a timeline for implementation.

Weaknesses:

The program's full launch will not occur until year three of the project. The inclusion of the methods of monitoring the implementation would have made the project's intent clearer. Selection criteria for teachers and students involved in the proposed project was not provided.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families;**

and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

Due to the additional stress caused by the pandemic, students need skills and motivation to face additional life challenges. The proposed project will add intervention support through an early warning system to 1) equip students with the SEL skills needed to problem-solve challenges both in and out of school and 2) increase students' feelings of school belonging. Moreover, greater support for these students and this project is based on data from the Maryland Report Card citing, "Out of 17,459 middle school students in Baltimore City in 2023, 8,196 were chronically absent."

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/13/2024 12:12 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2024 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	70
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - Early Tier 1 - 14: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's significance section was very persuasive. The Student Success Intervention Model proposed for this project will build on a current early warning system at the high school level in the city. The project will transform an existing, evidence-based early warning system to include social-emotional indicators and interventions with a focus on school connectedness and belonging in Baltimore City Schools middle schools. There is a strong body of research and other evidence that validates the need for this project, inclusive of its prior success, in high school.

There is a clear connection between the teacher buy-in strategy, early warning system and teacher efficacy. The Change Packet includes resources for schools with ideas to promote student social-emotional skill development.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant did establish a sufficient conceptual framework. The proposed project has a Theory of Change that represents the conceptual framework. It includes professional development training, materials, and resources that will support teacher teams and district leaders to implement schoolwide strategies and interventions established for students.

Another component of the conceptual framework is the Logic Model in the application. Also, included in the framework is professional development for teachers that will help them ensure the fidelity of implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The adequacy of the project to meet the goals, objectives and outcomes for this project are highly likely given the evidence presented. Each of these elements are seamlessly aligned. There are both quantitative and qualitative measures in place satisfactorily assessing the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)

Strengths:

The proposed project has thoughtfully planned multiple strategies that will address the needs of the target population. Based on the proven evidence that EWI (Early Warning Indicator) systems work to improve student outcomes at the middle and high school levels, the students at schools participating in this project should certainly benefit. There is a detailed description of strategies such as materials in various languages. The project will intentionally target middle schools in an effort to improve 9th grade success rates in high schools.

The Skills for Secondary School Success will help build student's self-management skills along with their relationship and collaboration skills. The intervention in this study focuses directly on improving the key student behaviors that are the strongest predictors of high school graduation: attendance, good behavior, and high school course passing, as well as, school belonging. In the Logic Model the applicant pays particular attention to school-wide evidence-based strategies to increase school connectedness for middle school students.

On a quarterly basis, teacher feedback and student feedback will be collected through an adapted fidelity of implementation (FOI) survey. These brief surveys will allow the applicant to gain insights into which interventions are being utilized, which interventions are useful to teachers and students, and which interventions need modifications.

There will be targeted support for multilingual learners with the team-based process where an ESL teacher will be

Sub

included as a standing member to provide insights into language acquisition as well as implement processes to support communication strategies with the families of multilingual learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

There is solid evidence that the project personnel are a highly qualified team of individuals who will support project implementation. According to the application, Johns Hopkins University does have a commitment to increasing employment representation of persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been in alignment with university commitments to equity and inclusion.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Sub

Strengths:

Given the high quality of the management plan, it is efficient enough to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. Milestones for the Impact Study Plan are reasonable to gauge effective implementation. The project staff time commitments are based on prior experience with multiple grants and projects of similar size and scope. Additionally, Table D2 includes timelines associated with outcomes, therefore the applicant has established multiple timelines that cover key components of the project. There are visuals of tasks to be completed. Lastly, a team of qualified researchers will work collaboratively to ensure the success of the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an

assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The proposed project will add intervention support to an early warning system to 1) equip students with the SEL skills needed to problem-solve challenges both in and out of school; and 2) increase students' feelings of school belonging. In supporting these students, the current project will address Competitive Preference Priority 2. Due to the additional stress caused by the pandemic, students need skills and motivation to face life challenges as evidenced by the research cited in the application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/12/2024 05:09 PM

