

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 09:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 35 |
| Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan | | |
| 1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan | 45 | 45 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 80 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - i3 Development - 9: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to develop and expand the Personalization for Academic and Social Emotional Learning (PASL) (pg.1). Two factors will be included; 1. Measuring its impact on non-cognitive factors, and 2. The impact attendance, course grades, and student achievement.

The applicant's proposal seeks to address a lower than national average graduation rate (76.5%) in a high poverty district (64%) with racially diverse students. (pg.4).The development of these non-cognitive factors may serve as a lever for increasing student achievement. Thus proposing a study that may provide a critical link between non-cognitive factors and academic behaviors to improved learning may prove to be nationally significant.

The applicant addresses Absolute Priority 4. (pg.9)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant has two (2) overarching goals 1. To develop and test a comprehensive PASL toolkit, and 2. Design professional development materials. (pg. 10) Three (3) objectives; 1. To improve non-cognitive factors 2. Improve behavior, and 3. Improve academic outcomes. (pg. 11)

The applicant history of successfully implementing and managing the past PASL program past projects and the inclusion of a detailed timeline (e79-e81) ensure the likelihood of the proposal achieving the goals and objectives of the proposal on time.

The continuous feedback model includes summer school feedback, field notes, recorded meetings, and online surveys. (pg. 17). Interviews during annual site visits, focus groups, discussion with stakeholders, and "feedback" forms all demonstrate a comprehensive continuous feedback strategy.

The applicant will leverage their NCSU website to share milestones etc. (pg.18). Furthermore the applicant proposes to use Vanderbilt, FSU, and RTI public relations department and use a commercial publisher to provide materials to other districts and schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 45

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

This section not scored by this reviewer.

Weaknesses:

This section not scored by this reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 09:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 08:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 32 |
| Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan | | |
| 1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan | 45 | 45 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 77 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - i3 Development - 9: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

The applicant discusses some of the national trends and how traditional schooling tends to look over the social emotional needs because the teachers are not as comfortable dealing with that. On p. 4 they talk about their student population. The aim to implements the Personalization for Academic and Social Emotional Learning (PASL) program in 15 high schools. They give numbers for the county and state that they are below the national average for graduation rates 76 vs 82, 64% of the population qualify for FRL; 41% are black, 32% are Hispanic, and 11% qualify for ELL services. They propose to serve 45,000 students over that time.

2. They give strong evidence on promising new strategies. On p. 1 the applicant states that the proposed 5 year project will develop and expand Personalization for Academic and Social Emotional Learning (PASL), a systemic school-based intervention in which staff deliberately attend to the social and emotional needs of the student. They will build on the work of the National Center on Scaling Up Effective Schools (NCSU). On p. 5 the applicant gives the core elements as being: 1) routine rapid check ins between adults and students; 2) goal setting activities that help students set short and long term goals; 3) intentional use of data to track student progress; 4) educator teams of administrators, counselors, and teacher that meet to discuss student progress; and 5) a culture of personalization. This equals a system of personalization. On p. 6 they talk about their two promising an innovative elements of their project: 1) PASL as a systemic personalization and 2) the process of improving itself. They state that the combination of effective schools theories and social cognitive theory provide theoretical grounding for PASL in with the framework being that the systems of academic, social emotion and behavioral activities should work together and not in isolation. They have made improvements to the PASL program over the past 2 years and they say that those changes are innovative with a top-down/bottom-up approach that allows for co-construction. They are working off the premise of institutionalized personalization where the teachers make a deliberate rapid check in with the students and if there are needs they address them. There are other activities in the school that also support the PASL practices such as clubs, extracurricular, mentoring programs, and a language of personalization p. 8. They also discuss their theory of action. They use a collaborative process so it leads to a greater buy in with stakeholders. The more experienced school serve as mentors and advises to newer schools, thus supporting and facilitating calling out and building district capacity.

