

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/07/2015 05:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Long Beach Unified School District (U215H150098)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	20	15
Total	20	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Skills for Success Evaluation Panel - 1: 84.215H

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Long Beach Unified School District (U215H150098)

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:

- The design proposed by the applicant is a QED, within-school matched comparison design which, if properly implemented could meet WWC standards with reservations, and can be used to estimate the effect size of the implemented program (p. 21)
- The applicant addresses the effectiveness of the implementation by collecting data on student outcomes and implementation fidelity. (p. 21)
- The applicant has established a process for sharing the findings of the evaluation through regular briefings, which will present data and performance feedback to support fidelity and develop strategies for replication. (p. 21)
- The applicant has identified an external evaluator that appears to have the requisite skills and expertise to conduct this evaluation successfully. (p. 21)
- The sample size and distribution is presented, which allows for an estimate of treatment effects. (p. 23)
- A detailed description of how students were assigned to treatment and comparison groups is provided by the applicant (p. 25) Equivalence of the groups is established through propensity scores, which were obtained through a regression model. (p. 25)
- An estimated effect size is provided with an MDES of .11 (p. 26)

Weaknesses:

- The estimated effect size of .11 seems to be a little low to achieve the validity of results that would be expected from this evaluation design. (p. 26)
- The outcome analysis for the impact of the implementation on students is unclear. GPA was used on p. 23, but resorts to Smarter Balance Assessment scores later on p. 25.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/07/2015 05:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/04/2015 12:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Long Beach Unified School District (U215H150098)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Skills for Success Evaluation Panel - 1: 84.215H

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Long Beach Unified School District (U215H150098)

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:

The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies via semi-structured protocols for interviewing key stakeholders, conducting student focus groups, and conducting site visits (page 22). The evaluator will triangulate observation data with teacher professional development reports, curriculum materials, and instructional practices to explore the effectiveness of project implementation strategies (page 22).

The evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. via the Jobs for the Future (JFF) networks, including 79 California Career Pathways Trust consortia and a 12-state Pathways to Prosperity Network (page 11). The JFF has a national clearinghouse for research, tools, practices, and approaches, which has the ability to host and disseminate promising tools, resources and practices to a national audience (page 11-12). The applicant intends to provide an array of replication usable materials including documentation of strong practices in video, webinar, and case study formats (page 9). The applicant will document and disseminate program information and results to national audiences to promote replication (page 9).

The applicant will provide multiple avenues for performance feedback and the periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, students will give and receive peer performance feedback, and teachers will participate in peer feedback activities for the purpose of problem solving, identifying successful practices, and improving content and pedagogy (page 14). The applicant will use structured management systems already in place to infuse accountability measures into monthly principal meetings and quarterly assistant principal meetings (page 15). The assistant principal will use bimonthly meetings to monitor progress, troubleshoot, and ensure fidelity of implementation (page 15). The applicant identifies specific data gathering processes that will be used to collect feedback including monthly online teacher surveys, weekly student feedback protocols, and site visits and observations (page 16). District and school leadership will conduct improvement institutes twice yearly to identify process and content gaps and effective strategies and activities (page 17).

The methods of evaluation have the potential to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations. For example, the study design matches students within schools, on demographics, and prior achievement (page 23) and collects data similarly for both treatment and comparison students (page 23). The applicant will use propensity score matching on a broad set of variables to increase

the likelihood of comparability of the treatment and comparison students (page 25).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant proposes a within-school matched comparison design (page 21), insufficient information is presented to determine how the 30 students are selected for participation in the treatment group versus those not selected for participation in each school (page 26).

The applicant proposes to evaluate the extent to which the program is implemented with fidelity (page 21), but does not describe how variation in dosage will be entered into the analysis as a moderating variable.

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/04/2015 12:28 PM