

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/12/2025 04:29 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

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

	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	35	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	70
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

## 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:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project introduces an innovative approach, such as a modification of an evidence-based project component to serve different populations, an extension of an existing evidence-based project component, a unique composition of various project components to explore combined effects, or development of an emerging project component that needs further testing.

#### Strengths:

The applicant introduces an evidence based innovative approach to literacy, edupreneurship, that includes STEM, entrepreneurship and literacy (p.e11).

#### Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project for recipients, community members and partners. In determining the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 35

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes the unmet need for literacy intervention in rural areas specifically, sharing there is limited research on this area and at the elementary level (p. e25). The applicant further shares that high impact tutoring has not been studied in rural areas although studied in urban areas (p. e25).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a clear management plan that shares the timelines, activities and individuals responsible (Table 1, p. e28).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

3. (3) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

**Strengths:**

The application includes 7 partnership organizations and 100 school districts across two states (p. e29) as a part of the project with letters of commitment in the appendix.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found

**Reader's Score: 5**

4. (4) The quality of the plan to deliver project services more efficiently at scale and maintain effectiveness.

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a plan with professional development to maintain/improve teacher capacity; technology tools to support ROOTS implementation in schools; coaching and training to ensure high quality instruction and continuous evaluation and feedback for sustainability (p.e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found

**Reader's Score: 5**

5. (5) The quality of the mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information and resources on its project to support further development, adaptation, or replication by other entities to implement project components in additional settings or with other populations.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a multifaceted strategy for disseminating information and resources that include a communication strategist, partnering with organizations in the consortium and disseminating through peer review journals, to name a few (p.e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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: 20**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The quality of the logic model or other conceptual framework underlying the proposed project, including how inputs are related to outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a high-quality Logic Model (p. e30-e31, e188) that includes resources, activities, outputs and outcomes (short-term, mid-term, and long-term). The Logic Model links the outputs to the outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and ambitious yet achievable within the project period, and aligned with the purposes of the grant program.**

**Strengths:**

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, ambitious, achievable within the project period, and aligned with the purposes of the grant program (p. e31-e36). Each goal was outlined with an objective, and outcome and how it would be measured.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation or other evidence-building of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation or other evidence building, 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 effectiveness of the project on relevant outcomes that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbooks.

**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 and potential implementation in other settings.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The quality of the evaluation plan for measuring fidelity of implementation, including thresholds for acceptable implementation, to inform how implementation is associated with outcomes.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) 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 valid and reliable information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

**Strengths:**

NA

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Returning Education to the States (up to 10 points)**

**Project or proposals that will be carried out by one or more of the following entities:**

**(a) State educational agencies (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7801(49))**

**(b) An Indian Tribe (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(e)), Tribal organization (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(l)), or Tribal educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7452(b)(3))**

**(c) Consortia of the entities identified under this priority.**

**Strengths:**

No strengths found.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not state that this priority is being addressed (p. e6).

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Expanding Education Choice (High-Impact Tutoring) (up to 5 points)**

**Projects or proposals that will expand access to education services that accelerate learning such as high-impact tutoring.**

**Note: Applicants are encouraged to review the evidence related to education services that accelerate learning, including high-impact tutoring, and to cite the highest-level of evidence supporting their response to the competitive preference priority in their application.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes the use of live and AI tutoring as it provides literacy intervention in rural areas (p. e8, e13).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/12/2025 04:29 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/11/2025 03:26 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

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

	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	35	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	70
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

## 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:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project introduces an innovative approach, such as a modification of an evidence-based project component to serve different populations, an extension of an existing evidence-based project component, a unique composition of various project components to explore combined effects, or development of an emerging project component that needs further testing.

#### Strengths:

The proposed project, Rural Opportunities through Literacy, Observation, Tutoring, and STEM (ROOTS), introduces a significantly innovative approach by using a unique composition of various project components. Each of those components is based on existing evidence-based interventions. The proposed project includes a four-tier high-impact literacy-infusion tutoring framework, Literacy Infused Science (LIS) tutoring, and field-initiated innovation of promoting evidence-based literacy based on the science of reading (SOR). The tutoring framework is innovative due to the infusion of STEM and AI-supported components, especially in rural, isolated service areas. These components, if successful, will meet the needs of the rural, isolated populations in two states (p e11-e25).

