

Promise Neighborhoods Pre-Award Webinar #4:
Pre-Application Logic Model and Evidence Requirements

Speakers:

ELSON NASH, U.S. Department of Education

CARLA TAYLOR, Center for the Study of Social Policy

JONATHAN JACOBSON, Institute for Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC, Center for the Study of Social Policy

Thursday, July 28, 2016

ELSON NASH: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Elson Nash, Team Lead for the Promise Neighborhoods program at the U.S. Department of Education. Welcome to the Promise Neighborhoods Pre-Award Webinar #4, the last in a series, and this one covers Logic Model and Evidence Requirements.

Today we will cover two very important topics, and they will be presented by two very important people. Dr. Carla Taylor is Senior Associate with the Center for the Study of Social Policy, our contractor for the programmatic technical assistance over the past 5 years. Carla will be our first speaker, and she will cover the logic model information. Our second presenter is Dr. Jonathan Jacobson, Senior Research Scientist with the Institute for Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education. Jonathan will cover the evidence portion of the presentation.

So now I will pass back on to Michael.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Hi, everybody. Thank you for joining the webinar today. My name is Michael Bochnovic. I'm a program and research assistant working with Carla at the Center for the Study of Social Policy. The session will be recorded and posted on the program website, together with a transcript and the slide deck.

To reduce the background noise we have muted everyone's phone—but if you do have questions please submit them by using the Q&A pod on the right side of your screen. We'll be monitoring questions throughout the presentation and we have some dedicated time to answer questions so feel free to continue to send those in as the webinar goes on.

Due to time constraints, we may not get to everyone's question. We will do our best to answer as many questions as efficiently as possible. If we don't get to all the questions we will respond separately after the conclusion of the webinar.

Just to go over the brief agenda for today, as Elson mentioned we will be going over the logic model terms, concepts, and definitions. We will also be covering common logic model elements



and how to develop a logic model. We also have a logic model FAQ section that we will be going over, as well as additional logic model resources. That will be Carla's section. Then Dr. Jacobson will be joining us to talk about evidence in the Promise Neighborhoods program, as well as evaluation in the Promise Neighborhoods programs.

To begin, we will start with Dr. Carla Taylor to talk about the logic model.

CARLA TAYLOR: Good afternoon, everyone. It is a pleasure to close out our pre-award TA webinar with this conversation about logic models, and we thought that, as a starting point, it might be useful to understand exactly how and where logic models show up in this year's notice. As you know, if you've combed through the notice by now, the proposals will be rated using specific selection criteria, and we've gone over these selection criteria in previous webinars. One of the criteria looks specifically at the quality of project design, and the notice explicitly says that the quality of the design of the proposed project includes the extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. Then when you look at the strong theory, you see that it means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.

So this brings us to the definition of logic models from the notice itself. It says that a "logic model refers to well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice. You can think of these as the active "ingredients" that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, both theoretically and operationally."

You'll notice that we've bolded a few of the key terms and phrases. A logic model is, first and foremost, a conceptual framework, and it also identifies your key comments and the active ingredients of your work, and, fundamentally, it describes how those components are related to each other and, ultimately, how they relate to your outcomes.

We wanted to offer a second, and I think complementary definition for logic models, which comes from the Kellogg Foundation's classic resource on this topic. We've included to the link to the resource, and it will show up again later in the presentation, in case you're interested in referring to it. But this definition, again, we bolded a couple of the key concepts. "A logic model is a systematic and visual way to present and share your understanding of the relationships among the resources you have to operate your program, the activities that you plan, and the changes or results that you hope to achieve."

Let's take a look at the basic layout of a logic model and how those elements or those ingredients that we just talked about are typically displayed. You'll see right away that there are four categories, or four buckets of categories: your resources or inputs, the activities, outputs, and outcomes. Again, you can think of these as components, as elements, as active



ingredients—all of those things that we bolded in the definitions that we just looked at. Note that they're connected to each other by arrows, which is a really important feature of your logic model. As you move through the logic model you're making the assumption that each element lays the groundwork for the next one in the chain. We call these connections "if-then" connections, and you'll see why as we start to move through the examples.

The very first element of your logic model is going to be your resources or inputs, and we define these as the human, financial, organizational, or community resources that are available to direct toward doing the work of your Promise Neighborhood.

Let's take a minute to talk about the if-then connection there and the underlying logic. The logic or the assumption that you're putting forward in this model is that certain resources are needed to support and implement your strategies, and if you have access to those resources, then you can use them to accomplish your planned activities.

As we move to the next building block in the logic model we get to activities, and these we think of as the processes, the tools, the events, the technology, and the actions that are an intentional part of your Promise Neighborhood. These interventions, or solutions, in many cases, you'll call them, are used to bring about the intended program changes or results. Again, what's the underlying logic here? That if you implement the planned activities, then you will deliver the product or service that you intended.

You will begin to see the pattern as we move from activities to outputs. What are outputs? They're very directly related to your Promise Neighborhood activities. They're usually described in terms of the size and/or the scope of the services and products that you deliver or produce. They tend to indicate if a program was delivered to your intended audience at the right dose, or the intended dose. Again, the question here—what's the logic? What's underlying this set of arrows and these set of assumptions? The logic says if you complete the product or service, then you will produce certain short-term, medium, term, and long-term benefits.

And this is worth pausing on for just a bit. Let's take a minute to talk about outcomes. Everything that's come so far in the logic model points you to a particular set of outcomes, and outcomes, in the context of a logic model, are typically divided into subgroups to reflect change over time. It's really important to note that the specific terms that you might see—in this presentation and other resources that you look at about logic models—those terms may vary. Some logic models are labeled short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes. Others use labels like short-term outcomes, long-term outcomes and impact. The idea is not to get caught up or tripped up in the language. Regardless of the terms, what you want to do is start with changes and attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, skills, et cetera, which are most often expressed at the individual level, and work their way up to longer-term, bigger changes at the neighborhood level. So that's the underlying principle, regardless of the language or terminology that you see or that you use.



Let's talk about the process of actually developing a logic model, which is very closely aligned with the elements of the logic model itself. In the context of Promise Neighborhood, because the Promise Neighborhoods program is guided by a results framework, it's very useful to start with the end in mind. So Step 1 is actually starting with the change that you want to see, so begin at the end and work back. The question that you want to ask yourself here is, ultimately, what long-term outcomes will we see as a result of our cradle-to-career work? The good news here is that that answer has really been provided for you through the Promise Neighborhoods results framework, so you'll want to be looking really closely at the States results as you think about the end that you're working toward.

