

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2024 07:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 #4 - Early Tier 1 - 4: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 provided substantial evidence demonstrating the need to address post-pandemic chronic absenteeism in the schools to be served (e12-19). The proposed project is poised to address gaps in the existing literature and evidence base of the What Works Clearinghouse by addressing targeted family engagement as a new strategy to improve attendance and other academic outcomes (e12-19).

The propose project demonstrates significant promise by building on an existing successful initiative, Every Student Every Day model. The project will embed community-based organization staff into the school building, thus increasing personnel capacity and focus on the target student population, and developing and supporting a new family engagement strategy (e12-19).

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)**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed logic model which delineates program resources, activities, and measurable outcomes (e21, e75-77). The applicant provided compelling research and evidence to demonstrate the potential positive impact of the project (e21, 75-77).

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 applicant provided extensive, targeted, specific goals and measurable objectives and outcomes (e22-25, e171-172, e186-192).

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 an in-depth discussion of the needs of the target populations and the schools to be served by the project. The applicant addresses potential barriers and proposes solutions (e200). The proposed project will include strong community assessment mapping and home visits to learn more about their target populations (e20-24).

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:

The applicant provided a robust staffing plan, including highly qualified existing staff and contractors (e25-29). The applicant identified a specific plan for targeted recruitment strategies to specifically hire persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (e25-26).

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed management plan which clearly articulates goals, objectives, milestones, and responsible personnel. The plan also includes enough detail to understand the project communications and processes (e29- 31, e173-174).

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 address CPP 1.

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's primary theory of action responds directly to the CPP 2 and will focus on improved attendance and family engagement. The applicant also proposes to conduct community asset mapping and home visits to better understand the needs that may have arisen because of COVID-19 impacts. The strategies to for the intervention have a strong evidence base (e9, e33, e203).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2024 07:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/06/2024 07:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	67
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	70

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Early Tier 1 - 4: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 effectively proposes an intervention that addresses chronic absenteeism within an existing Community Schools initiative for grades PreK-1. The model places community organization staff who target attendance and re-engagement inside of school communities to work alongside school and district staff (e13). The applicant provides compelling data and statistics about the risks of absenteeism and its predictive capacity on students' academic and life outcomes. Additionally, the data provides context behind different migratory elements that impact student enrollment and attendance, along with success from promising interventions such as the early warning systems (e15). Applicant proposes a multi-prong approach that includes training and capacity building for full-time school staff, home visits, and academic interventions in three schools with high rates of chronic absenteeism.

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: 27

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 provides adequate research and relevant citations about the proposed interventions that are aligned to Community School strategies to positively address chronic absenteeism (e15). The applicant includes a thorough logic model (e21) that outlines the resources and project activities, such as hiring project staff and quarterly coaching sessions.

I have discussed this with my colleagues; this score represents my professional judgment.

Weaknesses:

More research and/or citations are needed to substantiate the proposed activities for the targeted age group of PreK-1 students.

Reader's Score: 9

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 sufficiently describes goals, objectives and outcomes that are measurable and specific for each of the named partner groups. For example, there are goals and objectives aligned to the attendance success advocates (ASA), students, and family outreach components. These goals encompass summative and formative areas, including satisfaction from trainings and increased student attendance that builds on baseline rates within specified timeframes (e74). Furthermore, applicant describes weekly goals and objectives, such as analyzing data and engaging in improvement cycles (e22).

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 provides an adequate description of target school sites—identifying schools with high rates of chronic absenteeism. Additionally, the applicant provides a snapshot of demographic data for each school that identifies other areas of high need, including high rates of poverty, students with disabilities, students in temporary housing, and English language learners (e20).

I have discussed this with my colleagues; this score represents my professional judgment.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides minimal information about educator demographics and/or educator-student relationship quality, which are widely known to be factors in academic and non-academic success at school. More details are needed to understand the demographic data of the target students who experience the chronic absenteeism versus those who do not.

Reader's Score: 13

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 applicant sufficiently describes the school district's commitment to non-discrimination, which enacts equal opportunity policies and encourages employment from persons that have traditionally been underrepresented (e25). Furthermore, the applicant discusses their recruitment strategies to ensure representation from groups that have been traditionally underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability on the project team, which includes utilizing community-based organization networks. The applicant provides descriptions of open positions such as the ASA role and desired qualifications, which are aligned to the roles and responsibilities needed for the project scope. Additionally, the project team leadership's experience and expertise is demonstrated in their resumes and backgrounds.

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

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 provides sufficient description of the management plan, which highlights onboarding new personnel, weekly check-ins, and responsibilities for teams, such as the attendance team (e29). Additionally, they provide a table with a management plan that has a high-level overview of tasks and milestones, an annual timeline, evaluative tasks, and assigned roles. The plan is organized by the four goals and the associated objectives.

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 fails to demonstrate how the proposed project will be implemented in partnership with the defined entities.

