

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/05/2018 02:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (U411C180114)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Total	20	19

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (U411C180114)

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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in the NIA).
- (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The applicant presents an excellent evaluation plan. The evaluation methods could produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. A randomized controlled trial with 36 schools will be conducted during a two-year process. The applicant assumes low attrition based on prior experience (pg. 23). Due to the school-level design, contamination of program effects should be minimal. The sample size and power analysis are sufficient for the multilevel modeling approach.

An explicitly-developed plan is described that will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication. A project website will display project achievements, classroom videos, and project units. More importantly, specific grant products will be available including the professional development model, web-based participant guides, in-classroom coaching guides, lesson planning framework, and technology infrastructure and installation (pg. 20).

The applicant presents an extensive discussion of the measures and data sources that will provide extensive data for analysis in assessing outcomes and fidelity of implementation (Appendix H1), including assessment of prosocial behavior, school climate, and classroom engagement. To inform the evaluation with rich data, teachers and coaches will be interviewed and certified observers will conduct classroom observations (pgs. 21-22). To learn about academic achievement, math and science scores from the state's assessment program will be used in the efficacy study. An overall threshold for acceptable implementation was presented; 80% teacher participation in project activities would be necessary for quality implementation (pg. 22).

Weaknesses:

Two potential weaknesses were found with the research design. The first issue is that the applicant does not fully describe the observable characteristics of the sample groups for the efficacy study, if attrition is high. From as many as 20 districts, 36 schools will be recruited to participate with over half of those schools considered to be rural and Title I, but no other information was provided to ensure the treatment and comparison groups would be similar. Secondly, the applicant does not convincingly demonstrate that there will be low attrition. Their assumption is that it will be low based on prior history; however, no details or explanation were provided to support that assumption.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/05/2018 02:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/05/2018 01:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (U411C180114)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Total	20	20

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (U411C180114)

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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in the NIA).
- (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan connects research questions with the project goals and objectives (p. 11 & 21). The application proposes a strong implementation study that will serve to provide data to project staff and will produce information for future replication (p. 21). The application includes a discussion of the procedure for setting measurable thresholds (p. 22) of acceptable implementation. Using random assignment at the school level meets the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse, if well implemented (p. 23). The application also addresses concerns that may arise from crossover and attrition (p. 23). The evaluation plan includes a clear timeline that aligns data collection activities throughout the project period (Appendix H). Table H1b (Appendix H) provides detail regarding the quality of the measurement tools to be used in the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/05/2018 01:40 PM