

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/11/2017 11:42 AM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Austin Independent School District (U411C170017)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	20
<b>Total</b>	20	20

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Austin Independent School District (U411C170017)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

#### Strengths:

The project includes a good overview of the project's evaluation plan on page 18. In the overview, a formative evaluation focuses on measuring fidelity of implementation and providing timely feedback and a summative evaluation of program efficacy.

Research questions are presented specifically by dividing attention to fidelity, impact on students and teachers, subgroup impacts, and mediator impacts in Table 1 on pages 18-19.

In the impact evaluation on page 19, the project describes the school matching process using propensity score matching (PSM). For PSM, the project presents the detailed list of student and teacher variables (pp. 19 and 21) and the benefits of applying PSM in the project (p.19).

The project includes the evaluation of the longitudinal impacts in Years 3 and 4 (p. 19). The longitudinal samples of students on page 22 include the description of transition sample, indicating the teams' effort to cope with attrition issues.

The longitudinal sample of teachers on page 22 includes the description of classroom observations.

On pages 20-22, the project provides the detailed information on the sampling procedures of schools, the estimation of sample sizes of schools and students, minimum detectable effect size calculation for schools and subgroups.

Table 3 in Appendix G provides detailed information on the project outcomes, timelines, and instrument descriptions with available reliability and validity measures.

Analysis plans are thoroughly described on pages 22-25. In fidelity evaluation on pages 22-23, the project includes the description of measures of dosage and fidelity indicators with a list of assessments such as classroom observations/checklist, teacher/principal/ coordinator interviews, focus groups and student/teacher surveys.

The evaluation methods for the overall impact are explained with detailed variables and procedures. The Propensity Score Matching (PSM) method on page 23 is clearly explained with matching methods and variables. The hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) includes the purpose of analytical methods and detailed model specification in Appendix G.

Impact evaluation by subgroups on page 24 lists specific variables by including the descriptions of variable interactions.

Transitional and longitudinal analyses include the attrition rate of the district the project will be implemented. Power analysis with a specific effect size (0.27) is clearly presented on page 25 and Appendix G.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 20**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/11/2017 11:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/11/2017 10:25 AM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Austin Independent School District (U411C170017)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	20
<b>Total</b>	20	20

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Austin Independent School District (U411C170017)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

#### Strengths:

A quasi-experimental design is proposed which meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations (Appendix G, pg. e58). The management plan includes ongoing collection of information and communication from the evaluator to the project team to ensure continuous improvements (pg. 15). The proposal includes a plan for formative evaluation which includes focus groups, interviews, checklists, classroom observations and student perception feedback with strategies and responsibilities to ensure information is collected and used for improvements in a timely manner (pg. 16). Sufficient data collection is planned to have enough information to measure fidelity of implementation (pg. 18-19). The variables for matching students from the intervention and control group were clearly stated and appropriate for making comparisons and measuring program effectiveness (pg. 20-21). An implementation manual will be created with information from multiple sources which will allow replication of the project or testing in other settings (pg. 23). The data analysis plan was clear and provided information about how attrition will be handled (pg. 25, Appendix G). The evaluation plan provided key components such as available data across grade levels for comparisons, the cohorts thorough the years of the project, and a timeline for data collection (Appendix G). Measures for student level outcomes and teacher level outcomes were clearly stated and appropriate (Appendix G). A description of the proposed instruments was provided and sufficient evidence of validity and reliability were provided (Appendix G). The outcomes in which the impact study will compare students from the intervention and comparison group were clearly stated and align with the goals of the project (Appendix G, pg. e58). The plan for propensity score matching was clearly articulated with the formula and variables stated (Appendix G, pg. e58-e59). Expected performance measures were stated as well as a minimum detectable effect size (pgs.9-10, Appendix G, pg. e67). Key components, mediators and outcomes are clearly articulated and align with the goals of the project (pg. 19).

#### Weaknesses:

None found

Reader's Score: 20

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/11/2017 10:25 AM