3. P. 1 they will look at non-cognitive factors including student's sense of belonging, self-efficacy, agency, goal setting, self-regulation, as well as examine PASL's impact on student attendance and dropout rates, behavior referrals, course grades, and student achievement as measured by state assessments. P. 9 the applicant talks about how they will address Absolute Priority #4 and first back it up with current research. They talk about the institutionalized personalization and how when kids feel connected to an adult in the school, they are more likely to succeed. They will also work with student's ability to set goals and regulate their own learning and PALS does this.

Weaknesses:

1. Even though they want to measure outcomes for attendance, dropout rates, D and F roll, and fewer behavior referrals, they do not tell us what those numbers currently are for the schools that will be implementing the project so it is difficult to ascertain the need.
2. None noted.
3. None noted.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths:

1. On p. 4 the applicant states that they will improve the non-cognitive outcomes by .25 standard deviations on the New General Self-Efficacy Scale and other scales. They project that by the end of the 2nd year of implementation, that the schools will report a 5% decrease in students on the D and F list, 5% fewer behavior referrals, 5% increase in attendance rates, 5% increase in course passing rates, and .25 SD increase in student achievement. Appendix J also give a timeline with activities, milestones towards goals, and objectives and outcomes. They do give measurable goals e78. On p. 14 they give a nice narrative of how each year/phase will be broken up and then refer to the Appendix. There are 4 phases. Appendix D Table 1 also has the measurable outcomes.
2. On p. 10 they state that they aim to 1) develop, implement, and test a comprehensive PASL toolkit that will be a resource for amdisitors, counselors, and teachers; and 3) design a set of Professional Development (PD) material that can be used by schools implementing PASL. They give their outcomes with improving sense of belonging, self-efficacy, personal agency, and goal setting. They will also improve behavior as measured by attendance, dropout rates, and referrals which in turn will improve academic outcomes such as course grades, course passing rates, on time grade promotion, and student achievement as measured by state assessments.

The research team and district coordinator will oversee all aspects of the project including organizing the SIDT and DITD meetings, providing training and technical assistance to the SIDT and DITD members, supporting the SIDT and DITD member in the continuous improvement process. They state who will be the project lead, and other team members. The

BCPS district and school staff will be responsible for implementing PASL, managing daily activities, and provide relevant data. BCPS will also recruit new PASL schools and encourage exiting PASL schools to provide mentorship to the new schools. With the research team they will co-organize the fall and spring DIDT meetings. They then discuss the external evaluator and their credentials. The project evaluator in the budget narrative states that he will be responsible for assuring that the project meets timelines and is within budget, e69

3. On p. 7 the applicant state that the continuous improvement testing also focuses the local adaptation because each test provides knowledge about the implementation of specific adaptations in unique contexts, helping to make judgements about those adaptations.

On p. 12 the applicant states that immediately after the 2 hour DIDT meeting there will be SIDT meeting days where district and school administrators will meet to learn about the progress of PASL and participate in its development and design at the administrative level. They will hear about the success and challenges and provide their feedback and perspective on moving forward. They talk about the designing the toolkit and how it will describe the continuous improvement process used to develop and improve PASL. On p. 13 they go on to say that they will lead each school team in their continuous improvement process. Each school will review their goals and set new ones when met. They will also annually conduct site visits to each school to monitor implementation and provide feedback to the schools. They will interview the stakeholders to include the principal, counselor, AP, as well as conduct focus groups with teachers and students. They will prepare a report after each visit. P. 13. On p. 16 they state that the external evaluator will collect and evaluate data and provide for presentations at conferences. They will provide feedback throughout the study so that data driven refinement can be implemented p. 16.

All of the above was not even in the correlating section. Then on p. 17 they address this section and give even more evidence of how they will ensure feedback and continuous improvement. The other strategies in addition will be keeping detailed field notes and audio record every SIDT and DIDT meeting. They will also employ direct strategies for feedback. They will have participant fill out feedback forms and/or conduct online surveys at the close of the SIDT and DIDT meetings as well as the Summer Institutes in order to capture areas of success as well as areas for improvement. The results will be shared in management meetings.

