

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	35
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	5
<b>Total</b>	110	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.  
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.  
(7 points)

(v) 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.  
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

#### Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly describes the training and professional development services that will be provided by the proposed project. The quality, intensity and duration of the training/professional to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services are robust. The proposed project is also properly designed to build capacity. Strong evidence of how the applicant will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is noted in the narrative. Additionally, the applicant provides a detailed conceptual framework underlying the proposed research activities. Solid evidence that the planned project involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services is described in the narrative. Further, the applicant fully discusses the needs of the targeted area, and describes a proposed project that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population.

i. The applicant clearly describes an innovative three-tier project where teachers will receive PD focused on the integration of math, SEL and equity; receive a master's degree in education with an emphasis on education; and receive TI-Nspire technology augmented by PD and coaching (e22).

ii. Teachers will participate in the program for three years, during which they will: complete their M.Ed., create, implement, and reflect on multiple lessons that integrate mathematics content, SEL, and equity, and integrate TI technology in their lessons (e22). Summer PD will be provided in addition to 1.5 hours twice a month during the nine-month academic year, for a total of 54 session across 3 years. Details of the timeframe for services is also provided in the

narrative (e23). The PD is based on both the research on effective mathematics instruction, including the IES syntheses of research on mathematics education (Rittle-Johnson & Jordan, 2016), and age-appropriate guidelines provided by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) (e23).

iii. The applicant clearly indicates that they used the evidence-based Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (e36). Math+SEL+E teachers will acquire pedagogical knowledge as they learn about mathematics, SEL, and equity through PD. Furthermore, the M.Ed. coursework will build mathematics content knowledge. The TI technology and the T3 coaching will build technology knowledge. Each of the three components are necessary and mutually influence one another to build teachers' capacity (e37).

iv. The collaboration of partners is evident in that, the Math+SEL+E team includes a PI and Co-PI from the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), a Co-PI from the University of Missouri (MU), a Co-PI from Ohio University (OU), an external evaluation team at Education Program Research and Evaluation Consulting (EPRE Consulting), two UTA research assistants, and one project director at UTA. In addition, their team includes Texas Instruments (TI) T3 coaching personnel, an experienced advisory board, and the established UTA Project ECHO for Education for early childhood mathematics teachers (e37).

v. The applicant clearly indicates, the Math+SEL+E project is aligned with evidence-based practices, provides intensive PD and coaching, and is sustainable over time, aligning with recommendations from Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) to meet teachers' needs. The project will also meet the needs of students by giving teachers research-based strategies to support students' SEL and increase behaviors that support equity in the classroom (e41). The master's program will build teachers' pedagogical and content knowledge and teach them to use evidence-based practices in their classrooms (e41). Further, the TI Technology and T3 coaching will provide equitable access to technology and coaching on how to integrate their TI technology (e41).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted
- v. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

**1. B. Significance (25 points)**

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. (7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (6 points)**

**(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding. (6 points)**

**(iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.**

**(6 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant thoroughly describes the significant impact that are likely to attain by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. The budgeted items provided in the application are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. Additionally, the applicant provided comprehensive evidence of a plan for incorporating the project activities into the current program after Federal funding has ended. Further, comprehensive evidence of how the applicant plans to disseminate in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies is provided in the narrative.

i. The applicant specifies approximately 300 middle grades teachers and their current 39,596 diverse, high-need students from Dallas ISD and Mansfield ISD (where 95% and 70%, respectively, identify as students of color) will benefit from Math+SEL+E. Over time, substantially more students will benefit as participating teachers affect upwards of 10,000 new students each year, and may share their expertise with peer teachers (e41). The applicant has also clearly accounted for attrition in their review of impact (e42-e43).

ii. The applicant clearly indicates for the cost of about \$18,000, approximately 300 teachers will receive an M.Ed. degree, professional development, TI technology for their classrooms, and support from T3 coaches. Given the traditional cost of training and professional development this cost is reasonable (e43).

iii. As the project develops teacher capacity, partnering schools can capitalize on this capacity to tap participants as teacher leaders. Most districts use "in-house" personnel to provide PD because it is cost-effective (e44). Additionally, the applicant will incorporate SEL and equity into its existing, successful M.Ed. program in Curriculum and Instruction with emphasis in mathematics (e44). They will also collaborate with Co-PI Bergin's research laboratory for prosocial education to ensure it incorporates ongoing research in SEL (e44).

