

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/04/2018 11:36 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Inc. (U411C180223)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Early Phase Tier 2 - 8: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Inc. (U411C180223)

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:

Community Training and Assistance Center proposes a mixed method study using a Comparative Interrupted Time Series quasi-experimental design with a comparison condition. This approach will likely provide data to support the findings from the study and will meet the WWC standards with reservations. The applicant seeks to provide services for 15,500 students around STEM project based curriculum that is engineering and computer science centered. An effective power analysis was conducted to determine the number of students needed for the sample to be generalizable. The applicant provided clear goals, objectives and outcomes with measurable thresholds which were presented in section B.1. For example, the CAASPP Smarter Balanced Assessment will be used to determine academic growth in years 4 and 5 and is set at a 10% increase. Inclusion of these types of measureable thresholds increase the strength of the proposal. Additionally, using state standardized test scores along with the Smarter Balances Assessment outcomes provides valid and reliable performance data on relevant student academic outcomes. Using validated academic tests to determine student academic growth is one example of an effective strategy for replication in other settings. Conducting interviews and focus groups along with a survey further strengthens the proposal by providing important contextual information.

Weaknesses:

There is no mention of attrition or how this will be addressed although because of the large sample size this is not likely to be an issue. More importantly, mediators and moderators are not provided. Inclusion of mediators and moderators and the method of identification would further strengthen the proposal

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/04/2018 11:36 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2018 12:15 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Inc. (U411C180223)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Early Phase Tier 2 - 8: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Inc. (U411C180223)

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:

- 1) The discussion of the Comparative Interrupted Time Series method for evaluation was thorough and provided a detailed explanation of how baseline equivalence would be tested and controlled for. Additionally, the explanation for the identification of match schools for the treatment and control schools met the WWC standards for moderate evidence, thus having the potential to demonstrate project effectiveness.
- 2) The application proposes to use standardized tests (e.g., Smarter Balanced Assessments) as achievement measures, which have already been tested and adjusted for validity and reliability. The proposal also provides alternative analyses (ANCOVA) to compensate for having only one year of baseline data before the intervention, which only strengthens the validity and reliability of the performance data relative to the baseline measurements.
- 3) The evaluation plan includes the development of systematic measure of fidelity of implementation not only to ensure that each component of the logic model is being implemented according to the original project scope, but to also establish thresholds for acceptable implementation as well. The implementation study will also provide rich data from interviews and focus groups that will provide clear guidance about effective strategies and challenges for replication and potential scale-up.

Weaknesses:

- 1) In the implementation study, the application mentions conducting focus groups with key constituencies, yet does not identify who these individuals or groups may be. To better understand how the evaluation plan will provide guidance, it is important to know who the "key constituencies" are and the possible feedback that may be offered regarding fidelity of implementation or needs for replication. However, the specific groups were not identified in the proposal.
- 2) There is no discussion of mediators and moderators that may impact program effectiveness. This means that it is unclear the extent to which the program outcomes were the result of the program itself, without additional elements and confounding variables influencing the outcomes.

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2018 12:15 AM