4. On p. 5 the applicant state that at the conclusion of the grant, they will have developed a set of tested resources and material to be shared with other schools and districts. On p. 9 they talk about the replicability and how they will use implementers use the collaborative continuous improvement approach and the plan-do-study-act process in developing the PASL toolkit and PD material. This is a central goal to this grant. PASL is predicated on harnessing and strengthening practices and routines already present in high schools and therefore builds on what already exists by creating connections and organizational routines that lead to personalization. On p. 16 they state that the external evaluator will collaborate with them to develop conference presentation and articles to disseminate. On p. 18 they state that they will use multiple approaches to include the NCSU website, annual report, Summer Institute, journal articles, FSU's, Vanderbilt's, and RTI's public relations offices to develop and disseminate press releases.

Weaknesses:

1. None noted.
2. None noted.
3. None noted.
4. None noted.

Reader's Score: 45

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 08:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2016 10:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 32 |
| Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan | | |
| 1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan | 45 | 42 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 74 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - i3 Development - 9: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant cites research supporting the need to incorporate social emotional learning to reach students rather than focusing solely on instructional and academic outcomes (p. 2-3). The school district is the sixth largest in the nation with a 64% free/reduced lunch rate. The district has a high level of diversity including these demographics: 41% Black, 32% Hispanic, and 11% qualifying for ELL services (p.4). The graduation rate is 76.5%, lower than the national average of 82%.

(2) 15 schools in the district are already scaling PASL so the program will expand to an additional 15 high schools. This program will impact 45,000 students by the end of the five year project (p.4). The applicant is specifically targeting Absolute Priority 4 to influence the development of non-cognitive factors, specifically social emotional development.

(3) The applicant anticipates non-cognitive outcome improvements by .25 standard deviations on the New General Self-Efficacy Scale, the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Scale and the Teacher- Student Relationships Subscale of Student Engagement (p. 4-5).

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant could strengthen this section with the inclusion of data for the target population that includes outcomes related to non-cognitive skill development such as attendance, dropout and graduation rates. The applicant states that the program will be used for all ninth grade students and is not clear on how it will target potential dropouts and/or students with failing or near-failing grades.

(2) The applicant speaks to replicability and scalability and how this will be useful in expanding the PASL system to schools throughout the district; however, the applicant speaks in generalities. The applicant cites a pilot in 2014-15 but does not fully explain how the information from the pilot will be used to expand the PASL program to other schools. The applicant has researched the program and cites studies but does not clearly link how these previous outcomes are relevant to or will benefit their schools and student populations.

(3) No weaknesses identified for this question.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths:

- (1) The applicant sets out a clear set of goals for developing the tool kit and professional development materials , adding schools, and finally specific results for improved behavioral referrals, attendance rates, and other non-cognitive outcomes (appendix J).
- (2) The applicant identifies a research team and district coordinator to oversee the project, particularly SIDT and DITD meetings, training and technical assistance.
- (3) The applicant has a regular system for conducting DITD and SIDT meetings to get regular feedback for improvement from participants at the school and district levels. The applicant has clearly elaborated the phases of implementation and staggered the implementation to best meet the needs of schools and students throughout the project (Appendix J).
- (4) Early adopter schools will provide information to the next schools to explain how the five components of PASL were implemented and the continuous improvement processes to adapt PASL to their school cultures (p.11-12). The applicant will share information that will be applied to later adopting schools and recorded for dissemination to other districts for replication.