iv. Results of the proposed project will be used to advocate for additional public and private support. The Co-PI has been successful in achieving such support. In addition, they have relationships with organizations that will lead scaling efforts. The applicant will also create a website to support learning communities on SEL, equity and mathematics integration (e45). The applicant and partners will also disseminate project results through new releases, a promotional video, and direct contacts at state education agencies (e45). They will also disseminate data and best practices through reports, books, and both practitioner and peer reviewed journals (e45).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary**

considers the following factors:

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

(10 points)

(ii) 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.

(10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

**Strengths:**

The management plan provided includes four appropriate goals, objectives and outcomes that are measurable. In addition, the management plan is thoroughly developed and can be achieved on time and within budget. The responsibilities listed in the narrative for the key personnel are comprehensively described and connected to project tasks and activities. In addition, the applicant provides a detailed management plan including thoroughly developed objectives, activities, timelines, personnel and milestones that are outlined for appropriately accomplishing project tasks.

i. Four clearly articulated goals with corresponding objectives, measures and expected outcomes are articulated in the narrative. The goals and objectives are clearly mapped to the activities, outcomes and measures to be used to evaluate effectiveness (e45-e47).

ii. Math+SEL+E will occur over three calendar years. Key personnel to complete project tasks are appropriately qualified. A management team of PIs and Co-PIs from UTA, MU, and OU, and representatives from DISD, MISD, TI, and EPRE Consulting will oversee all aspects of the project. They will all be involved in semi-annual consultation with the advisory board. Several collaborators have successfully managed cross-organization projects and research supported by Federal grants, with similar components and scopes of work (e47). The applicant also provides a detailed timelines with appropriate milestones, to complete the tasks for ensuring the tasks are completed (e47; e49).

**Weaknesses:**

i. No weaknesses noted.

ii. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.**  
**(4 points)**

**(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.**  
**(4 points)**

**(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**  
**(4 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

Comprehensive evidence of an evaluation plan that is grounded in research that, if well implemented, will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook is noted in the narrative. The evaluation plan contains detailed information on the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Formative and summative data will be collected. The performance measures described are clearly aligned to the project goals, and the research questions described will produce both quantitative and qualitative data. Detailed data is provided to determine that the results will be valid or reliable. Further, the applicant provided a plethora of strategies for dissemination of data and results for replication of the study.

i. EPRE Consulting will conduct an external evaluation. EPRE will provide the PI/Co-PI team with formative assessment information in monthly meetings to ensure timely feedback to assist the program in meeting the defined objectives on time. The applicant outlines five appropriate research questions that will be analyzed using a randomized controlled trial (RCT) that is designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (e50). EPRE Consulting will randomly assign the 38 DISD and 12 MISD middle schools to either the control or treatment group (meaning there will be approximately 25 schools in the treatment and 25 schools in the control group) (e50). A power analysis was conducted to determine sample size (e50).

ii. Formative and summative data will be collected (e51-e52). Baseline Surveys will be administered at the beginning of each academic year to ask teachers information about their current school and district and their reasons for wanting to participate in Math+SEL+E, in addition to their goals and academic/professional background (e51). Teacher Satisfaction Surveys will be administered at the end of each academic year. Specifically, participating teachers will be asked to complete a satisfaction and preferences survey which will also include demographic questions (e51).

iii. Multiple data sources that will yield both quantitative and qualitative data are described. Specifically, attendance logs will be used to capture teacher's attendance at Math+SEL+E PD and completion rate of courses at a C or better (e52). In addition, teachers will also be submitting self-report teacher logs to indicate the number of lessons that integrated best practices in technology-mathematics, SEL, and equity strategies used in the classroom and T13 will be submitting coaching logs to indicate content covered and feedback for teachers (e53).