In Step 2 you're moving backwards. What are the medium-term outcomes, or, again, with the language differences you may see in some places, what are the intermediate outcomes that let us know that we're on our way to achieving those long-term outcomes? Step 3, move backwards again. What are the short-term outcomes that let us know we're on our way to achieving our medium-term or intermediate outcomes?

Step 4, you continue to work your way backwards through the elements. What are the outputs that we will produce as a result of implementing our Promise Neighborhoods activities? And it's useful here, I think, to give just general categories of examples. So for outputs you might be talking about the number of classes taught, meetings held, materials produced or distributed, or things like program participation rates and demography, perhaps the hours of each type of service provided.

Like we talked about earlier, those outputs are going to come right off of your activities, so when you work backwards you're going from outputs now back to activities and asking yourself the question, what activities must be provided and completed to achieve those outputs? Again, I think it's useful to look at examples of the kinds of things that you might list up under activities. You could be talking about products like promotional materials, educational curricula, services, or even infrastructure, which is particularly important in the case of Promise Neighborhoods. So structure, relationship, and capacity, all the things that you are doing and providing and delivering to bring about the desired results.

And then, finally, Step 6, which goes right back to the beginning, resources and inputs, and the question that you're asking here is what are the resources or the inputs that we need to make sure that our activities are implemented? The kinds having to do with funding, existing organizations, potential collaborating partners, existing organizational interpersonal networks, staff, volunteers, time, facilities, equipment, and supplies. All examples of the kinds of things that you might choose to include at that stage of the logic model.

Let's pause here for just a minute and talk about a couple of checks and balances, and by checks and balances we really mean the kinds of things that you want to think about as you're developing the logic model, to make sure it's on track. The first recommendation is to scrutinize



the "if-then" assumptions that are really implied or implicit in your logic model, to make sure that the connections between your elements are plausible.

The second is to build the logic model with the ten Promise Neighborhoods results at 15 indicators in mind. We talked about this earlier. They show up very clearly in the Notice and they give you the road map for what you should be aiming toward, in terms of outcomes and impact. So you want to look at that really closely and be sure to align your logic model with those outcomes.

The third check or the third balance is to make sure your logic model visually reflects the cradle-to-career approach of a Promise Neighborhood. There is no one right way to do that. We will look at a model in a couple of minutes. But I think this is the place where you can get creative in thinking about how do you want to visually display both the elements and the "if-then" chain of connections that make up your logic model, in a way that also shows the cradle-to-career approach that you're using in your Promise Neighborhood.

The other thing you want to think about is using a collaborative process that involves partners and other stakeholders in developing and refining the logic model, so that it's both broadly understood and broadly owned.

Here, as promised, is a picture of what it might look like, or it could look like, when you put it all together. Let's talk about that for a minute. As we just mentioned in the list of checks and balances, a logic model for Promise Neighborhood has to take the standard logic model elements and format and then apply them in the context of a cradle-to-career pipeline, or what the Notice calls a continuum solution. I'm sure you will no doubt find creative and visually interesting ways to display this information, and again I just want to emphasize that there is no one right way. The slide shown here is simply an example of what this could look like.

Let's take a look at it. You'll see the logic model linked by your "if-then" arrows, going down the left-hand side of this particular image, and then from left to right, the information is organized as a continuum of solutions, starting with early childhood and ending with college and career. And, once again, just to emphasize this point, you will want to consult the Notice and look closely at the 10 Promise Neighborhood results as this will help you articulate the long-term outcomes or the impact of your work, as a starting point for working term, outcomes, short-term outcomes, outputs, activities, and resources and inputs.

I think it's worth taking a few minutes just to have a brief logic model reality check. I guess there are a couple of things. What does a logic model not do? It is not all things to all people. It must provide a road map that shows the pathway. It does depict what will be done and what will be produced and accomplished. It does identify key components of your proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, and almost most importantly, it does describe the relationships among the key components and outcome.



But equally importantly, a logic model does not, in and of itself, convey the underlying theory and assumptions, and we'll talk a little bit more about that later. A logic model does not represent reality but it focuses on your intent and your expected outcomes, so that it's a vision of what could be, not necessarily an accurate depiction of what is. A logic model does not provide or demonstrate causal attribution. Just because you line things up and put arrows between them doesn't mean that one thing automatically leads to another or is responsible for causing that distinction.

And lastly, the logic model does not address winnings. I think as we get into the slides about evidence, in that discussion, that will shed some light on what does help you figure out if you're doing the right things or not, because a logic model, in and of itself, does not do that.

We thought we would queue up Q&A time with just a couple of Frequently Asked Questions about logic models, as we anticipate some of the questions or the issues that might come up, and then after we do that we will open it up and Michael will share any questions that have come in so far. But there are a few that we thought might be important to talk about.

What format or layout should I use for my logic model? I want to emphasize, again, there is no one right format, as long as all of the logic model elements are included. The template we reviewed earlier is just one approach.

How long will it take to achieve short-term outcomes versus medium-term outcomes versus long-term outcomes? It's a great question and it's one that each applicant will have to grapple with and really answer in the context of their own work. On this note, though, we suggest that you may want to consult the resource, "A Developmental Pathway for Achieving Promise Neighborhoods Results." There is a hyperlink in the slides which will be available. This product is really meant to help inform your thinking about Promise Neighborhood stages and sequencing.

Can logic models also be used to inform implementation, evaluation, or communications efforts? The answer there is a resounding "yes, but." Yes, but this webinar focuses on logic models as tool for program design, because that's the task that's most relevant during the application stage. The idea is that as you move forward in the work and should you move into implementation and evaluation and communications that the logic model could also become a tool that helps inform those efforts, but we really, at this stage, are talking about how to use a logic model to get really clear about communicating what the design of the program is to demonstrate quality, as it's indicated in the selection criteria.

