

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2019 09:41 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Sub Total	20	16
Total	20	16

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

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:

(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).

(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 program evaluation will use an individual level randomized controlled trial (page 22) which meets the standards for WWC Standards Without Reservations.
- Random assignment by block ensures equal assignment ratio from each school. (page 22)
- Applicant has calculated the sample size needed to produce a Minimal Detectable Effect Size (MDES) and has cited justification to support this effect size on page 22.
- The secondary research questions and implementation study will provide formative assessment data to guide implementation and replication. (page 25)
- Key components of professional development, mentor activities, and mentee activities are clearly stated on page 8.
- Mediators that have been identified for exploratory analysis are articulated in the logic model on page 8.
- Short term and long term measurable outcomes are presented on page 8.
- Minimum thresholds for acceptable implementation are specified on page 25 and seem appropriate for the study.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant states on page 23 that the Outcome Questionnaire will be composed from survey instruments that have been validated and published but does not specify what they are or state the Cronbach's alpha for each construct.
- The applicant specifies an Intent to Treat (ITT) framework, which can be applied to attrition, but it is not specifically stated as the attrition model. (Page 20)

Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/15/2019 09:41 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/18/2019 10:32 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
Sub Total	20	14
Total	20	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

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:

(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).

(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 proposed evaluation is an RCT randomized at the student level. The application indicates that attrition will be monitored and analyzed and baseline equivalence will be measured (p 24). If well conducted the study should be able to meet WWC standards without reservations.

The evaluation will have both urban New York and rural North Carolina samples allowing for greater generalizability than if there was only one school location (p 1, p7). Planned analyses by student and school demographic variables will allow other settings to better determine if this might be an effective intervention for their students.

Key project components and outcomes are clearly presented. Data to be gathered to assess fidelity is identified as well as expected fidelity thresholds (p 25).

Weaknesses:

A number of instruments will be employed in the evaluation, including Identification With School, Student Engagement Instrument, Self-efficacy in Goal Setting, Children's Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Self-efficacy, Academic Motivation Scale, and California Healthy Kids Survey. No psychometric information as to reliability or validity is presented for any of these instruments, making assessment of the quality of the measurements problematic.

Mediators are not explicitly identified. The mediators listed in the logic model are outcomes rather than mediators.

Goals for gains in project outcomes are for goals 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, and 3.2 are set at .1 st dev. (Table 1, p 9). This is far too low a threshold for success. WCC defines the minimal value for substantive impact at .25.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/18/2019 10:32 AM