iv. The Diagnostic Teacher Assessment of Mathematics and Science (DTAMS) will be used to determine whether participating teachers have increased their content knowledge in mathematics. It has appropriate reliability in four areas: (number/computation,  $\alpha = .87$ ; geometry/measurement,  $\alpha = .87$ ; probability/statistics,  $\alpha = .90$ ; and algebraic ideas,  $\alpha = .87$ ) (e53). The Equity Mindset Scale was validated with K-12 educators by Littenberg-Tobias et al. (2021). This instrument contains five scales that includes: 1) equality-equity (5 items,  $\alpha=0.85$ ), 2) assets-deficit (6 items,  $\alpha=0.61$ ), 3) avoidant-aware (5 items,  $\alpha=0.78$ ), 4) context-neutral and context-specific (6 items,  $\alpha=0.91$ ), and 5) equity-promoting behavior (5 items,  $\alpha=0.82$ ) (e54). Other reliable and valid instruments are also described in the narrative (e54-e57). Mean differences will be analyzed using t-tests and ANOVAs (e57).

v. The evaluation has been designed to demonstrate effectiveness of Math+SEL+E so that other districts may choose whether it suits their needs. All project materials supporting integrated mathematics, SEL, and equity PD, will be freely available using the project website (e57).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted
- v. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity  
(Up to 5 points)**

**Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not apply for this CPP

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not apply for this CPP

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities  
(up to 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—**

**(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:**

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**



- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;

**(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly indicates that the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA; both a Hispanic Serving Institution and an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution), the University of Missouri (MU), Ohio University (OU), Dallas Independent School District (DISD), Mansfield Independent School District (MISD), and Texas Instruments (TI) propose the project Increasing Teachers' Capacity for Integrating Mathematics, Social-Emotional Learning, and Equity (Math+SEL+E) (e19). Math+SEL+E will provide participating teachers with professional development that integrates best practices in technology-based mathematics, SEL, and equity and a professional learning community focused on the integration (e20). During the three-year funding period, Math+SEL+E will directly involve 300 middle grades teachers and approximately 39,596 middle grades students in both the Dallas Independent School District and the Mansfield Independent School District in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)**

**Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—**

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed plan clearly addresses social emotional learning. Their social emotional learning (SEL) component takes a prosocial education approach, which is a particularly important type of SEL for improving student learning, social-emotional well-being, and school climate. The applicant clearly indicates that their positive focus is important because studies suggest that the presence of prosocial behavior may better predict school success than the absence of negative behaviors for low-income students and those at risk for low achievement (e25). Teachers in Math+SEL+E PD will learn how to promote students' prosocial behavior using three strategies: 1) Praise students' spontaneous prosocial behaviors to increase frequency; 2) Use inductive discipline to correct misbehavior, with emphasis on "victim-centered induction." This refers to (a) pointing out how a student's misbehavior affects another, (b) asking the student to imagine being the other, and (c) suggesting acts of reparation; and 3) Form positive relationships with students through being sensitive, responsive, and warm; using non-coercive discipline; and supporting students' autonomy (e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	35
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	5
<b>Total</b>	110	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.  
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.  
(7 points)

(v) 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.  
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies a strategy for professional development that is of quality, intensity, and duration. As proposed, the project only demonstrates sound strategies to build capacity that it should yield results beyond the period of the federal grant. The conceptual framework is adequate, and as such, it shapes the quality of the proposed activities. The proposed project partners in this collaboration maximize the effectiveness of the proposed program services. As a result, the design of the project is appropriate to, and successfully address the identified needs.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

A1

Math+SEL+E will provide participating teachers with (a) professional development that integrates best practices in technology-based mathematics, SEL, and equity, (b) a professional learning community focused on the integration, (c) a Master of Education degree from UTA,(d) TI technology for use in their classrooms accompanied by (e) Teachers Teaching with Technology (T3TM) PD and Coaching, which provides teachers with hands-on, interactive experience to integrate TI technology into their lessons. During the three-year funding period, Math+SEL+E will directly involve 300 middle grades teachers and approximately 39,596 middle grades students in both the Dallas Independent School District and the Mansfield Independent School District in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. P. 5. The

scope of services and combination of professional development activities is a strong intervention, as proposed by the applicant.

A1

In addition, coaching centered on this PD will occur for 1.5 hours twice a month during the nine-month academic year using the ECHO model (discussed below) for a total of 54 sessions across the 3 years. Coaching sessions are spaced over time to allow teachers to actively implement different strategies and technologies in their classrooms, while developing their own instructional materials (Garet et al., 2001). P. 5 Coaching, over time, to increase adaptations and implementation is a strong addition to the scope of the proposed project.