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 includes community asset-mapping with the ASAs to leverage resources that support student's need for reengagement and family's needs. Additionally, the applicant's focus area of chronic absenteeism is widely understood as a challenge related to COVID-19. The proposed intervention includes professional development and equipping school staff with new strategies to support students and families, building on evidence-based strategies, such as early warning systems and community schools (e9, e33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/06/2024 07:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 10:39 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 #4 - Early Tier 1 - 4: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 goal of the project is to improve student attendance rates for students in high need and historically underrepresented populations through home visits, community mapping, success academies and collaboration with community organizations. This innovative project seeks to develop in-home partnerships that deviate from the usual one-time home visit. The proposed project further differs from existing projects in that it integrates community-mapping and canvassing into the needs assessments, and hosts community resource fairs for families (e 9). The innovative intervention is inspired by the community school model and the Every Student Every Day school initiative.

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 conceptual framework contains a comprehensive logic model that illustrates the resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes. The applicant includes a detailed narrative that describes the phases of the project. The project's stakeholders and their roles are included in the logic model (e21).

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 performance goals, objectives and measures are clearly defined and cover the duration of the project (e185-190). The milestones and timelines are included, and potential barriers to the project's success are also included with plans to how they will be addressed (e200).

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 goals proposed by the applicant will successfully address the chronic attendance issues of the target population. They intend to train the staff on research-based chronic absenteeism strategies, home visits, community asset mapping, and canvassing. Tutoring and family empowerment, a critical component to reduce chronic absenteeism, is included in the project. These strategies are appropriate for and essential to the students and families in the targeted population.

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

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 recruitment plans include efforts to attract a diverse pool of candidates by using community-based organizations that serve diverse groups to promote job openings (e 26). The goal is to create a workforce that mirrors the community. Resumes are provided for key personnel (e50), which identify relevant training and experience. The applicant's commitment to diversity is reflected in their workplace policies which includes a Non-Discrimination Policy (e15). Additionally, the applicant indicates a goal to implement recruitment strategies to promote job openings through community-based organizations to serve culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse groups. These initiatives will adequately address the need to hire individuals from underrepresented populations (e16).

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant identifies a comprehensive management plan that include timelines, milestones, costs, responsibilities of key personnel, and a plan to stay within budget. The applicant describes the communication that will occur to facilitate the successful implementation of the management plan (e 29-31).

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 fails to identify any partnerships with institutions of higher learning (e12).

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 proposes to integrate community-mapping, canvassing, and needs assessment for families. This will provide guidance in addressing the needs of the target population that were disproportionately impacted by the pandemic (e 23). The project advocates for students to access tutoring, academic recovery programs, after school enrichment programs, and Success Academies.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 10:39 AM

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 01:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Early Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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: 27

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 evaluation plan for Project REACH is well-designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations, aiming to generate credible evidence of the program's effectiveness. The selection of student participants is carefully outlined to ensure that both treatment and control groups accurately represent the target population (pp. e33-e34). The plan employs a quasi-experimental design with a nonequivalent control group switching replication, addressing validity concerns and enabling strong comparisons between groups (p. e33). Propensity score matching ensures baseline equivalence, meeting WWC's requirements for demographic and academic comparability (p. e34). The evaluation targets critical outcomes, such as attendance, academic performance, and absenteeism, which are aligned with the research questions in Table 4 (p. e36) and the logic model (Appendix G, p. e75). Additionally, a cost-effectiveness analysis (p. e32) examines resource use to support scalability and sustainability. The evaluation incorporates statistical methods, including regression models, moderation and mediation analysis, and multi-level modeling, to assess impact and account for variability in outcomes (p. e32). Overall, this comprehensive evaluation plan ensures reliable data collection and analysis to provide meaningful insights into the program's effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

One weakness of the evaluation plan for Project REACH is the absence of a clear strategy to address attrition. In longitudinal studies, unequal dropout rates between treatment and control groups can undermine comparability. Without a specific approach to manage attrition, the plan risks challenges in maintaining baseline equivalence, which may compromise the accuracy of the program's reported outcomes.

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)

Sub

Strengths:

The plan outlines a process for performance feedback and periodic assessment, focusing on continuous data sharing and discussions among key personnel, as shown in the feedback loop (see Figure 1, p. e38). The process includes regular monthly meetings, debriefs, and quarterly advisory sessions, which provide opportunities to monitor progress, identify challenges, and plan appropriate responses (p. e38). Participant feedback, collected through methods such as surveys and focus groups, contributes both qualitative and quantitative insights that inform any necessary adjustments to the program (p. e40). Additionally, the plan includes maintaining a database containing key evaluation data, such as demographics, self-assessments, attendance rates, academic scores, and content area grades, to facilitate ongoing data analysis and support informed decision-making (p. e29).

Weaknesses:

A noted weakness of the plan is the lack of detail on how the qualitative and quantitative insights from participant feedback, such as surveys and focus groups (p. e40), will be gathered, analyzed, and applied to decision-making. Additionally, although the plan refers to maintaining a database (p. e29) with key evaluation data, it provides limited information on how accessible this database will be for stakeholders, how often it will be updated, or the protocols for its effective use in the evaluation process. These gaps in detail could potentially limit the full effectiveness of the feedback and data in supporting continuous improvement.