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 09:20 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Total	30	28

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Early Tier 2 - 14: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

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:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. (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). (20 points)

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation includes a clear presentation of a quasi-experimental design (QED) study that can produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations (e33). The QED is responsive to a logical series of research questions stemming first from a question on the impact of the program on student attendance, absenteeism, grade point average, and core course failure (e32), a tightly bound set of outcomes directly tied to programmer goals (e23-e25). The instruments in the proposal are relevant and appropriate (e84-e86, e96-e97). The outcome measures are administrative data that are valid for this evaluation and should be easily obtainable from through the data sharing agreement in place between the Baltimore Educational Research Consortium and Baltimore City Schools (e34).

The decision to include six treatment schools that will receive full implementation over time aligns with programmer rationale about the treatment (e30). Matching the treatment schools to comparison schools within Baltimore City should enable the evaluator to determine baseline equivalence (e33). The generalized linear mixed model seems appropriate for the statistical analysis, including the nesting of students within schools (e34). The evaluator correctly recognizes the importance of attrition even if it is not necessary for a QED and appropriately indicates an intention to track and attempt to minimize attrition rates (e34). The evaluator also provides a thorough presentation of a power analysis, including reasonable assumptions about the numbers of student participants, assumed power of 0.80, etc. (e33). Their power analysis results in the determination of sensible minimum detectable effect sizes for the various impact outcomes (e33-e34).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not sufficiently consider the issue of joiners and how they will account for or respond to them in analyses. The proposal seems to discuss mobility and attrition somewhat synonymously (e34), but they are different issues. There is a possibility of contamination with student mobility across treatment and comparison schools that deserves some attention (e34).

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The ongoing working relationship between programmer and evaluator (e34) seems to allow for regular performance feedback and periodic assessments. Numerous relevant data sources are identified that appear to be diverse, both quantitative and qualitative in nature (e35). There is also an appropriate amount of consideration to how the various sources can be triangulated for deeper understanding (e35). The implementation study spans much of the project (e32), potentially yielding many opportunities for the programmer to make appropriate adjustments based on real-time learning. Numerous meetings of various kinds for differing purposes appear to be robust (e.g., e23-e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) 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. (5 points)

Strengths:

The evaluator clearly articulates various relevant impact, mediator, moderator, and fidelity outcomes (e36). The research questions inclusive of mediator, moderator, and fidelity strategically specify project goals (e23-e25, e32-e33). The evaluator skillfully develops an implementation framework that identifies key components for and thresholds at various levels (e23-e25) that align with programmer goals. The evaluation described through the logic model (e52) is robust and inclusive of project components, moderators, and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/03/2024 09:20 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/04/2024 10:34 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
Sub Total	30	29
Total	30	29

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Early Tier 2 - 14: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Johns Hopkins University (S411C240227)

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:

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

1. (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). (20 points)

Strengths:

As proposed, the applicant's evaluation will meet WWC standards with moderate evidence through a QED study using hierarchical linear modelling with controls for selection bias (e33). Notable design features to meet WWC standards will include 600 students in the treatment group from six schools with the match schools for the comparison group based on school-level demographics and achievement (e33). Additional strengths include establishing baseline-equivalence between the two groups in both the initial and final analytic sample using variables specified in the WWC Review Protocol for Studies of Interventions to Support the Transition to College (e33); and, while not required for QED studies, the applicant intends to track attrition rates(e33). The data analysis plan is robust, using appropriate statistics (e35).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address the joiners (e32). Contamination across schools in Baltimore is lumped with attrition and should be acknowledge and considered with separate elements (e33).

Reader's Score: 19

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant describes a comprehensive evaluation plan that will provide performance feedback for all key aspects of the evaluation, including moderation and mediation analyses to inform implementation (e35). Data to be collected is appropriately varied from multiple sources to address implementation questions and support changes to insure progress toward the intended outcomes (e35).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) 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. (5 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation plan clearly articulates key project components, mediators, and outcomes (e36). The applicant identifies a robust fidelity preestablished threshold and will also use school-level fidelity scores in exploratory mediation analysis. (e36)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/04/2024 10:34 AM