Coaching sessions are spaced over time to allow teachers to actively implement different strategies and technologies in their classrooms, while developing their own instructional materials (Garet et al., 2001). The M.Ed. program and the T3TM coaching will occur year-round. Teachers will have access to 24-hour TI support through TI Technical Support and will have monthly sessions with the T3TM coaches where coaches visit the classroom to help teachers integrate their technology effectively. P. 6 Coaching, over time, to increase adaptations and implementation is a strong addition to the scope of the proposed project.

The Math+SEL+E project will help address this need by providing teachers with research-based intensive PD aimed at increasing mathematics teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge that will be coupled with receiving an M.Ed. in curriculum and instruction with an emphasis in mathematics education. P. 7 – 8. Our social emotional learning (SEL) component takes a prosocial education approach, which is a particularly important type of SEL for improving student learning, social-emotional well-being, and school climate. Prosocial education refers to school-based approaches that promote prosocial behavior in students (Bergin, 2014). P. 8 This reviewer has found these components to be significant program design features of the project, as proposed.

7 points awarded.

A2

During the three-year funding period, Math+SEL+E will directly involve 300 middle grades teachers and approximately 39,596 middle grades students in both the Dallas Independent School District and the Mansfield Independent School District in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. P. 5.

The Math+SEL+E project was designed to build teaching capacity that will yield results well beyond the grant period. Each component of Math+SEL+E is scalable and replicable anywhere, including urban, suburban, or rural areas. The integrated mathematics, SEL, and equity PD materials will be freely available to districts nationwide. These materials will include topics covered, sample didactic lessons, and example discussions, among other resources. These PD materials will be available on the project's website (Section B.4). The Master's Degree program is accessible anywhere because it is asynchronous, online, and designed for busy working teachers. P. 18

The review believes this intervention builds capacity beyond the grant cycle, and, as proposed is adequate scale and scope based on the proposed intervention strategies.

7 points awarded

A3 This project is based on the TPACK model, as described on p. 19 of the project narrative as follows:

According to this framework, teachers need to understand, blend, and integrate three specific types of knowledge: 1) pedagogical, 2) content, and 3) technological. First, pedagogical knowledge refers different techniques or methods used in the classroom. Deep pedagogical knowledge facilitates teachers' understanding of how students construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop positive dispositions towards learning (Mishra & Koehler, 2009). Second, content knowledge is critical. This approach is sound.

Math+SEL+E teachers will acquire pedagogical knowledge as they learn about mathematics, SEL, and equity through PD. Furthermore, the M.Ed. coursework will build mathematics content knowledge. The TI technology and the T3TM coaching

will build technology knowledge. P. 19 – 20.

7 points awarded

A4 - The partnership for project implementation includes a PI, who is “an applied quantitative methodologist,” with specific research interests in “school climate, equity, and SEL,” and interests “in how to develop strong teacher-student relationships for students of color.” P. 20

CoPIs include faculty researchers from partnering schools (P. 21- 22), and coaches. The proposed project director will have expertise in mathematics education and teacher professional development in K-12 settings, and experience leading federally funded projects. Preference for SEL and equity experience. P. 22

The reviewers finds that this mix of responsibilities, expertise, and collaboration will lend itself to strong program implementation.

7 points.

A5 – For teachers the Math+SEL+E project is aligned with evidence-based practices, provides intensive PD and coaching, and is sustained over time, aligning with recommendations from Darling- Hammond et al. (2017) to meet teachers’ needs.

P. 23

7 points

#### **Weaknesses:**

A1 - No points deducted.

A2 – No points deducted.

A3 – No points deducted

A4- No points deducted

A5 – No points deducted

**Reader's Score: 35**

### **Selection Criteria - Significance**

#### **1. B. Significance (25 points)**

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.**

**(7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

**(6 points)**

**(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.**

**(6 points)**

**(iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.**

**(6 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project demonstrates improvements in teaching and student achievement. The proposed relationship to numbers served and anticipated results and benefits demonstrate that project cost are reasonable. As proposed, moreover, there is strong potential for the applicant to incorporate the project activities into the ongoing program of the organization at the end of federal funding. The application documents how the proposed project will be disseminated to enable others to use the strategies generated in this project.

