

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 7: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. 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 provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
 - (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
 - (3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

- (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and
- (2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

The project narrative includes a complete and thorough evaluation design that incorporates multiple methods of data collection for both qualitative and quantitative measures. The evaluation design includes use of validated and researched tests or instruments for student assessment and teacher/principal surveys.

Data collection strategies are periodic (i.e., quarterly, semi-annual, annual) to provide information for program improvements throughout each year of the project.

Data collection activities include appropriate adherence to FERPA issues, and the application includes alternative strategies if problems or issues arise in data collection or project activities.

Evaluators have experience and expertise in project/program evaluations of this complexity, and in early childhood education projects.

The project narrative includes clear, developed goals, which are aligned with the logic models for PD and learning for teachers, coaches, and principals.

The evaluation budget (23% of the total grant request) is sufficient to provide a comprehensive and effective project evaluation.

Weaknesses:

Although the budget is sufficient to do an effective evaluation, there is insufficient information in the application to determine whether the evaluation budget is reasonable and aligned to project activities. The application does not include a line-item type budget description linking funds to specific project and evaluation goals and activities.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

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 #7 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 7: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. 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 provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

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

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

(1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and

(2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

There are a very logical set of research questions listed on page e48. The authors provide a useful sampling discussion which is important because of the problems associated with trying to interview all 912 students, or 127 program professionals. The proposal lists a mix of qualitative techniques page e50 that are appropriate. The authors also mention that they will use several valid assessments to measure instructional environment.

For implementation, the authors provide a checklist for tracking fidelity of implementation for PD services. They further provide multiple measures of leadership capacity across time. Specific measures are listed. It is a strength that the proposal lists a partnership with the Consortium on Chicago School Research. Further, the authors list specific assessments that measure the Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions (KSD) of adult program leaders. This is a key outcome the authors hope to measure.

Moreover, the authors, list specific assessment that will be used to measure student outcomes in early language and literacy. It is clear that the authors have a detailed plan to measure outcomes. Finally, a good analytical strategy is presented given the limitation that no random assignment can be conducted. The authors propose to study changes in student outcomes for kids in PD and matched non-PD environments.

The program has been replicated in 11 (or 12) diverse and high needs sites across the country. Also, there is a detailed implementation study plan which will document how the program works. Thus, interested readers should quite easily be able to gather information on the key elements of the program.

The proposal clearly lists the relevant personnel, and how they will complete the tasks. Budget of roughly \$700K seems generally well supported.

Weaknesses:

Although the authors mention that they will use several valid assessments to measure instructional environment, it is a weakness that no specific assessments are listed.

Although the budget of roughly \$700K seems well supported, the proposal would be improved with more detail as to how the budget would be allocated. For example, all of the work collecting assessment data in the schools will be quite costly. The details of this should be provided.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM