

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	26
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	26

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Sub**

**Reader's Score: 0**

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

1. (1) 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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

The applicant has identified external evaluator American Institutes for Research (AIR), which is an extremely strong partner with high potential to produce evidence that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards (pg. e37). The application addresses implementation and fidelity strengths and potential issues, such as late joiners, attrition, and large sample size (pg. e46). The evaluation utilizes a very good evaluation design which is detailed as a block-randomized randomized controlled trial (RCT) with 8 K-5 teachers and 160 K-5 students per school covering 56 schools (pg. e42). The outcome measures are WWC-approved outcome measures, with hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) accounting for all internal errors. Additionally, teacher focus groups and school leader interviews will be conducted to ensure fidelity of implementation (pg. e44).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's narrative does not identify the roles and responsibilities of each lead evaluator, thus, there can be no determination of the experience of any specific evaluation research to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards in relation to the aspects of the project evaluation. The resume of Kimberly Kendziora does not indicate the depth of knowledge of the proposed implementation evaluation director with What Works Clearinghouse standards. (pp. e69-71) While Dr. Libing Li is a WWC certified reviewer, it is unclear the specificity of the roles of the impact evaluation director and implementation evaluation director. (pp. e74-77) In addition, there is a lack of specificity on the activities around addressing attrition other than the general statement in the application.

Reader's Score: 12

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

**Strengths:**

The applicant's evaluation partner, AIR, has an excellent generation of data around strategies for project replication. The applicant addresses a detailed and strong potential for the Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE) professional learning intervention to be used effectively in various other settings, as detailed on pages e43-44. The documentation of fidelity and variation of implementation provided is extremely strong and should support future replication models, which includes the sharing of codebooks and teacher feedback (pg. e43). Additionally, AIR will also include a comprehensive cost effectiveness study to measure the intervention compared to the costs.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has an excellent presentation of key project components, mediation events, and relevant outcomes. Teacher burnout, teacher surveys, and school leader interviews will provide feedback on the key project components at the implementation level (pg. e439). The applicant has provided excellent details on the potential mediators and how those will be integrated with replicability and effectiveness analysis of the CARE project (pg.

**Sub**

e43). The implementation details provided on page e45 will directly influence and impact decisions by administrators considering the adoption of this professional development intervention.

**Weaknesses:**

The measurable threshold is not clear; after teachers access the learning management system, what activities will be conducted?

**Reader's Score: 4**

**4. (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

AIR is proposing to regularly provide project progress through multiple time points, interim key findings, and jointly interpret the results with the implementation leadership team. (pg. e46) This integration of the evaluation performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress into the project management provides a strong foundation to ensure that the intervention will provide performance and ongoing feedback of the project to meet the identified outcomes. AIR will also interact and collect data from teachers, school leaders and the University of Virginia implementation team, which is a good practice for fidelity and feedback from the intervention deliverers.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	27
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	27

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Sub**

**Reader's Score: 0**

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (1) 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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

The University of Virginia (UVA) has clearly articulated its methods of evaluation using a blocked, school-level cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT); which, if well implemented, should produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook. The American Institutes of Research (AIR) will conduct an independent evaluation in addressing nine research questions (i.e., RQ6: To what extent is the impact of CARE on student outcomes mediated by teacher SEC, teacher well-being, and the quality of teacher interactions with students?) (e37-38). AIR will conduct a multisite school-level RCT with three successive cohorts of elementary schools (e38), which is highly advantageous to mitigate threats to internal validity, such as contamination that are common in studies using within-school randomization (e38).

**Weaknesses:**

UVA discussed how its proposed methods of evaluation would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. For example, UVA has accounted for attrition at the participating schools and expects it to be low. They are planning to combat attrition by providing resources to districts and staff to support school engagement, which should minimize school-level attrition. UVA failed to clearly identify the types of resources.

On another note, the applicant identified an implementation evaluator (e69) and an impact evaluator (e74) but failed to articulate the specific roles of each evaluator's role in the evaluation process.

Reader's Score: 13

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

**Strengths:**

UVA clearly described four ways in which its evaluation would provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication in other settings (e43). For instance, the American Institutes of Research (AIR) plans to identify variations in implementation fidelity and explore how such variation is linked to school, teacher, and student characteristics. The documentation of variation should be highly beneficial in replication and gaining an understanding of less optimal conditions for program implementation with fidelity (e44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

UVA has clearly demonstrated key project components (i.e., workshops on emotion skills instruction), mediators (i.e., teacher emotional skills and teacher well-being), and outcomes (i.e., student level: increased engagement and motivation; school level: increased achievement and teacher retention) as outlined in Appendix G, Figure 2. Project

**Sub**

ENGAGE Logic Model (e110) and Exhibit J6. Impact of CARE on Student Outcomes With and Without the Mediator (Total Effect) (e141).

UVA has clearly articulated its measurable threshold for acceptable implementation of Cultivating Awareness and Resilience (CARE) program. For instance, teachers would be required to attend two training days. For a school to scale CARE adequately, at least half of its teachers should meet the two-day training requirement.

**Weaknesses:**

Regarding a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation of CARE, UVA states that teachers should use the support learning management system (LMS) three times during the implementation year (e45). The applicant failed to clearly describe specifically what teachers would be required and expected to do once they access the LMS.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**4. (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided compelling evidence that demonstrates effective methods of evaluation would provide performance feedback toward achieving intended outcomes through frequent collection and analysis of both implementation and outcome data (e46). For example, the American Institutes of Research (AIR) plans to conduct analyses at designated time points (as described in Exhibit J3. Timeline of Evaluation Tasks and Data Collection Schedule on pp. e127-130) and report the analyses to the University of Virginia (UVA) (e46).

UVA has effectively described how its methods of evaluation would permit periodic assessment of progress. For instance, AIR plans to collect and analyze data during the pilot and impact phases of the evaluation, which should help UVA to track its progress in program implementation (e46).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:**

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	11
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	61

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The applicant explains the program is a compelling new strategy for addressing teacher retention issues. (e22) The program is a comprehensive professional learning program designed to promote and support teachers' well-being so that they are more effective in engaging and motivating students. The program includes best practices in adult learning and introduces materials sequentially. Program curriculum is presented using a blend of didactic, experiential, and interactive learning processes, including training in emotion skills, mindfulness stress management, and caring and listening practices. Teacher attrition is an ongoing problem that has increased dramatically during the pandemic. The proposed project has supporting research that the program has significantly reduced teacher psychological distress and increased efficacy in teaching (e26)

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 35

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant successfully identifies three primary barriers to implementing the project at a large scale. The first barrier is that the program is time intensive, and the districts are already struggling to provide adequate professional learning time for teachers. (e26-27) The applicant explains the phone coaching element of the program has been difficult to scale since it requires multiple trained coaches, and it is difficult to schedule time with the teachers. Lastly, there are a limited number of certified project facilitators. (e26) To address the first barrier, the project will deliver the program in two full days of in-person training and one full day of remote training, rather than the four-day model previously used by the program, however, this shorter time frame had not been research for effectiveness. (e26-27)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant briefly explains the management plan to achieve the three project objectives and clearly lists milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (e31-36) For example, the applicant states that goal 2 is to support teacher implementation by using a digital coaching platform and measuring success by examining LMS user data. The applicant provides a detailed budget, including a budget narrative that supports the project and clearly breaks down project costs. For example, the applicant lists travel costs in detail and explains project personnel's in-kind contributions. (e166-204) The applicant provides specific information concerning which personnel will accomplish project tasks in a table labeled, Key Staff Role, Responsibility, and Annual Full-Time Equivalents. (e199-200)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide a teacher stipend for the teachers for work completed outside of school hours.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant states that project partners have many years of experience leading large-scale, multiyear, multi-site projects that involve implementing programs with fidelity. (e28) Additionally, project partners have in-kind time commitments in the project. (e189) The applicant has clearly demonstrated capacity for the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not explain who within the project organization would provide financial management for the project's expenses.

**Reader's Score: 9**

- 4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will use the project website to share project milestones, conference papers, and publications. The project website will be updated regularly to provide information on the project's progress. The applicant will produce an annual report to share with partner Local Education Agencies which will have feedback for stakeholders on project progress. The project model and findings will be presented at both academic and practitioner conferences. Additionally, the applicant will publish project findings in academic and practitioner journals. (e30)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's plan for dissemination of project information fails to include social media.