Another question you might have is how is the logic model different from my theory of change? Great question. The Notice defines the theory of change as an organization's beliefs about how its inputs, and early and intermediate outcomes relate to accomplishing its long-term desired results. Wait a minute. That kind of sounds like what we just talked about for the logic model,



right? But as we discussed—and I think this is worth bearing in mind—simply assembling the logic model elements and putting arrows between the boxes does not explicitly convey the theory or the assumptions that are driving your work. With that in mind, you may consider an accompanying narrative called a theory of change, typically, that really outlines and clarifies the underlying or implicit "if-then" statements that your logic model assumes.

So, again, these two pieces are very closely related, but you want to think of the logic model as a picture, a visual, an image that lays out the basic components of your work, and the theory of change as a narrative that really goes into a much fuller, deeper, clearer explanation of why those arrows are there and what assumptions lie beneath the arrows.

And then the final question, what about a theory of action? You know, we're throwing around a lot of terms—theory of change, theory of action, logic model—and this is actually an easy answer because the Notice itself uses logic model and theory of action practically interchangeably, and we've included page references there. So there is a definition for theory of action, but in the definition for logic model the Notice explicitly says "also referred to as a theory of action." So as you are designing these pieces, I think it's fine and completely acceptable to use those two terms interchangeably.

Big one here. What about performance measures? In the Notice, performance measures actually show up in the selection criteria and it deals with quality of project design, which is also, incidentally, where the logic model requirement shows up. And we pulled some language from the Notice to help with this. The Notice indicates that one of the factors used to determine quality of the project design is "the extent to which"—and I've bolded this—"the methods and evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible."

I know that Dr. Jacobson will talk about this much more, but here's the takeaway, I think, about performance measures in the context of doing your logic model. While the logic model is not an evaluation plan, you will want to be sure that any performance measures that do show up in your evaluation strategy are consistent with the way you display outcomes in your logic model, and/or the theory of change, should you choose to provide that kind of accompanying narrative. So the takeaway here is about alignment. The performance measures, to the extent that you use them or they show up in your evaluation plan, should not be different than the way that you talk about outcomes in your logic model. You want to keep an eye on all those pieces and just make sure that they speak to each other and that they reflect the same kind of assumptions and measures.

We've included several additional resources. Let me say just a little bit about them. The first two get into the topic of performance measures in much more detail. I'll also refer you back to the data webinar by our colleagues from Urban Institute, where they talked a bit about



performance measures in the context of Promise Neighborhoods. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide, which showed up earlier on the slides—you may remember, as we looked at the definition of logic models—is sort of a classic resource that's been out there for about 20 years now in logic models and includes everything you could possibly want to know, and then some. It might something you use to skim or browse, if you're looking to develop your logic model.

And then last but not least, and we talked about this already, too, "A Developmental Pathway for Achieving Promise Neighborhoods Results" is one of the pieces that we helped create with our national partners, and is really meant to show that Promise Neighborhood, and any other cradle-to-career approach, happens over a span of time, and there are ways that you can think about the phases of that work and the staging and sequencing of it. So again, consistent with the way that a logic model asks you to lay out the assumptions behind your work and the pathway by which it will happen. So we just think that this could be something interesting for you to look at. It may sparks some ideas as you're creating your logic model.

I'm going to pause there and kick it to Michael to see if there are any specific questions.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Thank you, Carla. Yeah, we have received some questions, and please, as the webinar continues, feel free to continue to send questions in with the pane that's part of your control panel.

The first question we received today has to do with the length of the application itself. The question is, the amount of information that is required to count for a logic model, the evaluations, needs, plan, et cetera, are quite extensive, so if you exceed the length and the narrative and appendices that is recommended, will there be any penalty?

ELSON NASH: No. We encourage you to stay within the limit but there will not be a penalty.

And then someone want to know, are we supposed to create logic models for each and every solution and partner and/or the overall cradle-to-college continuum they wanted to spread?

ELSON NASH: That's a great question. If you look at the example that was given, it was an overall example, and from that perspective that, in many ways, gives you the road map. So if an applicant decides to do individual logic models for each one you're not going to be penalized for it, but the attempt here, with the overall—I won't even call it a template, but the overall example was to present something that was comprehensive. So it's really up to the applicant, but I think if you look at the example given, it can give you the overall road map.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you, Elson. And just to add, answer to the first question about penalties was no, there are no penalties for exceeding the recommended length.



We also received a question about the accompanying narrative to a logic model that you mentioned during the FAQ slides. Is that required, or is the proposal narrative itself sufficient for describing the theory behind the logic model?

ELSON NASH: I think if, in the project narrative, you're able to incorporate that and then perhaps you could provide a footnote—See Appendix G, Logic Model—that could be an efficient way of doing it and an appropriate way of doing it. But if an applicant wants to provide a more in-depth explanation, once again you wouldn't be penalized for it.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. And just to clarify that point a little bit, the Notice outlines the order of the grant materials, and it does list evidence and logic model as Appendix G.

ELSON NASH: Yes.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: However, you do suggest that these are parts of the project narrative so it should not be put in both places, or could you give us some clarity?

ELSON NASH: If I were an applicant I would put it in both places.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you. And please keep sending your questions. We are taking them as effectively as possible. We have a few more than we can go over right now before we move on in the presentation.

One of our participants want to know, in some cases would it be okay to include more than one logic model if there is a need for somewhat of a sub-logic model?

ELSON NASH: I would say, once again, yes. If an applicant feels strongly about wanting to perhaps give a more in-depth explanation around a particular part of the pipeline, maybe it's something they want to do for the—and this is just a hypothetical—for the competitive preference priority, that's something that's up to the applicant. You will not be penalized for that.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you, Elson. And just to remind people, the slide show will be available online as well as a recording and a transcript. They will be made available the next business day after the conclusion, so by COB tomorrow we will have both a recording and a slide deck available at PromiseNeighborhoods.ed.gov. So that should answer the question, about finding materials related to this webinar.

We have another question. Are there any sample logic models that we can share? Not necessarily for Promise, but it would be great to also see a completed model.

ELSON NASH: I think what Carla tried to provide were some of the resources. Once again, we did want to provide the flexibility of applicants to create their logic models with some idea, but



what we didn't want to do is to give you an example and then have everyone follow that one example. So you have the one way that Carla presented but then there are also, under, I believe it's page 23 of the slide deck, the logic model which is kind of the old standard, the Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Guide that's been around for quite a while now. And then other examples, as well, with information on performance measures, and the, of course, data systems, et cetera. So there are some good examples there.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. And we're just going to do one more question before we move on. We do have a question asking if we could show the slide again that explains the difference between the logic model and the theory of change, and maybe if we could just speak to that for another second that would be very helpful.