**Supporting Statements:****Strengths:**

B1 –

Approximately 300 middle grades teachers and their current 39,596 diverse, high-need students from Dallas ISD and Mansfield ISD (where 95% and 70%, respectively, identify as students of color) will benefit from Math+SEL+E. Over time, substantially more students will benefit as participating teachers affect upwards of 10,000 new students each year, and may share their expertise with peer teachers.

Participating teachers will receive: 1) intensive summer face-to-face PD and bi-weekly coaching using the successful ECHO model on how to integrate mathematics content, SEL, specifically prosocial education, and equity training in their classrooms, 2) and M.Ed. degree from the UTA, and 3) TI Nspire™ technology and T3™ coaching. Each of these three components has a research base demonstrating improved teaching and student outcomes. p. 25

The project logic model (Figure 3) summarizes important outcomes from Math+SEL+E. In the short-term teachers will implement strategies that incorporate mathematics content, SEL, and equity in their classrooms, and students will exhibit more prosocial and equity-based behavior. This will lead to long-term increases in student achievement, improved school climate, and higher enrollment in advanced mathematics courses in high school. 7 points.

B2 –

Accounting for all project expenses across three years, including both the cost of services and research, the average cost per teacher is about \$18,000. For the cost of about \$18,000, approximately 300 teachers will receive an M.Ed. degree, professional development, TI technology for their classrooms, and support from T3™ coaches. Traditional PD can often cost between \$1,000 to \$5,000 per day, not including travel costs or substitute teachers. P. 26

The application provides a rationale on how the proposed cost is reasonable, considering the proposed outcomes, scope, and benefits. 6 points.

B3 – As the project develops teacher capacity, partnering schools can capitalize on this capacity to tap participants as teacher leaders. Most districts use “in-house” personnel to provide PD because it is cost-effective. UTA can continue to provide support as it has strong relationships with Dallas ISD and Mansfield ISD due to previous research collaborations and pre-service teacher placements. P. 27

6 points

B4 – The applicant proposes to create a website to support learning communities on SEL, equity, and mathematics integration. In addition, the project proposes to disseminate through reports, conferences, books, and both practitioner and peer reviewed journals. The project team proposes prioritizing those sources without a paywall. P. 28

6 points awarded.

**Weaknesses:**

- B1 – no weaknesses noted.
- B2 – no weaknesses noted.
- B3 – no weaknesses noted.
- B4 – no weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

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

**(ii) 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.  
(10 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable, as described in the application narrative. The applicant proposes a compelling management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The plan includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

C1 – The Management Plan, the four goals of Math+SEL+E and accompanying objectives, measures and expected outcomes. Outcomes compare intervention with control groups. These are clearly aligned to the overall project intervention and define the framework for the proposed project. P. 28 – 29  
10 points.

C2 – The management plan is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. Staff responsibilities are clearly delineated such as “ PI Olsen will be responsible for ensuring that each phase of the project is completed on time and on budget and will oversee the project.” Further, “the project director will be responsible for scheduling meetings, tracking expenses and key personnel time, team communications and managing the project’s technology (e.g., the learning management system for the M.Ed. course, procuring/ distributing TI technology, maintaining the project website) ensuring data are collected on time, scheduling PD and T3TM coaching and other duties as necessary.” P. 31  
10 points



**Weaknesses:**

C1 – no weaknesses noted.

C2 – no weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(4 points)

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes methods of evaluation that will produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that meet WWC standards with or without reservations. Further, the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress towards achieving the intended outcomes. The evaluation plan uses objective performance measures, will produce both quantitative and qualitative data, and will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in possible replication of the project activities or strategies.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

D1 - A randomized controlled trial (RCT) that is designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations will be implemented. To examine the efficacy of the Math+SEL+E project on teacher and student outcomes, EPRE Consulting will randomly assign the 38 DISD and 12 MISD middle schools to either the control or treatment group (meaning there will be approximately 25 schools in the treatment and 25 schools in the control group). P. 33

