

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 01:48 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

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	27
<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	62
<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	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	4
<b>Total</b>	115	66

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Expansion Panel - 17 - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

## 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's response to this criterion is excellent. The proposed project is innovative in its integration of AI coaching tool for tutors - technology delivering real-time pedagogical and content-focused guidance for tutors – with high-impact tutoring on the science of reading (e19). The project is promising in its innovative extension of an existing evidence-based project component – Intermediary Supports for Tutoring from providing mathematics support to providing Science of Reading-aligned literacy support. (e14, e20)

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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: 27

#### 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.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's response to this factor is very good. The proposal includes overall NAEP data for 4th and 8th graders nationwide, identifies common reasons tutoring underperforms at scale, and convey scaling the model into DC, Maryland and Virginia (e14-15, 21). The scale of the proposed study is consistent with partner capacity and the infrastructure.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal lacks data specific to the literacy needs of DC, Maryland and Virginia. Thus, the extent to which the unmet demand is aligned with the proposed level of scale is unclear.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 is very good. For each year of the project, multiple milestones with quarterly timeframes are provided (e24). Key personnel and their respective responsibilities are thoroughly discussed (e24-25, e914-920). Thus, the management plan provides some information to suggest that the objectives could be achieved on time and within budget.

**Weaknesses:**

The management plan lacks clarity with respect to which goal or objective an activity/milestone supports. Providing an organization as the owner of a milestone does not provide adequate clarity as to the party responsible for the milestone. Additionally, more granular milestones relative to the school level HIT implementation with shared responsibility for districts/partners would strengthen the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 7**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's response to this factor is excellent. Several public schools across Virginia, Washington DC and Maryland, identified as partners, will serve as implementation sites for the proposed study. The Maryland State Department of Education actively supports recruitment of schools in that state (e10, e23) EduTutorVa, Reading Assist and Reading Partners, providers of High-Impact Tutoring, articulate a clear commitment to the proposed project through letters of support (493-497). Thus, each partner's role and commitment coheres directly with the goals of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's response to this factor is good. The proposed project seeks scale the model into DC, Maryland and Virginia and maintain quality of tutoring via use of standardized tools (e14-15, 21). The applicant details cost efficiencies relative to a prior project that included one of its partners (e27) and reports maintaining strong student outcomes while scaling. Therefore, there is some evidence of the capacity to scale while maintaining effectiveness.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not offer sufficient discussion of plans to improve efficiency with the currently proposed project and its new partners, or of strategies to maintain effectiveness given the number of new partners that are providing tutoring services. Additionally, how the AI-tool might increase quality while driving scale is not discussed in sufficient detail (e27). Therefore, the plan is underdeveloped in its consideration of maintaining effectiveness.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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's response to this factor is very good. The availability of a variety of openly licensed resources supports further development and replication (e27). Plans to actively disseminate findings appropriately target national conferences and hosting public webinars. An abbreviated list of organizations that host national and regional conferences is included (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's plan for dissemination does not sufficiently discuss a range of mechanisms in a way that engages partners in outreach and dissemination of information and resources.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 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's response to this factor is excellent. A comprehensive theory of change conveys an operational relationship among design sprints, Science of Reading aligned resources and training for tutor and increased proficiency outcomes (e584). Additionally, the quality of the logic model is very good (e585-586). Multiple inputs and key actions are clearly identified (e30). Several outcomes, including short-term and long-term outcomes, are described and include quantitative targets.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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 applicant's response to this factor is excellent. Multiple goals and objectives are clearly specified. Each objective correlates with a quantitative measure and target and is aligned with the purposes of the grant (e32). The applicant provided multiple short term and long-term outcomes, including student outcomes (e30). Specifically, outcomes include student reading growth on state assessment and nationally normed interim assessments (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**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:**

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

**Sub**

**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:**

The applicant does not meet this Competitive Preference Priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not meet this Competitive Preference Priority.

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's response to this CPP is very good. The proposal prioritizes access to High Impact tutoring for high need students but provides access for all students (e15) in order to further expand access. Additionally, Intermediary Support for Tutoring provides structured coaching, technical assistance, and design sprints to support and enhance quality of HIT implementation in a way that is coherent with research on HIT implementation (e14). To support research-based implementation, choice is embedded into the model, allowing schools to select and schedule tutoring during the school day and, where available and standards aligned, via vetted virtual models (e17).

#### Weaknesses:

The AI-supported tutor coach and its implementation lack sufficient detail and discussion. Given that the tutor coach is CitySchools Collaborative's tool designed to increase coaching reach, its deployment to or through providers implementing tutoring and the districts that they support is unclear (e19).