CARLA TAYLOR: I'm happy to talk about that. You want to think of those two pieces as related to each other but serving slightly different purposes. The logic model, for all intents and purposes, again, it's a visual. It's a picture. It's an image that lays out the components of your work, and the arrows convey that you are making certain assumptions but it doesn't necessarily tell someone what those assumptions are. So you want to think of the theory of change as the place where you really make explicit the assumptions that are driving the work, the theory that's behind the work, and that typically works best as a narrative.

So if you were to overlay those pieces on top of each other, they would speak to each other, they would explain each other, they would complement each other, but the logic model would primarily serve as a visual whereas the theory of change would really clearly outline what the theory is that's driving what you're doing and that animates all the people in the logic model.

ELSON NASH: One other piece to that, that I think is tied to this, under, I believe, project design, where we talk about strong theory. Strong theory is actually connected back to logic model. And so if you were to think of your application as kind of a book, your logic model would perhaps be the table of contents, to kind of give an overview of what your book is about, and then the more detailed components, the chapters, et cetera, are all the other elements within your book.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you, everybody. I think this is a good point to continue with the webinar. We will be taking questions, as I said before, throughout, but just to be able to cover all of the content we're going to go ahead and move on for now.

ELSON NASH: Our next presenter for the second half of the presentation that focuses on evidence, once again, is Dr. Jonathan Jacobson. Thank you.

JONATHAN JACOBSON: Hello. As you've already heard I'm Jonathan Jacobson with the Institute of Education Sciences, which is the permanent education research, statistics, and evaluation arm. The grant notice of the Promise Neighborhoods program describes how the program is intended to both be based on evidence of what works to improve child and youth outcomes,



and to build such evidence. In particular, the Notice says that "Promise Neighborhoods are led by organizations that work to ensure that all children and youth in the target geographic area have access to services that lead to improved educational and development outcomes, from cradle-to-career. The services are based on the best available evidence, and are designed to learn about the impact of approaches for which there is less evidence. The services are linked and integrated seamlessly, and the services include education programs as well as programs that provide family and community supports."

The absolute priority in the grant notice includes a requirement that the applicant submit a Promise Neighborhood plan, to "describe the applicant's strategy for building a continuum of solutions over time that addresses neighborhood challenges as identified in the needs assessment and segmentation analysis. The continuum of solutions must be based on best available evidence, including, where available, strong or moderate evidence," as defined in this notice, which I'll define in a moment, "and be designed to significantly improve educational outcomes and to support the healthy development and well-being of children and youth in the neighborhood."

The grant notice also says, regarding the Promise Neighborhoods plan, that "to the extent feasible and appropriate the applicant must describe, in its plan, how the applicant and its partners will leverage and integrate high-quality programs related to public and private investments and existing neighborhood assets into the continuum of solutions. An applicant must also include in its application an appendix that summarizes the evidence supporting each proposed solution and describes how the solution is based on the best available evidence, including, where available, strong or moderate evidence as defined in this notice."

The quality of project design, which is worth up to 30 points for each application, also takes into account the extent to which the design of the project includes evidence-based solutions. The grant notice says, in part, "In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the secretary considers the following factors. One of these is the extent to which the applicant documents that proposed solutions are based on the best available evidence, including, where available, strong or moderate evidence."

So we're hearing the word "evidence" a lot. What does that mean?

For the purpose of Promise Neighborhoods program, strong evidence means evidence from studies with designs that can support causal conclusions, that is, studies with high internal validity, and studies that, in total, include enough of the range of participants and settings to support scaling up to the State, regional, or national level, that is, studies with high external validity.

Moderate evidence means evidence from previous studies with designs that can support causal conclusions, that is, studies with high internal validity, but have limited generalizability, that is,



moderate external validity, or moderate evidence is from studies with high external validity but moderate internal validity.

So we'll describe evidence a little bit more and give some examples of what these definitions could mean, but first let's ask the question, where would you go to find strong evidence or moderate evidence, or, in other words, how do you find evidence of the effect of education interventions, whether it's a program, a practice, a policy, on a relevant outcomes, an outcome that perhaps is in the logic model?

One option is to rely on yourself, your own knowledge and your experience, which obviously is very valuable. Another possibility is to turn to colleagues, peers, program administrators for their insights. Another possibility is to look at professional associations that might have gathered information on evidence-based practices. A fourth possibility is to turn to researchers—academic researchers or researchers with non-academic organizations. And a fifth possibility is to go online and look at the news stories, blogs, or academic journals, some which are, unfortunately, behind pay walls.

A potentially valuable resource that we would like to point you to for identifying evidence of what works to improve student outcomes and other relevant outcomes for education is the What Works Clearinghouse. The WWC is an initiative of the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, where I work. The WWC reviews, rates, and summarizes original studies of the effectiveness of education interventions.

There is a wide variety of education research. The only subset of this would be reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse. These would be original studies of the effectiveness of education interventions, and as of the beginning of this week the Clearinghouse has reviewed over 12,000 studies. The What Works Clearinghouse does not rate qualitative studies, purely descriptive studies, or the re-analysis or synthesis of others' data, even if that's done for the sake of studying an intervention.

The What Works Clearinghouse reviews education intervention studies using evidence standards. These are developed by panels of national experts for different types of effectiveness studies. They focus on internal validity of estimates, which relates to the Promise Neighborhood's definition of evidence. Internal validity means whether an estimated impact is valid or whether it's likely to be biased. And applied by teams of certified reviewers to gives studies one of three possible ratings. A study's highest What Works Clearinghouse rating would be what meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The next-to-highest rating would be to meet What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with reservations, and the lowest rating for an eligible study would be does not meet What Works Clearinghouse standards.



The What Works Clearinghouse evidence rating received by an education intervention study depends on the design and implementation of the study. In general, randomized controlled trials, experimental studies which use lotteries to assign subjects to the intervention can meet the What Works Clearinghouse highest evidence rating, meets standards without reservations, if they have low attrition, that is, if there is little loss of sample from the time of randomization. If an experimental study has high attrition but establishes the equivalence of the intervention and control group on certain baseline characteristics, that study can meet What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. If not, the study does not meet What Works Clearinghouse standards.

