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Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.

   (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 performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   (4) 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.

Strengths:

1. The applicant presented on pages 20 to 24 very detailed methods of evaluation. The applicant would utilize a quasi-experimental design in which over three years 8 schools will be phased into the treatment group and would include 125 teachers receiving training in the Start on Success model involving 3,500 students. These included utilizing mentor focus group data and logs which would be assessed for themes plus interviews of two teachers per grade to monitor fidelity of the training and implementation of the Start on Success program.

2. The applicant would conduct classroom observations to document fidelity of implementation of the content of the instructional modules.

3. The applicant on page 22 would utilize the Rasch rating scale model to obtain a much more structured determination of validity and reliability which was a procedure recommended by WWC.

4. The applicant on page 21 would conduct an online survey of all students twice per semester. This pre/post survey would address a complete range of non-cognitive skills related directly to the Start on Success instruction modules listed on pages 10 and 11. These findings would be combined with school site data such as discipline, attendance, and academic achievement to identify students for the Tier II mentoring services and later Tier III services. This was an effective strategy for utilization of limited resources which might be highly suitable for replication in other settings.

5. The applicant on page 25 provided minimal detectable effect size to assist in determining a meaningful difference between the treatment and control groups.

6. The applicant on pages 21 and 22 and the logic model listed a series of ongoing data collection points and periodic review sequencing to provide for continuous feedback. The applicant would provide annual performance outcomes regarding the fidelity of implementation of the Start on Success program plus corresponding discipline, attendance and academic data analysis.

7. The applicant had an excellent designed evaluation process that addressed the fidelity of implementation of the professional development and classroom instruction. It also included timely and appropriate and the, the quantification of survey data, plus the movement to identification of identified students requiring additional assistance through its Tier I and Tier II interventions. The applicant's methods of evaluation should meet WWC standards with reservations.
Weaknesses:
There were no weaknesses found.
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Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.

   (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 performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   (4) 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.

Strengths:

The collection and use of evaluation data is well-articulated throughout the proposed project plan (p. 10-14). These descriptions provide assurances that the data are integrated and used to inform the progress, development and refinement of the project.

The evaluation plan includes a thorough description of the intended sample for both the formative and summative evaluation (p. 20, 22-23). The evaluation team also includes a power analysis for the quasi-experimental design. These details ensure that the project is sampling a sufficient number of students to detect measurable changes in outcomes.

The project specifies a wealth of data collection activities and associated instruments to inform both the formative and summative evaluation (p. 21-22). This proposed data collection will ensure sufficient information is collected to monitor the implementation and progress to outcomes.

The evaluation plan includes specific information about the types of analyses that will be used for both quantitative and qualitative data (p. 22, p.24-25). These analyses include generating information on technical qualities of the instruments to inform revisions. These analyses will allow for a thorough examination of the collected data to provide high quality information to the project staff.

The evaluation team provides detailed information about how they will use propensity score matching to generate comparison samples for a quasi-experimental design (p. 23). The applicant provides specific information about how they compare the adequacy of the matches which will help ensure the validity of the interpretations from the resulting data.

Weaknesses:

The reviewer noted no weaknesses in the evaluation plan.