**Reader's Score: 8**

- 5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains they will assemble teacher focus groups to supplement the survey data collected. This will allow teachers to provide a more detailed response than a fixed-response survey and will focus on perceptions of usability and utility of the project training and materials. (e138)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not fully explain how the utility of the project's products, such as information, materials, processes, or techniques that will result from the proposed project, will be applicable in other schools. The applicant fails to clearly explain how this project and its materials have the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings. (e138)

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 11**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant had a logic model that is based on the researched Prosocial Classroom Model. (e110) The program is based on outcomes for a teacher's social-emotional skills, teachers' well-being, and the quality of teacher and student interactions. The applicant has previously used this program, which uses proximal impacts on teachers' social-emotional skills and wellbeing, and teacher-student interaction quality. The program also has distal impacts on student engagement, motivation, academic achievement, behavior problems, and attendance outcomes. At the school level, the logic model expects to produce teacher achievement and retention while reducing disparities in disciplinary actions and increasing student engagement, motivation, and academic outcomes. (e30-31)

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides three project goals that have clear objectives that are tied to project outcomes. For example, the applicant discusses having 66 school leaders agree to partner with the applicant to implement program training and participate in data collection for one year. (e30-36)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a percentage of increase, or a percentage of participant completion or any other clear measurement to determine if project goals were achieved. For example, what data will the Learning Management System yield that will demonstrate the accomplishment of project teacher training goals? There was no description of what data was being used that comes from the LMS. No project objectives have a clear measure of increase with a baseline and an expected percentage of improvement made by the implementation of project training. Each objective needs a clear alignment with a goal that has an amount of increase to demonstrate progress toward that project goal. (e30-36)

**Reader's Score: 2**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant state that the proposed project will successfully address the needs of teacher and students who experienced high levels of stress due to the pandemic. The applicant asserts that teachers participating in the program will develop strategies to support their own well-being and the well-being of their students. The program will result in improvements in teacher-student interactions and improvements in student learning through the creation of student supports in the learning environment. (e36)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the student Social Emotional Learning needs. Also, the applicant's target audience is not well defined; the applicant's goals and objectives are focused on the teachers, yet some data is being collected on students, making the target audience unclear. (e36)

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) 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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

#### Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

#### Strengths:

No strengths noted.

#### Weaknesses:

The project did not address the Competitive Preference Priorities and no boxes on page e108 were checked.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

**Reader #4:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	36
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	12
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	63
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	63

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE) professional learning program is based on best practices in adult learning (p. e23). The program includes Emotional Skills Instruction, Mindfulness/Stress Reduction Practices, and Caring and Listening Practices (pp. e23-24). Data was provided to support outcomes with mostly medium effect sizes (pp. e24-25).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 36

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

#### Strengths:

Three realistic barriers with solutions are provided (pp. e26-27). The applicant proposes to alter the program from a 4-day, in-person program to a 3-day program with two in-person days and one virtual day of training. Additionally, in-person coaching will move to an online learning management system to support teachers in the implementation

**Sub**

of the program (p. e27) and facilitators in training will be used to build local capacity (p. e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

**Strengths:**

A detailed management plan is provided with an overall management team, advisory board and local education agency (LEA) leaders. Project structure including personnel are presented and specific duties are discussed (p. e28). An organization chart and job roles, responsibilities and relevant experience are provided for the evaluation team (pp. e123-124).

**Weaknesses:**

No stipends were included for participating teachers outside of the workday.

**Reader's Score: 4**

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has experience implementing numerous trials of intervention studies in collaboration with the American Institutes of Research, and Creating Resilience for Educators, Administrators and Teachers (CREATE), a non-profit organization that supports the work (p. e29). They have qualified personnel (p.28; pp e123-134).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no information on financial management for the project. Providing this information would strengthen the application.

**Reader's Score: 9**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposed to provide a Project ENGAGE website to share project milestones, biographies, and conference papers and publications. Annual reports will be written and shared with LEAs. Academic and practitioner-oriented presentations will be made at conferences. Academic and practitioner-oriented publications will be written. University of Virginia and AIR's public relations offices will develop and disseminate press releases (p. e30).

**Weaknesses:**

Including social media outlets in the dissemination plan would improve the application.

Sub

Reader's Score: 9

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to take the CARE program to scale in new educational settings (p. e17). A previous study was conducted in a high-need elementary school in Upper Manhattan and the Bronx in NYC (p. e17). CARE materials are provided and introduced sequentially (p. e23). Program materials include a Facilitator's manual, participant Workbook, and audio of guided practice for personal use (p. e24).

**Weaknesses:**

There was no direct discussion around the utility of the products used in the program. Adding information on how the products, processes or techniques might be used in other settings would improve the application.