To determine sample size, a power analysis was conducted using PowerUp! (Dong & Maynard, 2013). Results suggest that a teacher sample size of 300 would be large enough to detect a minimum effect of 0.08 standard deviations when accounting for 5% attrition. P. 33

This reviewer believes the evaluation strategy is adequate to meet WWC standards  
4 points

D2 – The following data collection activities will help produce ongoing formative data to help guide this project. Baseline Surveys will be administered at the beginning of each academic year to ask teachers information about their current school and district and their reasons for wanting to participate in Math+SEL+E, in addition to their goals and academic/professional background. EPRE will administer the surveys to help: 1) determine teacher’s perceived usefulness of the Math+SEL+E project, 2) evaluate current supports teachers have from their schools, and 3) ask for suggestions to help improve experiences in the program. Teacher Satisfaction Surveys will be administered at the end of each academic year. Specifically, participating teachers will be asked to complete a satisfaction and preferences survey which will also include demographic questions. This survey will allow the participants to provide feedback and share perceptions about their experience with the master’s degree program, their TI technology, their T3TM coaching, and the mathematics content, SEL, and equity PD. This important feedback will allow the PI/Co-PI leadership team to ensure participants are satisfied, have their current needs met, and are making progress towards the intended goals of the Math+SEL+E project.

p. 34 – 35  
4 points.

D3 – The use of objective performance measures that are related to the intended outcomes of the project is demonstrated by the strategies identified on p. 35 – 36 of the project narrative. The application proposes that EPRE will use multiple data sources to measure and track Math+SEL+E’s performance measures and outcomes based on the project goals identified. Specific performance measures and target data descriptions are identified. This is adequate.  
4 points.

D4 – The use of outcome measures that will provide valid and reliable performance data is identified and detailed on p. 36 – 40, and includes a data analysis plan. Examples such as DTMAS, The Equity Mindset Scale, The Mathematics Classroom Observation Protocol for Practices (MCOP) are described. Multiple instruments proposed, when used together, should, in this reviewer’s observation, produce robust data for the relevant outcomes proposed.  
4 points.

D5 - The design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will be conducted in a systematic way that will result in information to guide the replication of project activities, p. 40, with specific strategies such as: 1) project materials supporting integrated mathematics, SEL, and equity PD, will be freely available using our project website, 2) all measures used in this evaluation are freely available, therefore, our evaluation plan would be fully replicable by other organizations.  
Adequate.  
4 points

**Weaknesses:**

- D1 – no weaknesses noted.
- D2 – no weaknesses noted.
- D3 – no weaknesses noted.
- D4 – no weaknesses noted.
- D5 – no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### Priority Questions

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

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

#### Strengths:

The applicant did not propose to meet this criteria. No points awarded.

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

#### (1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.
- (ii) Elementary school.
- (iii) Middle school.
- (iv) High school.
- (v) Career and technical education programs.
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

#### Strengths:

The application demonstrates alignment to the CP on social emotion learning:

p.1 : Our goal is to increase the number of middle grades mathematics teachers who have the capacity and confidence to lead social-emotional learning (SEL), equity, and mathematics integration.

p. 2: To better serve students with marginalized identities, SEL is being integrated with equity, known as “transformative SEL” or “T-SEL”. T-SEL aims to interrupt inequitable educational environments by attending to issues of identity, agency, and belonging, and related issues such as power, privilege, prejudice, discrimination, social justice, empowerment, and self determination.

p. 8: Prosocial education is a distinct type of SEL program that is intentionally other focused.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)**

**Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—**

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

**Strengths:**

The application has shaped the project in equity, as a professional development landmark, and this is aligned to the CP.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:40 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	35
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	5
<b>Total</b>	110	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The University of Texas at Arlington (S423A220084)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.  
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.  
(7 points)

(v) 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.  
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

#### Strengths:

The applicant's proposed project purpose is to increase teacher's capacity for integrating mathematics, social-emotional learning and equity (Math-SEL=E). The applicant provided appropriate details for the project design that included professional development training. Throughout the project, the applicant adequately demonstrates that building capacity will occur throughout the project. The applicant satisfactorily outlined a conceptual framework and discussed the project's effectiveness.

