# Welcome!

Tell us your name, role, and organization in the chat box.



# **Evidence Standards for Evaluating Math and Science Programs**

#### Lyzz Davis | Joe Taylor

March 20, 2019



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

# **Objectives for Today's Webinar**

- Build awareness of evidence standards from U.S. Department of Education and their relevance to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) research
- 2. Learn about the criteria and use of *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) tiers of evidence
- **3.** Understand the key aspects of What Works Clearinghouse standards

# Welcome to **ZOOM**

- Audio settings
- Test audio
- Mute/unmute
- Raise/lower hand
- Q&A
- Submit a question
- Use chat
- View options
- Leave meeting

#### Audio Settings



#### Test Audio

	On Mac
General Audio Video Recording Advance	Audio
Speaker	
Test Speaker Click Test Sp	Built-in Output (Internal Speakers)
Output Level: Output Volume: Microphone	
Please speak to your blinking, select a diff	microphone. If you can not see the volume indicator erent mic.
Test Mic	Built-in Microphone (Internal Microphone)
Input Volume:	Automatically adjust microphone settings
Automatically join audio by compu Always mute microphone when joi	ter when joining a meeting ning meeting
_	

#### On PC



#### Mute/Unmute





Leave Meeting

#### Raise/Lower Hand





#### Q&A



### Submit a Question



#### Use Chat



#### **View Options**



#### Leave Meeting



# Background on This Webinar Series

- Funded by a Discovery Research PreK–12 (DRK-12) grant from the National Science Foundation
- Goal to help elevate rigorous research methods within the DRK–12 program
- Quarterly webinars in 2019 and 2020
- Hosted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR), and featuring research methodologists



### **Meet the Presenters**





Lyzz Davis Senior Researcher AIR Joe Taylor Principal Researcher AIR Part 1: What Works Clearinghouse

### **Broad Research Types**

#### Foundational research

• Early stage or exploratory

- Design and development
- Impact
  - Efficacy
  - Effectiveness
  - Scale-up

#### Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development

A Report from the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

and the National Science Foundation

August 2013





# Poll 1: Study Type

# What Is the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)?

**ICS** INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

The WWC is an investment of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) within the U.S. Department of Education.



The WWC is a central and trusted source of scientific evidence on education programs, products, practices, and policies.

The WWC reviews the research, determines which studies meet rigorous standards, and summarizes the findings.

# What Does the WWC Provide?

- Information about interventions for both decision makers and researchers
- Centralized location for rigorous evidence of intervention effectiveness
  - Common standards for assessing evidence
  - Common procedures for synthesizing evidence and assessing effectiveness
- Guidance to researchers for designing, conducting and reporting impact studies

# **Separate Design Standards**

Design Type	Description
Single-case design	Uses experiments in which an outcome measure is assessed repeatedly within and across different phases that are defined by the presence or absence of an intervention
Regression discontinuity design	Similar to a randomized trial in that groups are formed by design, but differs in that the assignment is not random
Group design	Randomized controlled trial (RCT)— groups formed randomly
	Quasi-experimental design (QED)— groups not formed randomly

# Poll 2: WWC Study Design Ratings

# WWC Disqualifiers (study is ineligible for review or does not meet standards)

- Ineligible design
- Confounding factors
- Issues with outcome measures
  - Face validity
  - Reliability
  - Overalignment
  - Inconsistent administration

# What Studies Can Meet WWC Group Design Standards?

Rating	Design Type
Meets design standards without reservations	RCT with low attrition
Meets design standards with reservations	RCT that has high attrition but demonstrates baseline equivalence
	QED that demonstrates baseline equivalence
Does not meet standards	RCT with high attrition that cannot demonstrate baseline equivalence
	QED that cannot demonstrate baseline equivalence
	RCT or QED with a confounding factor, or something other than the intervention that could be causing the outcome

# Evidence Review Protocols

Subject-specific protocols define outcome domains and establish eligibility criteria such as:

- Student populations
- Interventions
- Outcome measures

### Most Relevant Review Protocols to DRK-12

#### Science

Science achievement

#### Math

- Elementary school math
- Middle school math
- High school math
- Mathematical problem solving
- Primary math
- Secondary math
- Teaching strategies for middle/high school algebra

# **Science Achievement Domains**

# Science Knowledge

### **Science Practice**

- Life science
- Earth/space science
- Physical science

# Skills in:

- Identifying or using science principles
- Using science
   inquiry
- Using technological design

# **Science Achievement Eligibility Criteria**

Populations	Interventions*	Outcomes
Developed for students in grades K– 12 (ages 5–18)	Which describe: Intervention in general	Standardized, nationally normed achievement tests
Conducted in the U.S. or countries that used English-language	Duration of the intervention	Standardized state or local tests of science achievement
materials	Characteristics of the individuals who deliver the intervention	Research-based or locally developed tests of science concepts or skills

# **Examples of Eligible Science Interventions**

- Textbooks
- Software programs
- Hands-on science kits
- University summer programs for young scholars
- Math-science partnership programs
- Museums' scientific programs and activities

# **Activity: Guess the WWC Study Rating**

An RCT of a high school biology intervention has high levels of student attrition. However, for the set of randomly assigned students for whom a post-test score was available, the treatment and control group means on the biology pretest were nearly identical.

Assuming no disqualifying study features, what is the likely WWC study rating?

# **Activity: Guess the WWC Study Rating**

An RCT of a high school biology intervention has high levels of student attrition. However, for the set of randomly assigned students for whom a post-test score was available, the treatment and control group means on the biology pretest were nearly identical.

If all of the treatment group students came from one high school and all of the comparison students came from another, what is the likely WWC study rating?

# Other Review Protocols of Potential Interest

- Adolescent Literacy
- English Language Learners
- Students With Specific Learning Disabilities
- Preventing Dropout in Secondary School
- Other

Question-and-Answer Session

# Part 2: ESSA Tiers of Evidence

# **ESSA** Tiers of Evidence

Tier 1: Strong evidence Tier 2: Moderate evidence Tier 3: Promising evidence Tier 4: Demonstrates a rationale

# Why Do Districts and School Leaders Care About ESSA Tiers of Evidence?

- Schools identified for targeted supports must implement at least one intervention that is supported by promising evidence.
- Some federal grant programs (such as Striving Readers and Promise Neighborhoods) require interventions that meet strong or moderate evidence.
- Other activities require interventions that at least demonstrate a rationale.

# Why Should STEM Education Researchers Care About ESSA Tiers of Evidence?

- Education Innovation Research grant requirements
  - Early phase: Demonstrates a rationale (tier 4)
  - Mid-phase: Moderate evidence (tier 2)
  - Expansion: Strong evidence (tier 1)
- Some states have published lists of "preferred practices"
  - Program developers need to generate evidence of their programs' effectiveness to be eligible for these lists

# Why Is It Important to Focus on Evidence?

No Child Left Behind

> "Research based"

Less focus on effect on outcomes



"Evidence based"

Focuses on improvement of outcomes

Criteria	Strong (Tier 1)	Moderate (Tier 2)	Promising (Tier 3)	Demonstrates a Rationale (Tier 4)
Study design				
Significant favorable effect				
No significant unfavorable effects from causal studies				
Large, multisite sample				
Context				

Criteria	Strong (Tier 1)	Moderate (Tier 2)	Promising (Tier 3)	Demonstrates a Rationale (Tier 4)
Study design	Well-designed experimental			
Significant favorable effect	$\bigstar$			
No significant unfavorable effects from causal studies	$\bigstar$			
Large, multisite sample	$\bigstar$			
Context	Population <b>and</b> setting			