Reader's Score: 4

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 12

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to use the prosocial classroom model for the CARE framework (p. e30), which aligns with the proposed project's theory of change (Appendix G) and activities. Key components/activities include emotional skills instruction, mindful awareness, and stress reduction practices, compassion and listening practices, workbook, and online coaching (p. e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Strengths:**

Goals, objectives, outcomes, and measures are provided and are achievable (pp. 31-32). The applicant provides details on the outcomes and how those outcomes will be measured.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Providing a target percentage, where appropriate, would strengthen the application. For example, on Goal 1.c. CARE Fidelity of Implementation Measures: 1.c.1. CARE Fidelity Rating Form, including a target percentage would add clarity to the measure as well as for 1.c.2. – 1.c.3 (p. e31). While academic learning/achievement is discussed (p. e25, p. e31) and student achievement data will be gathered from district records in math and language arts (p. e40) there is no goal, objective or outcome associated with the data to be collected.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to provide teachers from a variety of schools with the CARE program to decrease teacher stress exacerbated by COVID-19 (p. e37). The program seeks to increase a teacher’s social-emotional well-being by reducing psychological distress and increasing effective emotional regulation and well-being.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant states that it is for teachers, however, student achievement is presented and discussed (p. e40) making the target audience unclear.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) 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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Sub

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

4. (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

### Priority Questions

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this priority. The box was not checked for Competitive Preference Priority 1 on page e13.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/21/2023 05:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2023 05:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

**Reader #6:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	14
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	11
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	60
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	60

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-phase - 1: 84.411B

Reader #6: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (S411B230020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 14

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides thorough evidence in the form of peer reviewed research about the efficacy of the components of the Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE), peer reviewed research evidence on pages e18-22 of the need for program, while avoiding blaming of teachers or students.

#### Weaknesses:

It is not clear in the application how the program and trainings will be responsive to racially minoritized participants, which is a relevant consideration when considering scale. This score represents my professional judgement.

Reader's Score: 14

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 35

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

#### Strengths:

The barriers listed are plausible with ways to address them. The ways in which the proposed plan addresses the barrier of time is a strength (i.e., shortening the teacher training and using a course management platform to expedite training). The ways that the applicant proposes to address the barrier of the phone element with the use of

**Sub**

online learning management system (LMS) on page e27 is an additional strength. The use of local trainer candidates is likewise a strength.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**Strengths:**

The specified timelines, milestones, and responsibilities of key personnel are clearly described in multiple levels of detail (i.e., high level and highly detailed). The timeline is realistic, the milestones are specific, and the responsibilities of key personnel are detailed. For example, the chart on page e123 provides good detail about staff, their roles, responsibilities, and relevant experience.

**Weaknesses:**

While research team members are well-compensated for travel (page e169), conference attendance (page e168), and time (page e167), stipends for participating teachers to compensate for work done outside of the school day were not identified as a budget item.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The plan proposed for this project (e28 and e189) reflects a strong and well-qualified team that is necessary to perform the program tasks. The proposal clearly provides the qualifications of the key project personnel. It includes information about credentials (page e30) which demonstrates they are well-positioned to implement the project successfully.

**Weaknesses:**

There is no person identified as the financial manager of the program.

**Reader's Score: 9**

- 4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

**Strengths:**

The plan includes specific plans, such as the building of a website, annual report, conferences, and press releases (page e30) for research dissemination. The proposal includes plans for how the team will use management capacity to bring the project to scale.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Dissemination plans on page e30 are only moderately detailed. The application lacks a plan for dissemination on social media.

**Reader's Score: 8**

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

**Strengths:**

The inclusion of ample peer reviewed research on its components (pages e18-22) demonstrates that CARE is likely to be effective in a variety of settings, for example randomized controlled trials demonstrate the significant positive impacts of the proposed program on student engagement, motivation, and reading competence. (page e18).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no direct discussion of the utility of the products in the application, for example, testimonials from participants who participated in the initial roll out or peer reviewed research documenting the results reporting on initial

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 11**

**Sub**

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

Strong research on the prosocial classroom model, which theorizes that teachers' SEC (social and emotional competency) and well-being are critical to their capacity to build supportive relationships with students and to effectively manage the classroom, is provided establishing a good quality conceptual frame. The conceptual frame and theory of change makes clear specifically how the proposed program will return positive results. The logic model is a specific strength.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Most objectives, outputs, and outcomes are measurable, thorough, and appropriate. Table 1 on page e31 is a strength, showing strategies, outcomes, and measures. Time is well-planned.

**Weaknesses:**

Some objectives are measurable and some quantitative goals are provided. There are no goals or objectives stated for student achievement in math and language arts.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The planned intervention is likely to be successful because it prioritizes the development of teachers' emotional well-being that according to research provided on page e37 will improve teacher-student interactions and student learning. This section of the application (page e36) moderately addresses the importance of managing high occupational stress.

**Weaknesses:**

The target population across the application is unclear. While most of the application seems to target teachers, at times, it seems that there are student goals as well.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) 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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Sub

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this competitive priority. The box is not checked on page e13.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/21/2023 05:46 PM