Reader's Score: 4

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 outlines the key project components, mediators, and outcomes while establishing clear thresholds for acceptable implementation (pp. e171-e175). The logic model in Appendix G details the connections between resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes needed to achieve the project's goals (p. e75). The plan includes measurable benchmarks, such as achieving 90% fidelity in intervention implementation and reducing unexcused absences by 20% (pp. e75-e76). It also sets Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bound (SMART) goals, such as having 85% of ASAs report effective training (Exhibit 1, Appendix 9, p. e171), to track progress and ensure a structured evaluation process. The measurement plan outlined in Table 7 outlines (p. e175) measurement tools further strengthens the overall integrity and reliability of the evaluation process.

Weaknesses:

One noted weakness in the evaluation plan is the lack of detail on how academic motivation and academic engagement will be measured (p. e175).

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/03/2024 01:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 01:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

Reader #2: *****

	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 #6 - Early Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: City of New York Board of Education (S411C240130)

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 evaluation will be conducted by L&G Research and Evaluation Consulting an independent external evaluator, which is a strength because it ensures objectivity and impartiality in assessing the project's outcomes. A rigorous evaluation framework (Table 3, page e32) and timeline (page e32) are presented, demonstrating a well-structured and methodical approach to the evaluation process. The evaluation framework covers formative evaluation, fidelity of implementation, cost-effectiveness analysis, and impact evaluation, providing a comprehensive evaluation of both the process and outcomes of the project.

The project will use a nonequivalent control group switching replication design with intervention removal, combined with a quasi-experimental design (QED) (page e33), to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations.

Logistical challenges, variability in implementation, ethical considerations, and self-selection bias are carefully considered (page e34), demonstrating foresight in addressing potential threats to the validity and reliability of the evaluation.

The application rigorously addresses key factors for conducting QED in line with WWC standards (pages e34-36): group design and formation (using propensity score matching), baseline equivalence (pretest, with strategies to form a control group with baseline equivalence), confound analysis (controlling for potential confounding factors), and outcome analysis (with no imputation for outcome data). This approach ensures that the comparison groups are as similar as possible, reducing the risk of bias and increasing the credibility of the results.

Evaluation questions, as well as confirmatory and exploratory research questions with related data sources, are presented in Table 4 (page e36), which provides clarity and focus for the evaluation, ensuring that key areas of interest are thoroughly investigated.

Year-by-year progress, organized by cohort, is outlined in Table 5, which allows for a clear tracking of progress over time and ensures that the evaluation remains on schedule.

Sub

Multi-level modeling will be used to adjust for the nesting effect (page e32), which is an appropriate and rigorous analytical technique for accounting for hierarchical data structures.

Weaknesses:

A power analysis has not been conducted to determine the initial sample size. This is a significant weakness because it raises concerns about whether the study is adequately powered to detect meaningful effects. Additionally, the proposed treatment effect size of 0.25 (page e42) lacks supporting references from the field, which undermines the credibility of this assumption and raises questions about the appropriateness of the expected effect size.

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:

Monthly meetings will be held between L&G staff and project personnel to discuss current and upcoming issues, as well as project progress, which is a strength as it fosters ongoing communication and ensures that any challenges are addressed in a timely manner, promoting project efficiency.

L&G will use a feedback loop (Figure 1, page e39) to provide continuous feedback to project personnel, a critical strength that ensures timely adjustments and continuous improvement, which can significantly enhance project outcomes.

L&G will incorporate participant feedback to make adjustments (page e38; timeline in exhibit 2 on page e174), demonstrating a commitment to responsiveness and ensuring that the project remains aligned with the needs and experiences of those participate.

L&G will provide evaluation performance feedback to project staff and assess progress, allowing for ongoing adaptation and improvement of Project REACH (page e43), which is a strong approach to ensure that the project progresses based on evidence and feedback.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses 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:

Exhibit 2 outlines the responsibilities, timelines, and milestones aligned with the project's goals and objectives (pages e173-174), which ensures clear accountability and a structured approach to achieving project outcomes.

Evaluation measures are listed in Table 7, indicating who will be tested, what domain will be assessed, what measure will be used, and when tests will be administered. Baseline measures are also included in the table (page e175), which is a strength because it provides a comprehensive evaluation plan that ensures all key areas are

Sub

systematically assessed from the beginning.

Thresholds are presented in the logic model on a yearly basis (Appendix G, pages e75-77), which allows for clear benchmarking and tracking of progress over time, ensuring that the project stays on target and can make data-informed adjustments if needed.

Mediators, moderating impacts, and related data and research questions are listed in Table 4 (page e37), demonstrating a thorough consideration of how various factors may influence the project's outcomes.

Moderation and mediation analysis techniques will be employed (page e32), which further enhances the evaluation's rigor by exploring how and why certain effects occur, which adds depth to result interpretation.

Weaknesses:

No instrument is proposed for measuring participants' academic motivation and engagement, which makes it problematic to accurately assess the effectiveness of interventions and track progress toward achieving Goal 3.

Reader's Score: **4**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/03/2024 01:55 PM