

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: Interim Evaluation Report [X] **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: FNS [] **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Rich Lucas

Subject of Review: Evaluation of SNAP Employment and Training (E &T) Pilots

Purpose of Review: Subject the information to formal, independent, external peer review to ensure its objectivity.

Type of Review: [X] Panel Review [] Individual Reviewers
[] Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 11/2018 End: 4/2019 Completed: 6/2019

Number of Reviewers: [] 3 or fewer [X] 4 to 10 [] More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: _____
The areas of expertise needed: (1) program evaluation, evaluation design and outcome measurement; (2) practitioners with expertise in E &T programs and workforce systems; and (3) experts in SNAP and SNAP E and T policy.

Reviewers selected by: [] Agency [X] Designated Outside Organization
Organization's Name: Mathematica Policy Research

Opportunities for Public Comment? [] Yes [X] No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:
How: _____
When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? [] Yes [X] No

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? [] Yes [X] No

Other: _____



The technical working group (TWG) will be charged with two tasks as follows:

1. Reviewers will be requested to determine if (i) the data collection as implemented was appropriate, (ii) whether the analyses as carried out reflect the original plans and (iii) whether the analyses are appropriate given the actual implementation of sampling and data collection.
2. Reviewers will be charged with evaluating the clarity of hypotheses, the robustness of the methods employed to address the hypotheses, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall conclusions. The peer reviewers will be requested, as appropriate, to suggest ways to clarify assumptions, findings, and conclusions; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; and, if needed, encourage authors to more fully acknowledge limitations and uncertainties.

Each reviewer will be instructed to supply the results of their review in written form. Because this study is considered influential scientific information, reviewers will be informed that the Agency will make available to the public written comments from technical working group as well as the Agency's responses to the comments.