

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2017 03:17 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** School District 1J Multnomah County (U411C170253)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	19
<b>Total</b>	20	19

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 3: 84.411C

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

Applicant: School District 1J Multnomah County (U411C170253)

## 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 applicant has presented an evaluation plan that may be rated as "excellent" (p. 19).
- The evaluators for this program appear to have the expertise and resources to conduct an evaluation of this size and scope (p. 20).
- The plan contains both a formative or implementation phase and an efficacy or impact phase (p. 21).
- The formative phase contains a fidelity of implementation component that will use various qualitative and quantitative data sources to address five evaluation questions during the first four years of the program (p. 21).
- The efficacy or impact phase of the evaluation will use a randomized control trial design which if conducted properly will result in meeting WWC standards without reservations (p. 23). Students will be randomly assigned to the schools with the treatment group taking the PREP courses and the control students taking the course as usual. The students who want to take the course after implementation will be assigned randomly from that point forward.
- Although baseline equivalence is not required for RCT designs, the plan will collect baseline data on the schools and students to avoid an issue with high attrition (p. 24).
- Measurement instruments used to collect data for the impact phase are indicated along with previous reliability results. All appear to be appropriate to answer the impact questions presented (p. 24).
- A power analysis is presented and it appears that the sample size is sufficient to measure the expected effects of this program (p. 25).
- A data analysis plan provides a regression model that will be used for the impact phase. Various other statistical analyses will be employed to analyze the implementation phase (p. 25).

#### Weaknesses:

- The plan does not indicate the possibility of confounding variables. With students in the same school taking the same classes, there is the possibility of spillover effects that may bias the results.

Reader's Score: 19

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/03/2017 03:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 09:04 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** School District 1J Multnomah County (U411C170253)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	18
<b>Total</b>	20	18

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - EIR - Early Phase - Evaluation - 3: 84.411C

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

Applicant: School District 1J Multnomah County (U411C170253)

## 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 evaluation is likely to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards, because it uses an experimental approach with random assignment to treatment and control groups (page 23).

The applicant plans to use a qualified, experienced external evaluator (page 19-20, Appendix C). This will help ensure the proposed project evaluated from an unbiased perspective.

The evaluation is likely to provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings, because it includes an ongoing plan for fidelity of implementation with increasingly high expectations for fidelity (page 14). The applicant also plans to disseminate information about the proposed project through conference presentations at a variety of educational conferences (page 19).

The methods of evaluation are likely to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes, because it is based on project goals which are well-defined and correlate to the proposed project (pages 8-13, 19-25).

The applicant identified a variety of measurements that will be collected for both formative and summative data on the project's implementation and efficacy (pages 21-24). The evaluation plan includes a thorough plan for data analysis that is designed to show the average treatment effect (pages 24-25). These will provide important information on the project's impact.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant stated it expects the treatment and control groups to be equivalent in observed and unobserved characteristics (page 23); however, it did not indicate how it has determined that or specifically which characteristics it has considered.

The measurable threshold for acceptable implementation is unclear, since Appendix G was not available.

**Reader's Score:** 18

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/02/2017 09:04 PM