Additionally, the applicant shared sufficient evidence to support the project's proposed collaboration of partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project service. The applicant provided a clear extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to the targeted population.

i. The applicant stated the PD will focus on the integration of mathematics, SEL, and equity. Also, the candidates will receive a Master of Education degree in Curriculum and Instruction, and they will receive TI-Nspire technology (e22). The applicant provided a narrative for each of the three areas of focus to address the duration of intensity which is identified as three years(e22).

ii. The applicant indicated that coaching will be centered around the TI technology in their classrooms and will occur for 1.5 hours twice a month during the nine-month academic year using the ECHO model for a total of 54 sessions (e22).

Additionally, the PD offered through the grant will focus on mathematics, SEL and equity (e22- e33). The applicant provided research based on effective mathematics education by (Rittle-Johnson and Jordan, 2016 (e23).

iii. The applicant shared that the Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge framework will be used (e35). The applicant explained that teachers will acquire pedagogical knowledge as they learn about mathematics, SEL, and equity through PD. The applicant shared that the T1 technology and T3 team coaching will build upon the technology knowledge for the participants (e37).

iv. The applicant shared the collaboration of partners for the project (e36). The partners include PI and CO-PI from the University of Texas at Arlington, a Co-PI from University of Missouri, a Co-PI from Ohio University and external evaluation team at Education Program Research and Evaluation Consultant, research assistants and a project director (e37). Tuition for one of the partners (PI Amanda Olsen) is \$8,000.00. Additionally, there are several professors listed that will support the PD for the proposal (e36-e39).

v. The applicant clearly provided evidence that the Math+SEL+E project is aligned to evidence based practices, provides intensive PD and Coaching and is sustainable throughout the project and beyond the project timeline ((e37). The applicant states that Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex expressed the need to integrate social justice and SEL as they increase student Mathematics achievement (e39). Furthermore, the applicant shares that the master's program will build teacher's pedagogical and content knowledge and teach them to use evidence-based practices in the classrooms (e41).

**Weaknesses:**

i. None noted.

ii. None noted.

iii. None noted.

iv. None noted.

v. None noted.

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

**1. B. Significance (25 points)**

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the**

**proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.  
(7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.  
(6 points)**

**(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.  
(6 points)**

**(iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.  
(6 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided an overview detailing the results and outcomes for the project and provided a table graphing the dissemination of the details of the project. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the extent of the costs is reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the applicant provides evidence that the project's activities will extend beyond the end of Federal funding.

i. The applicant stated that approximately 300 middle grades teachers and 39,596 identify as students of color. The applicant states that more students will benefit as participating teachers will affect over 10,000 new students each year (e40). Also, the applicant stated that the incorporation of M/S/E will lead to long-term increases in student achievement, etc. (e41). Additionally, the applicant addressed the possibility of attrition in the narrative (e42).

ii. In narrative form, the applicant provided the cost of 300 teachers being \$18,000 which included receiving an M.Ed. degree. Moreover, the applicant provided cost per day for TI technology support and calculator costs (e42). Based on the given costs for professional development, the cost is reasonable (e43).

iii. The applicant provides some detail about sustainability of the project's purpose. For example, the applicant states that most districts use "in-house" personnel to provide PD because it is cost effective (e43). Furthermore, the applicant states that UTA will incorporate SEL and equity into its existing C & I program(e43).

iv. The applicant shares that the dissemination of the project will include social media outlets, as well as reports, conferences, and books will be sources of dissemination (e44). For example, the applicant states that they will create a website to support learning communities on SEL, equity and mathematics integration (e45). Additionally, the applicant states that the targeted audiences will be AERA and NCTM, etc. (e44).

**Weaknesses:**

i. None noted

ii. None noted

iii. None noted



iv. None noted

Reader's Score: 25

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

#### 1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(10 points)

(ii) 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.