Weaknesses:

- (1) The applicant does not mention baselines or growth in specific student objectives until the third year in this five year timeline. With the amount of research and previous implementation of PASL, it would seem that student improvements may become evident earlier than indicated.
- (2) The applicant is too general in discussing how the program will be supervised and implemented at the schools. School counselors and administrators were mentioned throughout the application however, specific role assignments are not identified. The applicant gives a general statement that “BCPS district and school staff will be responsible for implementing PASL, managing daily activities and providing relevant data (p. 16). Most of the roles and responsibilities identified in the milestones and achievements are relevant to research rather than program implementation.
- (3) No weakness identified.
- (4) The applicant relies heavily on meetings (DITD AND SIDT) without really explaining the information that will be exchanged, how these meetings will be organized or facilitated. The information provide is very general. For example, “explanations of PASL as a systemic practice that bridges academic social, emotional and behavioral activities; descriptions of the five practices and specific activities drawn from the schools...” (p. 12). It would be helpful to give mores specific examples of the information that will be collected, mechanisms for recording the information, and analysis.

Reader's Score: 42

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2016 10:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2016 02:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Reader #4: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan | | |
| 1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan | 45 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 19 |
| Total | 100 | 19 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - i3 Development - 9: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The non-cognitive outcomes are clearly and consistently defined and appropriate measures are proposed (pp. e34-e35, p. e39, pp. e44).

The proposed evaluation design will use propensity matching to equate groups (p. e47).

The evaluation will use the first year to develop appropriate survey instruments (p. e45) and will leverage this non-implementation year to create a comparison group (p. e47).

The proposed evaluation will examine the effect of the intervention on high-needs students and will examine whether high-needs students benefit more than other students (p. e49).

The proposed evaluation will use tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade data to estimate the long-term program effect past the ninth-grade intervention, in alignment with the intention of the intervention to have "lasting effects through high school" (p. e49).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not include a power analysis; thus it lacks evidence that the proposed evaluation design is likely to have sufficient statistical power to detect the impact of the intervention.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2016 02:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2016 02:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Reader #5: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan | | |
| 1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan | 45 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 18 |
| Total | 100 | 18 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - i3 Development - 9: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Florida State University (U411C160107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

1. The applicant on page 19 provided clear information regarding four outcomes dealing with non-cognitive skills and other outcomes dealing with academic and behavioral performances.
2. The applicant on page 19 detailed two research questions which aligned closely with the program's outcomes and data collection procedures.
3. The applicant on page 25 provided very high reliability coefficients for the three student non-cognitive scale inventories which were a key strength of the evaluation analysis.
4. The applicant on pages 21-23 indicated that it would utilize a quasi-experimental design. It would be an interrupted time series design with the 10 school sites not in the intervention in years 1, 2 and 3 serving as the control school sites. This procedure was a specialized single site (e.g. district) design. The design did seem to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards for single site design.
5. The applicant on pages 22 and 23 provided a detailed rationale for the utilization of the schools not in the intervention to serve as the pre/post control group.
6. The applicant on page 24 detailed an innovative procedure for addressing the effects of the intervention on selected high-need students.
7. The applicant on page 25 detailed how it would analyze student academic and behavioral outcomes dealing with academic achievement on state tests, disciplinary referrals, on time graduation and attendance,
8. The applicant on page 25 detailed the training and experience of the evaluation team which seemed sufficient to conduct the program evaluation.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant did not seem to present a sound rationale for how the district level administrators who would be involved in the program from year 1 would not present confounding variables regarding interactions with the principals and teachers at the 10 schools sites within the same district to be utilized as control schools in years 1 and 2 of the study.
2. The applicant on page 23 indicated it would combine historical data from 15 other high schools utilizing a similar intervention to develop student outcome trends. This might have the potential for an effective design, but the demographic and achievement levels information regarding these 15 schools was not presented or discussed in any detail. There were only vague mentions of similarity and comparison compatibility given by the applicant. This did not allow for any meaningful decisions regarding the appropriateness of this design approach.

3. The applicant in the Budget Narrative listed \$1,220,953 for the external evaluation. This was approximately 40% of the total program costs of the proposed program. These resources were well in excess of the norm of 10 -20% for an extensive external evaluation.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/20/2016 02:23 PM