

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/7/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Del Norte Unified School District (U411C110418)

Reader #2: *****

	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 #6 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 6: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Del Norte Unified School District (U411C110418)

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:

This is a comparison group pre-post design and an interrupted time series with comparison group design (p36). This is a strong approach to use and should provide informative data. The research questions are clearly stated on the same page. Three teachers per coach will be selected for each data coach. This will form the treatment group. Twenty-four comparison teachers from similar schools who are not exposed to the coaching model will form the comparison group (p36). This is a relatively small group which might be further reduced in size due to teacher attrition. The project may wish to consider expanding the size of the groups.

Both formative and summative data will be collected. Formative data will be collected from teachers through the administration of surveys, self reports, interviews, and a review of activity logs (p34). It would be helpful to know if comparison group teachers are to take the same surveys as the treatment group. Student data will be academic assessment test results.

Variables of teacher experience, participation in program, student race and poverty, and attitudes will be considered in examining program effects on teachers. Additional information on the handling of the data would be helpful in that the subgroups will be extremely small due to the small size of the teacher group to begin with. Student variables will include age, gender, special education status, race SES and teacher experience (p37). Student data for the treatment and comparison students will be compared.

Feedback of evaluation findings to project staff is planned to inform the project of any need for adjustment (p38). The evaluators listed on page 34 are independent of the applicant organization (p37). Resumes are presented for two individuals (pp46-49) one of whom appears experienced in evaluation. The budget of \$240,000 for 3 evaluators over 5 years appears to be sufficient to conduct the evaluation as stated.

Weaknesses:

The number of teacher in the comparison group is listed as 24 on page 36. Later on page 36, and again on page 37, the number of teachers in each group is stated as 21. This difference requires clarification.

On page 33, the use of the STAR test with students is indicated while in the table on page 35, it is noted that the CST will be used. Additional information is needed to fully understand the assessment instruments to be used.

The frequency of feedback from evaluators to project staff is not explicitly stated. The statistical procedures to be used in data analysis are not stated. Both of these items would be helpful to know and add to the strength of the application.

Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/7/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Del Norte Unified School District (U411C110418)

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 #6 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 6: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Del Norte Unified School District (U411C110418)

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 evaluation in the proposal has been well-designed and clearly stated. Goals, Objectives, and Performance Objectives are detailed. Three research questions are related to these (pg 17).

The sources of data are appropriate for the study (ie. Teacher response rubric, established surveys, state test results) and will support a high quality evaluation (pg 18-19).

Two of the three research questions will be analyzed using a quasi-experimental, comparison group pre/post test design. The third question will be analyzed using an interrupted time-series design. Both of these designs are effective and logical for the stated research questions (pg 18-19). The evaluation does list several demographic variables to be considered (ie. ethnicity, poverty, SES, gender, teacher experience, etc.) (pg 19).

The evaluation has both formative (training and practice of Data Coaches) and summative components (teacher knowledge and student achievement outcomes).

The applicant does consider how much growth might be expected in student achievement over the course of the study and does examine the cost of scaling up the project (pg 14, objectives pg 17). Sample size is provided (pg 14).

Finances to support the proposed evaluation activities are detailed in the Budget Narrative (pg e119). The proposed evaluator is experienced and independent (20-21).

Weaknesses:

The proposal addresses evaluation design but does not mention the minimum detected effect size or attrition. No method was provided to address fidelity of implementation. These are minor weaknesses.

The statistical analyses that will be used to analyze the quantitative data are not mentioned in the text.

Formative data is collected and these results are provided twice per year to Data Coaches, administrators, and directors. However, there is no indication that the data will be used as feedback to adjust implementation and to improve the program.

Additionally, there is no mention of analyses that will be run on the formative data.

There is no Logic Model provided that clearly outlines the project's elements, outcome, and questions.

Reader's Score: 16

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