Regression discontinuity designs, which use a rating variable to assign the intervention on the basis of either merit or reviewed under a separate set of What Works Clearinghouse standards, they can receive one of three ratings under these standards: meets without reservations, meets with reservations, or does not meet standards.

Quasi-experimental designs that include an intervention group and a matched comparison group can meet standards with reservations, if they establish equivalence between those groups on certain characteristics measured at baseline, but they cannot receive the What Works Clearinghouse highest rating.

Let me just make some notes about the evidence ratings of the Clearinghouse, in case those are relative for considering what to include in your applications. These standards are applied to study findings, not to the intervention itself. So, consequently, an evidence rating is rating the quality of the findings from the study, not of the intervention. The study as a whole receives the rating of the highest rated finding reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse, which may be different from the finding relevant for your project.

A high study rating is not the What Works Clearinghouse's endorsement of an intervention or a determination that either an intervention or finding is relevant for your project. In general, you need to decide what is relevant for what you propose to do. In addition, whether an estimated effect is statistically significant and positive, or there's a favorable statistically significant effect, that's reported by the What Works Clearinghouse but does not affect the What Works Clearinghouse rating of a study. So a study rating of meets What Works Clearinghouse standards, even meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, does not mean that the intervention is effective.

Study ratings are listed in the What Works Clearinghouse Reviewed Studies Database, which is available on the What Works Clearinghouse website, but study findings are found in What Works Clearinghouse publications. These includes What Works Clearinghouse practice guides and intervention reports. Study findings are also included in the Find What Works tool available on the What Works Clearinghouse website, and in a study findings dataset that's accessible in a spreadsheet, flat file, Excel format on the What Works Clearinghouse website.



Besides the What Works Clearinghouse evidence ratings, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, known as EDGAR, include some definitions that relate to external validity, that is, to the generalizability of a study. According to these definitions, a large sample means an analytic sample of 350 or more students, or other single analysis units, or 50 or more groups, such as classrooms or schools, which contain 10 or more students or other single analysis units. Multisite sample means more than one site where a site can be defined as an LEA, a school district, a locality, or a State.

The Department's General Administrative Regulations also have a definition of moderate evidence of effectiveness. It's very important to realize this is not identical to the Promise Neighborhood program definition. However, knowing this specific definition may be helpful to understand how the internal validity and external validity of a study are both recorded consideration when reviewers assess the quality of evidence submitted with a Promise Neighborhood application.

So, the first part of the EDGAR definition of moderate evidence of effectiveness says a study should either be a randomized controlled trial, an experimental study that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, which means a study with high internal validity, or making causal inferences, or it should be a quasi-experimental design, or RCT, that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations, which would have moderate internal validity, but that QED or RCT that meets Clearinghouse standards only with reservations needs to include a large, multisite sample, that is, it needs to show that it probably has high external validity, that is, high generalizability.

In addition, for the EDGAR definition, a study needs to have overlap with the population or settings proposed for the intervention, and this relates to the external validity, that is the generalizability of the study findings. Was the study done on a population, on settings that correspond with those proposed for the intervention, for whatever it is the solution is going to be proposed to do in the project?

Finally, the EDGAR definition of moderate evidence of effectiveness needs to show statistically significant favorable impact on a relevant outcome with no statistically significant overriding unfavorable impacts in that study or other studies reviewed and reported by the What Works Clearinghouse. This relates to the validity of a conclusion about effectiveness. It's not enough for a study to have a high rating, showing it's a high-quality study. There needs to be a finding from the study that shows a favorable statistically significant impact, and that needs to be understood in context of any other studies that have been done at that intervention and then that are reported by the What Works Clearinghouse, in order to assess the validity of a conclusion that the intervention was effective.

I'm going to shift gears and review some language in the Notice that relates to building evidence by participating in the evaluation of Promise Neighborhood program and its



components. The Notice says that the purpose of the Promise Neighborhoods program is to significantly improve the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in our most distressed communities and to transform these communities by learning about the overall impact of the Promise Neighborhoods program and about the relationship between particular strategies in Promise Neighborhoods and student outcomes, including through an evaluation of the program, particular elements within the continuum of solutions, or both.

The Notice, and absolute priority one, also asks that applicants, in their Promise Neighborhoods plan to describe their commitment to work with the Department, and with a natural evaluator for Promise Neighborhoods or another entity to be designated by the Department, to ensure that data collection and program design are consistent with plans to conduct a rigorous national evaluation of the Promise Neighborhoods program and of specific solutions and strategies pursued by individual grantees.

This commitment must include, but needs not be limited to (a) ensuring that through memoranda of understanding with appropriate entities the national evaluator and the Department have access to relevant program and project data sources, that is administrative data and program and project data, including data on a quarterly basis if requested by the Department; (b) developing, in consultation with a natural evaluator, an evaluation strategy, including identifying a credible comparison group, as defined in the Notice; (c) developing, in consultation with the national evaluator, a plan for identifying and collecting reliable and valid baseline data for both program participants and a designated comparison group of non-participants.

So what is a credible comparison group? The Notice defines a credible comparison group as including a comparison group formed by matching project participants with non-participants based on key characteristics that are thought to be related to outcomes. These characteristics include, but are not limited to (1) prior test scores and other measures of academic achievement, preferably on the same measures that would be used to assess the outcomes from the project; (2) demographic characteristics, such as age, disability, gender, English proficiency, ethnicity, poverty level, parents' educational attainment, and single- or two-parent family background; (3) the time period in which the two groups are studied, for example the two groups are children entering kindergarten in the same year as opposed to sequential years; and (4) methods used to collect outcome data, for example, the same test of reading skills administered in the same way to both groups.

Finally, in the Department's assessment of the quality of the project design, which is worth up to 30 points for each application, also takes into account, in part, the quality of methods of evaluation proposed for each project. The grant notice says, in determining the quality of the design of proposed project the Secretary considers the following factors, including the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are



clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project, and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

I'll just back up and point out that that previous slide referred to outcomes, which relates, of course, to the logic model for the project.

So now I'm going to share some additional resources, many of them available on the What Works Clearinghouse website that may be helpful to you in thinking about sources of evidence, criteria for assessing the internal validity and external validity of study design, and the design of evaluations to produce evidence.

