

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2019 11:10 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (U411C190159)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	16
<b>Total</b>	20	16

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (U411C190159)

## Questions

### 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:

(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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) 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 program evaluation will use a matched cluster-level (school) randomized controlled trial (page 20) which meets the standards for WWC Standards Without Reservations.

Schools will be demographically matched and then one school from each pair will be assigned to the treatment group. (Page 22)

Implementation study will collect teacher reported and observational data on fidelity and needed improvements in the implementation of program goals. The applicants plan to publish and present on their process and findings at conferences. This will aid in replication of this study in other settings. (Page 23)

The evaluation method of HLM is appropriate to the nested structure of students within teachers within schools and treatment groups. MDES is set at .20 for student outcomes, .35 for teacher outcomes, and .45 for classroom outcomes, and the justification for these effect sizes is cited on page 25.

Multiple coders will evaluate facilitator implementation to establish interrater reliability. (page 16)

Key project components of teacher workshops, a workbook, and phone coaching, as well as student training days and a curriculum that includes SEL and brain science are clearly stated in Appendix G,

Teacher demographics, student demographics, and school characteristics will be explored as mediators (Appendix I, page 1).

Impact outcomes of greater teacher social and emotional competence, classroom interaction quality, and student outcomes of SEL, attention, aggression, engagement, and academic performance and writing skills are clearly articulated on page 2 of Appendix I, with appropriate measures.

### Weaknesses:

Attrition is not specifically addressed, although implementation is following an Intent-to-Treat model, and the application specifies that joiner bias is not anticipated to be significant. (page 23)

"A rubric will establish thresholds for satisfactory levels of implementation" It would be helpful for the applicant to be specific about and/or attach the rubric. (page 23)

**Reader's Score:** 16

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/15/2019 11:10 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2019 12:14 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (U411C190159)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	18
<b>Total</b>	20	18

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 2 - 2: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (U411C190159)

## Questions

### 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:

(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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) 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:

Schools will be randomly assigned to CARE+PATH (intervention) and PATH only (control) (pg 20). If attrition is not problematic and the intervention is managed well, the evaluation would be expected to meet WWC standards without reservations.

Project results will be communicated by a project website, press releases, annual reports, conference presentations, and journal publications which when combined should maximize the visibility of the intervention in the educational community exposing other settings to the possibility of adopting the intervention (pg 19)

An analysis will be performed to detail the extent to which school, teacher, and student characteristics moderate outcomes, assisting other settings to determine the fit of the intervention to their local setting.

Psychometric information is provided on the measures to be employed (Appendix I) indicating that quality measures have been selected which should provide reliable and valid data.

The rationale for the proposed intervention is clearly presented. Elements of the intervention are presented and thoroughly described. There is a rigorous assessment planned for the fidelity and dosage of both CARE (Appendix K-4) and PATH (Appendix I-3) implementations.

There will be a rigorous statistical analysis of mediating effects (Appendix I, RQ6)

### Weaknesses:

How attrition will be dealt with as a requirement for meeting WWC standards is not specifically addressed.

The rubric for assessing implementation fidelity (p.23) is not defined or adequately described.

**Reader's Score:** 18

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/17/2019 12:14 PM