

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/18/2019 12:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: San Francisco Unified School District (U411C190257)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	20	17
Total	20	17

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 10: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: San Francisco Unified School District (U411C190257)

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:

1. The proposed evaluation of the Summer Academy for Integrated Language Learning (SAILL) includes an implementation study and an impact study based on a quasi-experimental design with a matched comparison group (p. e37, p. e38). The evaluation design is likely to meet What Works Clearinghouse Standards with reservations, given the establishment of matching baseline characteristics at the outset, and a reexamination of baseline equivalence after the analytic sample has been collected that will involve controlling for characteristics that differ through appropriate statistical analyses (p. e40).

2. The implementation study will provide some data to guide replication of the SAILL curriculum in other settings, given the evaluation plan's particular attention to factors that contribute to or hinder implementation (p. e42-e43). Inclusion of multiple levels of qualitative data analysis can provide a support to quantitative data within efforts to replicate effective strategies in other settings (p. e42-e43).

3. The evaluation includes four clearly articulated questions that will explore the role of professional learning (PL) on teachers' ability to implement the SAILL curriculum, their knowledge and skill development, and their development of targeted EL practices (p. e38). The evaluation includes research questions designed to assess the effectiveness of implementation of SAILL (p. e38, p. e76). The impact evaluation also includes clearly articulated research questions assessing whether SAILL produces significant student outcomes in the areas of reading, EL proficiency, English Language Arts and Math proficiency (p. e39), and whether SAILL teachers demonstrate significant gains in knowledge, skills, and confidence relative to teachers in comparison schools (p. e39). Baseline equivalence will be established between students receiving the SAILL curriculum and the comparison group of students and will be reexamined and adjusted for (p. e39-e40). Hierarchical linear modeling will be used to assess changes from pre-intervention to post-intervention (p. e40). These methods of evaluation are highly likely to provide valid and reliable performance data, and data relevant to program outcomes.

4. The evaluation addresses each key program component through research questions for the impact and evaluation studies (p. e38, p. e39). Additionally, the evaluation includes a research question that will explore the mediating influence of the number of EL students on ELA, math achievement and GPA (p. e39).

Weaknesses:

The relationship between data collection and analysis, and the provision of formative feedback does not provide adequate detail to inform whether replication will be possible in other environments (p. e43). The methods of dissemination, in particular, appear cursory and not designed to provide broad awareness of project outcomes, especially for individuals working outside higher education (p. e43). Within the implementation and impact study, the evaluation plan is structured around year-end data collection of the development in teachers' skills, knowledge, and self-efficacy (p. 38). It is unclear whether retrospective individual interviews and focus groups with teachers done at the end of the year will provide reliable data regarding variations in implementation of curriculum and teaching practices, community of practice participation, and other outcomes (p. e41).

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/18/2019 12:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 05:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: San Francisco Unified School District (U411C190257)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 10: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: San Francisco Unified School District (U411C190257)

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 applicant proposes a quasi-experimental design with matched group comparisons (pg. 20). The applicant clearly explains how groups will be matched, how baseline equivalency will be established, and the anticipated minimum detectable effect size (MDES) and significance level for the sample size (pgs. 21-22). Based on this information, 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.

Research questions on page 21 for the impact study are aligned with goals listed on pages 12-13. Clear and measurable outcomes are also included for each goal. The data for each research question is clearly explained and aligned (pg. 23-24). Data collection instruments, data collection points, and variables for analysis are also clearly explained on pages 23-24. Data analysis is clearly explained and will adequately produce valid data (pg. 22 and Appendix I).

Research questions are appropriate to determine implementation fidelity, progress toward achieving goals, and program improvement; data collection methods for implementation and study is appropriate; and a timeline for data collection is provided (pgs. 20, 22-24). The applicant also proposes a pilot study to assess validity of data collection instruments (pg. 23), and explains that thresholds and fidelity scores will be used for each component of the logic model (pg. 24). Based on this information, the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

Sample size for teachers is unclear. Unclear how RQ 8 will be answered. The applicant explains that a teacher survey will be developed to measure perceptions and confidence in implementation (pgs. 23-24). However, there is no data collection method addressing increases in teacher knowledge. While the applicant explains that HLM analysis will be conducted for each outcome, it is unclear if the analysis includes comparison of teacher-to-teacher data, or if it only includes teacher data as a mediator to student outcomes. Explaining how the analysis method addresses each RQ would strengthen the

study.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 05:11 PM