A note that the trained reviewers considering the evidence submitted with a Promise Neighborhoods application will give consideration to the document and the strength of the evidence you submit. This includes the internal validity of the evidence, that is, the extent to which the evidence has met or has the potential to meet What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards for experimental or quasi-experimental intervention studies, while showing statistically significant or favorable effects from the intervention, as well as the external validity of evidence, that is, its generalizability for the population settings proposed to receive those solutions in your project. Note, however, the evidence submitted with an application will not be submitted for a formal review by the What Works Clearinghouse but will be assessed by the trained reviewers scoring the application.

So the resources here are the What Works Clearinghouse Help Desk, for any generic questions on the Clearinghouse; the Handbook of Procedures and Standards for the What Works Clearinghouse, showing the evidence standards that the What Works Clearinghouse uses to identify studies that meet Clearinghouse standards, with or without reservations; webinars on designing strong studies for making causal inferences; additional resources on the design of quasi-experimental studies, which are studies that don't use random assignment but seek to approximate the results from a randomized study.

So we now would like to address any questions you may have about the evidence or evaluation portions of the presentation. Please submit relevant questions and comments. And due to time constraints we may not be able to answer all of the questions received. If a question can't be answered you may e-mail it to PromiseNeighborhoods@ed.gov. Since we can't respond to every inquiry with an individual response we will post on the program website answers to frequently asked and relevant questions.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you, Dr. Jacobson. We do have a lot of questions that have been coming in, and I think the best way to do it would be to focus first on the evidence section and then address questions related to the logic model that have come in a little bit later, if that's all right with you.



To get started, is it required that all solutions be evidence-based? If not, about what percent should be evidence-based?

ELSON NASH: There is no percentage that we're giving that should be. I think what it outlined there is there should be best available evidence for each intervention, and it's, as mentioned, strong to moderate evidence. So the idea is that for each of your solutions or interventions you should be trying to address the evidence issue or the evidence question. I think beyond that the issue is, okay, if this is my intervention, can I research it even more to see if the evidence that is out there is moderate or strong? And so what Dr. Jacobson attempted to do was to give you resources where you could look up that intervention perhaps, to see if it were on the What Works Clearinghouse. So, once again, ideally, yes, you should be able to address the evidence question with each of your interventions.

The one thing that is important about this—now if, for any reason, your intervention doesn't have, once again, the best available evidence, you should try to document what is out there, according to the intervention, because the other piece to this puzzle is that we need to build evidence related to Promise interventions, and part of that is where we come to what you all are submitted. That helps us as well as it helps you.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Thank you very much, Elson.

With respect to evidence, it doesn't have to be peer-reviewed. It seems like it would be difficult to know about the internal and external validity without a peer-reviewed paper, but the question is specifically, does it have to be?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: The evidence submitted with the application will be considered by the reviewers of the application. It does not have to be from a peer-reviewed publication. There needs to be something in writing for them to examine and review, so that they can assess whether the evidence is from a study with strong internal validity or strong external validity. The What Works Clearinghouse, when it reviews studies, also needs to review a study that's publicly available, that's in writing. It does not have to be a peer-reviewed publication. It can be a draft paper or a working paper, but it needs to be something that is available for the public to review.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you very much.

We have a couple of questions about the established matched control group. One of our participants want to know, do we need to establish a matched control group or can we compare our results to our own school baselines before the intervention, or to the State standards in general?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: In general, in designing a project evaluation or an evaluation of a single project, or an evaluation across projects, a study will be more likely to meet strong or moderate



evidence standards if it has a group that is matched to the students or the children or youth who are participating in the project. So, in general, that would be a stronger design to have a matched comparison group than simply to compare with the population at large.

What the What Works Clearinghouse would do in assessing any comparison with a larger population would be to compare how similar that population was with the students in the project. Therefore, that is a consideration I would ask you to have, is how similar are the students to whom you would compare the students receiving services from the Promise Neighborhood program.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And that actually speaks very well to another question, which was how closely must comparison groups match, and what it sounds like is they should be very closely matched.

Another question about the comparison groups, can they be outside of an applicant's targeted neighborhood?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: There obviously might be several options in terms of where to obtain a matched comparison group. I'm not aware of any absolute requirement that the matched students need to be from the same target neighborhood. Usually, when the What Works Clearinghouse reviews a study, there are certain characteristics they would want to use to be able to assess. Often these characteristics include prior test scores of children. And so the important thing for understanding the quality of a matched comparison group is would you have similar information on them before the receipt of services or interventions and would you have similar outcomes for them.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you very much. We're going to throw a few questions over to Elson, more about the technicality of the application itself.

Citations. Where should people be putting them?

ELSON NASH: More than likely the citations will go in the Appendix. The last round we had, folks put citations in the Appendix, and so I would say more than likely that information will go in the Appendix. If you put it in the general project narrative that's okay as well, but generally I've seen folks put that information in the Appendix.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then, is there a certain number of citations required for evidence in each section?

ELSON NASH: We don't have a requirement regarding a certain number.



MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you. With respect to the evaluator, do applicants have to select their evaluator as a part of the application, or does that happen if they become a grantee?

ELSON NASH: You know, what I'm finding is it has been both, meaning we've had applicants come in with an evaluator in mind, in the past, and then we have folks who essentially wrote in that they would have an evaluator work with them, and after the fact they perhaps had a contract and bids for an evaluator. So it really depends on the applicant.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. And do applicants have to submit the full articles or will the citations suffice?

ELSON NASH: I would say a citation would suffice.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. We're getting a lot of questions coming in, which is fantastic. Please keep them coming. But maybe we'll take a moment to go back to the logic model questions and talk a little bit to that work.

Dr. Taylor, a question for you. To what extents are applicants allowed to modify existing evidence-based practices so they are more culturally responsive to target areas? When they're thinking of doing a theory of change, should applicants develop theirs to meet the needs of culturally specific populations?

CARLA TAYLOR: That's a great question, but because it touches so closely on evidence, I'm actually going to kick it to Dr. Jacobson to respond to.