Criteria	Strong (Tier 1)	Moderate (Tier 2)	Promising (Tier 3)	Demonstrates a Rationale (Tier 4)
Study design	Well-designed experimental	Well-designed quasi- experimental		
Significant favorable effect	$\star$	$\star$		
No significant unfavorable effects from causal studies	$\bigstar$	$\bigstar$		
Large, multisite sample	$\bigstar$	$\mathbf{\star}$		
Context	Population <b>and</b> setting	Population <b>or</b> setting		

Criteria	Strong (Tier 1)	Moderate (Tier 2)	Promising (Tier 3)	Demonstrates a Rationale (Tier 4)
Study design	Well-designed experimental	Well-designed quasi- experimental	Well- designed correlational	
Significant favorable effect	$\star$	$\star$	$\star$	
No significant unfavorable effects from causal studies	$\bigstar$	$\bigstar$	$\star$	
Large, multisite sample	$\bigstar$	$\star$		
Context	Population <b>and</b> setting	Population <b>or</b> setting		

Criteria	Strong (Tier 1)	Moderate (Tier 2)	Promising (Tier 3)	Demonstrates a Rationale (Tier 4)
Study design	Well-designed experimental	Well-designed quasi- experimental	Well- designed correlational	Well-defined logic model
Significant favorable effect	$\star$	$\star$	$\star$	Evaluation is planned or under way
No significant unfavorable effects from causal studies	$\bigstar$	$\star$	$\star$	
Large, multisite sample	$\bigstar$	$\star$		
Context	Population <b>and</b> setting	Population <b>or</b> setting		

### **Activity: Guess the Tier of Evidence**

An **experimental study** that tested the effectiveness of a new math program on state standardized test scores in mathematics meets WWC standards without reservations. The researchers found that the math program significantly increased mathematics test scores, and a search of the intervention on the WWC shows that other studies of this intervention have also found significant positive increases. There were 562 students from 10 high schools included in the analysis.

What evidence tier would you assign this outcome? **Tier Rating: Strong** 

## **Activity: Guess the Tier of Evidence**

A quasi-experimental study that tested the effectiveness of a science curriculum on science achievement meets WWC standards with reservations. The researchers found that the science curriculum significantly improved science achievement, and a search of the intervention on the WWC shows that no other studies of this curriculum have been reviewed. There were 200 3<sup>rd</sup> graders across 3 elementary schools included in the analysis.

What evidence tier would you assign this outcome? **Tier Rating: Promising** 

Question-and-Answer Session

# **Takeaways for DRK–12**

#### Why are evidence standards relevant?

- Evidence quality matters for school systems and funders
- Rigorous evidence is needed, particularly in S,T, E areas
- DRK–12 projects and proposals can advance rigor

# How can WWC and ESSA standards be applied to DRK–12?

- Inform designs of comparative studies
- Align designs of impact studies to meet standards
- Set goals for future research



# **Next Steps**

- What are your key takeaways and next steps?
- What questions do you have?

#### Resources

- Guidance to current and future principal investigators
- Resources for researchers
- Resources for decision makers

# **Thank You for Joining Us!**



### Lyzz Davis Idavis@air.org



Joe Taylor jotaylor@air.org

# **Alignment of the Standards**

WWC Rating	Alignment	ESSA rating
Meets standards without reservations	<ul> <li>Reviewed under WWC standards 2.1 or higher; significant, positive effect, with no negative effects from other studies that meet WWC standards; large, multisite sample</li> </ul>	Tier 1 Strong evidence
	<ul> <li>Significant, positive effect, with no negative effects from other studies that meet WWC standards; large or multisite sample criteria <b>not</b> met</li> </ul>	Tier 3 Promising evidence
Meets standards with reservations	<ul> <li>Reviewed under WWC standards 2.1 or higher; significant, positive effect, with no negative effects from other studies that meet WWC standards; large, multisite sample</li> </ul>	Tier 2 Moderate evidence
	<ul> <li>Significant, positive effect, with no negative effects from other studies that meet WWC standards; large or multisite sample criteria <b>not</b> met</li> </ul>	Tier 3 Promising evidence