#### Weaknesses:

No weakness was found

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project for recipients, community members and partners. In determining the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 35

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project

Sub

**that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project effectively addresses the extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the components of the project. Several past studies have included one or more components of the interventions that are planned for the proposed project; however, some of those studies are limited in scope and scale. Few address the potential effects in rural, isolated areas. The tutoring component of the proposed project is based on strong evidence studies; however, these did not include rural schools. Some studies did indicate significant results for the improvement of reading efficiency and fluency, and will be used as a basis for some of the planned interventions (p e22-e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The management plan demonstrates clearly the feasibility of the project to be completed on time and within budget. The management plan includes specific timelines with beginning and ending dates for each major milestone. The project tasks are clearly aligned to the individuals or partners who are responsible for the completion of those tasks. These efforts ensure the accomplishment of the tasks on time and within budget. The key leadership roles are filled with individuals with appropriate expertise to ensure that the goals of the project are met (p e27 and p e68-e98). The management plan will be monitored appropriately by using a grant milestone chart to track the major activities. An advisory board will meet to review the progress at least annually (p e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**3. (3) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project is supported by relevant partners, including Texas A & M University, University of Southern Mississippi, Amira Learning, Walmart, and 100 school districts across Texas and Mississippi (p e29). Amira Learning will provide specialized training and ongoing technical support. The letters of support from Amira Learning and Walmart demonstrate the commitment of those partners to the implementation and success of the proposed project (p e178-e180). The letters of support and the listing of the schools that have indicated support for the proposed project are strong and will ensure commitment from those partners (p e 104-e175).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**4. (4) The quality of the plan to deliver project services more efficiently at scale and maintain effectiveness.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project demonstrates effective plans for delivering project service efficiency at scale and maintaining effectiveness. Efficiencies include providing real-time feedback and virtual coaching to teachers and tutors (p e29). Training will be designed to strengthen and maintain high-quality instruction over time. Partnerships will support efficient scaling (p e30).

The proposed project will implement a delayed release method for control and interventions. This effort clearly ensures sustainability and the maintenance of effectiveness over time (p e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**5. (5) The quality of the mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information and resources on its project to support further development, adaptation, or replication by other entities to implement project components in additional settings or with other populations.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will use a comprehensive plan to disseminate information and resources. This approach is included in Objective 3.2, which is to disseminate project findings nationally. The outcomes related to that objective include published papers, presentations, and research briefs that will be shared. The budget includes appropriate expenditures to ensure that the products are disseminated, and the project can be replicated (p e30, p e35, p e308).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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: 20**

Sub

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The quality of the logic model or other conceptual framework underlying the proposed project, including how inputs are related to outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project's logic model clearly identifies the resources, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, mid-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. The logic model appropriately links the outputs to the outcomes. These efforts provide support for the quality of the project design and ensure that the project will meet the desired outcomes and achieve measurable progress (p e30 and p e187).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and ambitious yet achievable within the project period, and aligned with the purposes of the grant program.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project has an overarching goal that is measurable. The goal is to expand evidence-based Science of Reading strategies and literacy infusion with content reading in STEM-science undergirded by high-impact tutoring and professional development for teachers via a longitudinal randomized controlled trial (RCT) study to impact student growth in reading literacy and content reading in the area of science. That goal is then supported by three clearly defined goals that are linked to objectives and outcomes. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are measurable and specific. For example, one of the outcomes is to have 1,000 students engage in the Amira literacy tutoring platform per year and exhibit literacy growth (p e30-e36). The applicant clearly links the baseline data available for several objectives (p e291-e300).

The goals for reaching the number of teachers and students during the five years are both ambitious and achievable (p e30-e36).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation or other evidence-building of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation or other evidence building, 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 effectiveness of the project on relevant outcomes that would meet the**

**Sub**

**What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbooks.**

**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 and potential implementation in other settings.**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**3. (3) The quality of the evaluation plan for measuring fidelity of implementation, including thresholds for acceptable implementation, to inform how implementation is associated with outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**4. (4) 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 valid and reliable information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Returning Education to the States (up to 10 points)**

**Project or proposals that will be carried out by one or more of the following entities:**

**(a) State educational agencies (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7801(49))**

**(b) An Indian Tribe (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(e)), Tribal organization (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(l)), or Tribal educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7452(b)(3))**

**(c) Consortia of the entities identified under this priority.**

**Strengths:**

Did not apply (p e8).

**Weaknesses:**

Did not apply (p e8).

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Expanding Education Choice (High-Impact Tutoring) (up to 5 points)**

**Projects or proposals that will expand access to education services that accelerate learning such as high-impact tutoring.**

**Note: Applicants are encouraged to review the evidence related to education services that accelerate learning, including high-impact tutoring, and to cite the highest-level of evidence supporting their response to the competitive preference priority in their application.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project meets Competitive Preference Priority 2. The ROOTS project demonstrates the implementation of a high-impact tutoring project that is supported by evidence-based literacy instruction. The ROOTS program is based on the science of reading and is an explicit, systematic, and intentional instruction of phonologic awareness, phonics decoding, oral and sign language, vocabulary, language structure, reading fluency, reading comprehension, writing, and knowledge-rich materials (p e12).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness was found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/11/2025 03:26 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/13/2025 01:11 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

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

	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	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	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. Returning Educ to States	10	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	115	27

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M Research Foundation (S411A250016)

## 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:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project introduces an innovative approach, such as a modification of an evidence-based project component to serve different populations, an extension of an existing evidence-based project component, a unique composition of various project components to explore combined effects, or development of an emerging project component that needs further testing.