(10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

#### Strengths:

The applicant addressed the quality of the management plan by providing a logic model including partners, four SMART goals, objectives, activities, short and long-term outcomes that are appropriately outlined to accomplish the project's tasks. Additionally, the applicant provides an adequate management plan that is suitably developed. The provided management plan, if well implemented, can be achieved on time and within the budget. Key personnel are listed in the narrative.

i. The applicant outlined four goals and provided objectives, measures and expected outcomes (e44). For example: Goal 2: Increase Teacher Prosocial Strategies and Student Prosocial Behavior in the classroom. The applicant shared that TI is serving as the corporate partner providing the 25% match for all three years of the grant(e47).

ii. The applicant shared that the project director will be responsible for scheduling meetings, tracking expenses, etc. (e47). Based on the narrative, the Math+SEL+E will occur over three calendar years. Key roles and responsibilities were listed for managing the project's technology, etc. A management team of PIs and CO-PIs from three universities along with other listed partners will oversee the project (e47). The applicant provided a clear timeline and milestones for evaluation research questions and project completion (e49).

#### Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. None noted

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

### 1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

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:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

#### Strengths:

The applicant stated that EPRE Consulting will conduct an external evaluation and provide the PI/Co-PI team with formative assessment information monthly. Evidence of a well implemented plan will produce support about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook as noted in the narrative. The performance measures described in the narrative are clear and concise and aligns to the project goals. The provided research questions will produce both quantitative and qualitative data. Additionally, bi-annual reports will be disseminated to appropriate audiences (e48-49).

i. The applicant states that EPRE will address both process and outcome questions aligned with the logic model (e50). The applicant provided Tables 8 (Evaluation Questions) and 9 (Evaluation Research Questions) producing questions that get to the extent of the implementation of the project. Furthermore, the applicant explained that a randomized controlled trial will be designed to meet WWC standards and will be implemented (e.50). Additionally, the applicant provides sufficient details about the sample size and assumed correlations as outcomes for the project (e50).

ii. The applicant provided the following methods for performance and progress feedback using Baseline surveys and Teacher Satisfaction Surveys. Formative and summative data will be collected (e51-52). The applicant provided sufficient evidence to justify the perceptions about the experiences that will be received from the targeted audience (e51). Also, the applicant states that TI will be submitting coaching logs to specify content covered (e53).

iii. The applicant outlined objective performance measures indicating three goals and included performance and target data (e52). Additionally, the applicant stated that teachers will submit self-reporting teacher logs to indicate the number of lessons that integrate best practices (e53).

iv. The applicant provided reliable and outcome measures with an emphasis on Teacher Measures with the implementation of the Triple E Framework (extend, enhance, and engage) (e54). The next measure mentioned by the applicant is the Student Level Measures which will include a 10-item student level questionnaire that measures sharing, helping, complementing, etc. (e55). The applicant provided reliability in four areas and used appropriate instruments for measurement. The applicant also provided an analysis plan using ANOVAs (e57).

v. In a narrative form, the applicant provided information explaining that the project will be conducted in a systematic way that will result in information to guide the replication of project activities (e57). For example, the applicant shares that the Mathematics, SEL, and PD will be available on the project website and available for other organizations(e57).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. None noted.
- ii. None noted.
- iii. None noted.
- iv. None noted.
- v. None noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)**

**Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.**

**Strengths:**

This Competitive Priority Preference was not selected by the applicant to address.

None noted

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not apply for this CPP.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities  
(up to 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—**

**(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:**

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

**(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant states that it will address (Math+SEL+E) of middle schools, grades 6-8. (e17). The applicant mentions that SEL and equity have both been pressing national needs, but the remainder of the sentence is cut off and the reader is unable to determine how these needs will address inequity and inadequacy (e17). The applicant discusses the quality of relationships between the middle school teacher and student (e18). Additionally, the applicant addresses the needs of marginalized identities through Transformative SEL (e18).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs  
(up to 2 points)**

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.

**Strengths:**

The applicant shares research from (NAEP) that speaks to the lack of proficiency levels amongst 8th grade students nationally. The applicant states that Mathematics and SEL combined will help improve Mathematics pedagogy (e18). Also, the applicant states that the University of Texas at Arlington is both a Hispanic and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander-Serving institution. The MATH+SEL+E will address technology-based mathematics, SEL, equity, and provide PD that incorporates a focus on integration (e20). The applicant shares that the teachers in MATH+SEL+E will learn how to support students' prosocial behavior using three strategies (e26). For example, the third strategy includes forming positive relationships with students through being sensitive, responsive, and warm; using non-coercive discipline; and supporting students' autonomy (e26).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**             Submitted  
**Last Updated:**    07/13/2022 01:40 PM