JONATHAN JACOBSON: I think when assessing the quality of evidence, the prior question first is which intervention, which program do you need to implement? Because if you need to implement something, you then have the option of either finding evidence on it, or if there is not evidence on it, you have the alternative to build evidence on that. So I recommend that you first decide what you need to do. Then there's that matter of how to characterize the evidence that exists for it, and, in that case, if a study was done on a large sample, a multisite sample, if it was done with similar populations and settings, as are proposed, there would be a high external validity, there would be a high degree of generalizability about those findings, and you could say, indeed, this has the same intervention, the same solution as has already been tried on the populations I plan to serve.

If there's an intervention that has perhaps evidence with strong internal validity—a high-quality experimental study that had been done but on a somewhat different population, and there would be a need to adapt that for implementation with a different population where it was studied, that might be an example of a study with high internal validity but the study would have moderate external validity and then it would be implemented in a somewhat different setting or a slightly different population. So that would just be important to consider when



characterizing the evidence. The pre-existing evidence for the service or intervention, the stronger the argument to include that component, that particular solution or service in the evaluation to try to build evidence.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Thank you very much. Focusing a little bit more on the theory of change, is a theory of change explanation necessary for every activity?

CARLA TAYLOR: That's an interesting question. I think the purpose of the theory of change is to help the reader understand what's driving the connections between all of your elements. So it sort of depends. Once you lay the framework out and are able to clearly state here are my resources, here are the activities, here are the outputs, here are the outcomes, and then you want to back into a pretty clear explanation about what those links are and what those relationships are. So you may not necessarily need an explanation for every activity, but you want to be sure that whatever the implied arrows or assumptions are really that it depends on what level of detail and complexity you go for with your picture. Then that also will sort of determine the level of detail and complexity that you need for the accompanying narrative.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: I think that answered that question. Great.

We have a question, going back to evidence. In the webinar on data requirements it was told that applicants are required to propose solutions to address academic indicators but not to specifically address family- and community-support indicators. So this person wants to know, does that mean that if they propose solutions for the family- and community-support indicators those are not required to meet the same standards of evidence?

ELSON NASH: That's a great question. I'm going to have to have an FAQ on that one. I would say, offhand, given what we've said before—I'll make sure that an FAQ is posted on that. It's a great question.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then as far as moderate and strong evidence goes, one of our participants wants to know, do applicants have to declare whether they think the evidence is moderate or strong?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: I think what's going to be more useful for reviewers, rather than labeling the quality of the evidence is to characterize the features of the study that was used to support whatever solutions or interventions are being proposed, to describe if it's an experimental study, if it's a quasi-experimental study, to describe the sample and the populations on which it was done. Providing that information that would help reviewers to assess the characteristic study would be helpful. If the evidence is from a study that's already been reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse it may be useful to reviewers to know that. But I would not recommend making an assertion about a study that's not substantiated, so I would recommend either citing a review of the study that's already occurred or citing the characteristics of the study in order to characterize that.



MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And with respect to specific studies, we had one person ask, whether research studies done or commissioned by HUD, DHHS, or DOJ and their rating mechanisms be recognized as meeting What Works Clearinghouse standards?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: The relevant evidence definition are the two moderate and strong definitions for the Promise Neighborhoods program. The discussion of the What Works Clearinghouse was as a potential resource and as an example of a specific implementation of those definitions. If there are corresponding evidence reviews and standards done elsewhere, especially for any interventions that might have been in setting that would be specific to the proposed Promise Neighborhoods plan, those certainly could be considered as evidence by the reviewers, and the reviewers would then make a judgment whether that evidence was comparable to evidence that would receive a high rating from the What Works Clearinghouse.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Elson, here's a question that perhaps you can speak to. Can an applicant propose a solution for which there is no research validation? So can they propose something in the application where there is no evidence?

ELSON NASH: What I'm hearing is, and I guess this should be something that they document, that if it's an intervention that there is no research that supports it, they need to support what research they've done to support that there's no research. I'm thinking from the perspective of a reviewer. A reviewer would wonder. We would look at this and obviously if something is not in What Works Clearinghouse database, there's no literature to support it, we would have to understand what is it behind this and why isn't it documented.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Right. So with that specific program per se, if there's not much research behind it but there might be evidence supporting the building of some kind of program. That's the kind of documentation.

ELSON NASH: We need some type of documentation.

JONATHAN JACOBSON: I would add on top of that that I'd recommend applicants think in the context of the logic model for their project, what components need to be in the logic model, and if there's a component that needs to be there, but it's not able to identify any evidence for that component, then that would provide a justification for the applicant, including that particular component or solution, if the logic model indicated that that was a necessary component. And, as I said earlier, if evidence is lacking for a component, if the applicant is unable to identify any, then that becomes a prime candidate for inclusion in the evaluation of the project.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. We have a question about the definitions in the Notice. When considering definitions to fall into the threshold of research quality, should the applicants be following definitions in the Notice, even if they don't fully align with EDGAR?



JONATHAN JACOBSON: The EDGAR definition is cited in the Notice but it's not the relevant definition of moderate or strong evidence for the Promise Neighborhoods program. The reason I discussed the EDGAR definition is first to note that they're not the same. The EDGAR definition is more specific. It is not an absolute requirement that the evidence submitted conforms to the EDGAR definition of moderate evidence of effectiveness. That is more as an example of how evidence could be submitted that would correspond with the Promise Neighborhoods definition. It's an example of it. It's not an absolute requirement that the moderate evidence of effectiveness as defined by EDGAR, that that definition be satisfied.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: It looks like we just have a few more questions. I'm going to pause and remind people of a few things. First and foremost, there will be a recording of this webinar along with the accompanying slides and transcript available for your use at PromiseNeighborhoods.ed.gov. They will be available by close of business tomorrow. So if there's anything at all that you missed, you will have a chance to go back and look through those documents.

And then I do want to remind people that we can't answer questions that are specifically about your application. We are providing general technical assistance right now, specifically for the Notice. So if you're trying to get a response to a question specifically about your application, if we see it we're not ignoring you on purpose. It's because we want to provide guidance to everyone. You're always more than welcome to check out the previous webinars and the other FAQ documents and sites that we've mentioned before.

As I said, just a few more questions. We have a question about anecdotal evidence. Can this count as best available if that's all there is? What would be the recommendation for anecdotal evidence, so to say?