#### Strengths:

NA

#### Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project for recipients, community members and partners. In determining the applicant's strategy to effectively scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.

#### Strengths:

NA

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

3. (3) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

4. (4) The quality of the plan to deliver project services more efficiently at scale and maintain effectiveness.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

5. (5) The quality of the mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information and resources on its project to support further development, adaptation, or replication by other entities to implement project components in additional settings or with other populations.

**Strengths:**

NA

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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 quality of the logic model or other conceptual framework underlying the proposed project, including how inputs are related to outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

Na

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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, measurable, and ambitious yet achievable within the project period, and aligned with the purposes of the grant program.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation or other evidence-building of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation or other evidence building, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 27**

Sub

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the effectiveness of the project on relevant outcomes that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbooks.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains the methods of evaluation that produce evidence about program effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservation. The applicant states the project uses a clustered RCT (randomized controlled trial) at school-level with random assignment to treatment and control groups (e36). The applicant indicates that the evaluation will use a hierarchical linear model, which is appropriate for the research model and research question (e37-38). The project uses a clear framework for tutoring as part of the implementation strategies (e17) and indicates that consent forms will be used for high-need student participation (e13). The applicant clearly explains recruitment of 100 schools with integrity of assignment throughout the evaluation period (e36). There is minimum contamination by randomly selecting educators to implement the corresponding condition (e36). The applicant explains the covariates collected and included in analysis (e36), while also explaining how attrition and missing data are minimized by overall and differential attrition rates at student and school levels (e37). The applicant states that baseline equivalence is established through pre-testing and will be used for comparisons at the end of the school year (e37). Baseline equivalence will be used in longitudinal analysis to examine sustainability of project (e37). The applicant clearly justifies the sample size through power analysis (e37-38).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score:** 15

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly explains the extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing and potential implementation in other settings. The applicant clearly identifies and explains the data collection efforts (e38). Questions to determine objectives and analyses are clearly stated (e38-43, Appendix J6 on e292). The power analysis explained clearly identifies justification for replication of testing and evaluation (e37-38).

**Weaknesses:**

Additional explanation around psychometric qualities and baseline and outcome measures (Appendix J6, e292) could provide necessary additional information around replication and generalizability of project.

**Reader's Score:** 4

3. **(3) The quality of the evaluation plan for measuring fidelity of implementation, including thresholds for acceptable implementation, to inform how implementation is associated with outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies high quality plans for measuring fidelity of implementation (FOI), including thresholds for acceptable implementation, to inform how implementation is associated with outcomes. The applicant clearly identifies well researched FOI measures for students and identifies several measures of implementation (e44). The applicant offers some indication of teacher level FOI measures, specifically around psychometrics and implementation (e44 and Appendix J6 e292).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not clearly identify any additional instruments (e.g. end of program surveys) or measures of implementation (e.g. duration of program) may be useful from educators implementing the program. Providing additional instruments and measures of implementation offer more opportunities to gain insight into program use and determine the degree to which differences in implementation will impede or support the outcomes measured in the evaluation.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 4. (4) 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 valid and reliable information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains 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. The applicant explains three components for scale regarding integrated science classes, high impact AI tutoring, and virtual mentorship for educators (e44). The applicant indicates using a delayed release model for control schools, which ensures equitable outcomes and possible asynchronous training, can provide meaningful, impact means of replication of the project and evaluation (e44, 45). The project implementation and evaluation explains that such replication is feasible.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide sufficient information about the asynchronous training. This is necessary given the possibility of lack of access and different interpretations of training material.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

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

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Returning Education to the States (up to 10 points)**

**Project or proposals that will be carried out by one or more of the following entities:**

- (a) State educational agencies (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7801(49))**
- (b) An Indian Tribe (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(e)), Tribal organization (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(l)), or Tribal educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7452(b)(3))**
- (c) Consortia of the entities identified under this priority.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Expanding Education Choice (High-Impact Tutoring) (up to 5 points)**

**Projects or proposals that will expand access to education services that accelerate learning such as high-impact tutoring.**

**Note: Applicants are encouraged to review the evidence related to education services that accelerate learning, including high-impact tutoring, and to cite the highest-level of evidence supporting their response to the competitive preference priority in their application.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/13/2025 01:11 PM