JONATHAN JACOBSON: Anecdotal evidence may be relevant to mention in the application. It would not satisfy the definitions of moderate or strong evidence, as described in the application, but an application could be strengthened if anecdotal evidence were relevant for discussing and providing a rationale for some solution that was proposed by the applicant. So the applicant should consider whether it's helpful for their application. It would not satisfy the evidence definitions.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Thank you very much. Going back to a question we had earlier about the evaluations, we have a two-part question. Part No. 1, do we need an outside evaluator, and Part No. 2 does an applicant need to select an evaluator as part of the application?

ELSON NASH: Applicants don't have to select their evaluator as part of their application. Part of what an applicant who is selected will do is, if there is an overall evaluation they would be a part of the overall evaluation. At the individual level, the hope is that, of course, they would eventually hire an evaluator to be at the local level as well.



JONATHAN JACOBSON: And just one thing I'd add about the distinction between local evaluators and a national evaluator. Usually the role of the summative evaluation of the program as a whole, the local evaluators can be of particular benefit for providing formative information to the project. So applicants should keep that in mind. If there's formative information from evaluation that they would like to receive, that might not be provided by a national evaluator. They should consider what sort of local evaluator would be of benefit to them.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And we have one question about clarifying the idea of proposing solutions for which we want to build evidence. This person wants to know, can we clarify whether applicants should be identifying or promising solutions that they're gathering evidence for as part of their application, or if the Department of Ed is looking for ideas that they want to build evidence of?

ELSON NASH: I think that the approach that an applicant should take is, first and foremost, what will assist you in addressing your need in the community. That really is the first and foremost thing you need to consider, not so much are you addressing a need or evidence from the U.S. Department of Education's perspective. This really is about how your application addresses a specific need in your community. Everything else, I think, is icing per se, on the cake. You really should be focused on the best intervention for your community.

JONATHAN JACOBSON: And the language in the Notice emphasizes using evidence to the extent that it's available. So if there is a need that needs to be addressed, there certainly is consideration in the application of whether applicants are using evidence that's available to address that need, but there is no language in the Notice, or any suggestion, that you should leave needs unaddressed simply because evidence is lacking.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then one final question, fairly simple, who will actually be reviewing the evidence, i.e., us or the reviewers?

ELSON NASH: It will be the reviewers.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you. And I think, if it's all right with you, we'll give people just another minute. If they have some final burning questions, please feel free to use the question pane in the control panel. We'll wait about a minute and see if there's any last questions that we have.

We are still here, just waiting another few seconds.

One question that just came in, does the proposed evaluation require a comparison group design or is that just for describing the evidence proposed solutions?



JONATHAN JACOBSON: The willingness of the applicants to cooperate with the national evaluation includes a willingness to cooperate with a matched comparison design and to provide data that would allow such a design to be implemented.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then we do have a question about Promise Neighborhoods funds needing to be separate or leveraged. We are not covering funding in this webinar. I would recommend going back to previous webinars that we've shown. There is a general overview webinar. That recording and transcript and slides are available at PromiseNeighborhoods.ed.gov, and I will refer to that for any funding questions.

ELSON NASH: And they can also check in the FAQs. I think we have a question that covers that as well.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then another pretty straightforward question, how many citations should be noted when prospective applicants give a solution or a proposed solution?

ELSON NASH: We do not have a specified number, on number of citations.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And once again I just want to remind people that we can't speak to specific documents or site plans. This is general technical assistance. So questions we receive and answers we give have to be able to apply to all participants.

ELSON NASH: And while you're looking at additional questions, that's an important point, Michael. Generally speaking, we cannot speak to one's individual plans or give any types of consultations around that. We can only clarify things related to the application package here. So any design things, we actually can't answer that because we do not want to give any one site any advantage over another by providing that type of consultation.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: And then one final question we just received. How are specific resources, when they are leverage funds, meant to be included in things like the logic model or they're used to the evidence in the application?

CARLA TAYLOR: I think one easy answer would be the resources/inputs box. That is the part of the logic model where you want to lay out what does it require, both from a financial perspective but other kinds of resources as well, to be able to implement and deliver on your activities. So that would be one placeholder that I would keep in mind, if I were doing an application, about where that might show up.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. And we just got one more. As long as a site agrees to a matched control group by a national evaluator, do they themselves need to design the matched control group?



ELSON NASH: It's not necessary for the applicants to design the national evaluator requirements. That would be redundant. The agreement is to cooperate with as well as have plans for the local project.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. And it actually just broke up quite a bit right there. Would you mind restating?

ELSON NASH: There's no requirement for applicants to design the requirements to be willing to cooperate with a national evaluation. Obviously, for a local evaluation the applicants should consider their plans for a local evaluator.

MICHAEL BOCHNOVIC: Great. Thank you, all three. Those are great answers to very great questions, and that's all we have right now.

CARLA TAYLOR: Thank you.

ELSON NASH: So, once again, I thank Dr. Carla Taylor and Dr. Jonathan Jacobson, for this information, which is pretty hefty. But we went through all of this information over these last couple of weeks because we wanted to make sure you had this information up front. We know that many of you have started to work on your applications, and that this is a heavy load. We recognize that.

The piece around both the logic model and evidence, based on previous applications, we have not had such a heavy emphasis, and part of it is because we want to build up the field. So the idea being that Promise Neighborhoods is now an established program. We are now part of the Every Student Succeeds Act. We were part of the reauthorization of the Every Student Succeeds Act. And it is critical, moving forward, for those of you who have looked the Every Student Succeeds Act, recognizing that evidence is all around. So this is one of the reasons why, during this competition, we're focusing on building up evidence for the field.

So thank you once again for participating. For those of you who will decide to submit an application this round, we thank you as well, and we know that it is a tall order but we also know that you can rise to the occasion, and that this helps you, as an organization, to move forward. There have been a number of communities that have told us over the years that completing this application has actually helped them to move forward, and it has actually helped them with private foundation funding as well.

So think of this as a supportive tool within your tool kits, and that your efforts are not gone unwanted, or just know that with the peer reviewers they will be providing feedback as well on your applications. This information, I have heard over the years, has been quite valuable.



So thank you, Michael, and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, for hosting these webinars, and once again, probably by tomorrow afternoon the link will be available, and then late next week, early the following week, we'll have the transcripts available.

So thanks again, everyone, and we look forward to hearing more about the types of things that you're doing.

FIN