Reader's Score: 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 12/01/2025 01:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 12:37 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

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	27
<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	62
<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	67

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Expansion Panel - 17 - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

## 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 is significant in that it goes beyond basic High-Impact Tutoring and attempts to quantitatively evaluate the results of the program. (p. e-18) It goes beyond the original boundaries of the project and extends it to other jurisdictions across the three state entities. In this way different populations can be served and effectiveness tested. Many new interventions, such as Sophia, an AI support for coaching tutors, and a tutor to teacher program will be incorporated and tested for effectiveness. Thus, the model will include HIT (high impact tutoring, Intermediate Supports for Tutoring (IST), and Innovation for Scale. (e-19) It is hoped that the evaluation will provide evidence as to which supports are most effective in which environments.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

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: 27

#### 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:**

Scores on the recent NAEP test and requests by the states of Maryland and Virginia indicate that there is a need for broader implementation of the project. (p. e- 21-22) Data are provided which indicate that cost is a barrier for parents in receiving tutoring services and that a number of school districts requested expansion of publicly-funded tutoring. (p. e-22)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that there is unmet need for their specific project. While some quantitative and subjective data are provided to indicate unmet need, more specific data from surveys or other measurable documentation would have been helpful to justify that need and the justification for scaling up.

**Reader's Score: 7**

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 clearly demonstrates how the management plan used thus far in the project implementation will continue to be used to scale up the existing model to other entities. (p. e-22-24) A timeline is presented which covers activities already underway and activities to be conducted in the future. (p. e-24) Milestones are presented. Team responsibilities are defined.

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant discusses the efficiencies created by scaling up, discussion is lacking on the ability to achieve project objectives and goals within budget.

**Reader's Score: 8**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has effectively delineated the roles of the various partners, including the LEAs, the SEAs, the tutoring partners, evaluation partners, and others and each is committed to the project. Letters of support and contracts support these commitments.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides adequate justification that providing additional services at scale will not compromise the effectiveness of the project. (p. e-27) The number of students in the past has increased, while costs for serving students have gone down significantly, thus there is no reason why further increases in numbers will compromise effectiveness of the services. Additional tools, such as AI through Sofia, should further impact scalability. Increasing numbers to an already-established jurisdiction should impact economies of scale and enable the maintenance of effectiveness while serving more students.

**Weaknesses:**

While new partners have been added to an existing model, a sufficient narrative has not been provided to ensure that these partnerships will be maintained and scaled effectively. There is insufficient explanation about how the Sophia product will drive the scaling.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 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 has a strong dissemination plan to cover a broad range of entities and to enable further development and refinement of its model. (p. e-28) Materials developed will be openly licensed through the Creative Commons. State toolkits will be developed. Evaluation reports will be available. CSC will present at national conferences

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not adequately describe how the partners will be involved in the dissemination plan, although they are a critical part of it.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 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:**

(p. e-30) The Logic Model fully describes how the introduction of various supports to the basic tutoring model might impact outcomes. Inputs are described as those existing services, and key actions. Key actions/outputs describes additional supports that might be added to the original model. Potential short- and long-term outcomes are demonstrated.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**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:**

Goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved are specified, measurable, ambitious, yet achievable as described. (p. e-31-32) Goal 1 relates to increasing reading proficiency through High-impact tutoring in three states. Goal 2 enables states to maintain these levels while they are state-led after the conclusion of the grant. Existing data systems can be used to disaggregate the data. (p. e-32) Objectives and performance measures delineate specific data sets to be collected and the target date for reaching the projections. (p. e-32)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**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:**

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.

Sub

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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 meets CPP 2, Expanding Education Choice with High-Impact Tutoring. All three localities included in the initiative have supported High Impact Tutoring and will continue to do so. (p. e-17) Impact has already been demonstrated and scaling up has already occurred. This will continue on an accelerated basis through this project.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 12/01/2025 12:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2025 02:32 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

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	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	30
<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	30

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Expansion Panel - 17 - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: CitySchools Collaborative (S411A250017)

## 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:

N/A

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

N/A

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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:**

N/A

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation 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: 30**

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 application will likely produce strong evidence about the effectiveness of the project. The applicant will use a cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT) to compare student outcomes such as English language achievement, confidence, engagement, and early literacy skills (p. e10). The applicant presents data that its RCT will meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (p. e20). Schools will be randomly assigned within blocks by state, school type, and school level, which is appropriate (p. e35).

The applicant presents evidence that it has considered factors such as attrition and missing data. For example, student joiners will not be included in the analysis (p. e35). In addition, recruitment practices will be used to minimize attrition of school participation (p. e35). The applicant has conducted a power analysis, aiming to retain 90% of schools (p. e36). Missing outcome data will not be imputed (p. e35). The applicant provides effect size estimates for reading growth (pp. e64, 68). Baseline equivalence will be tested on state assessment data prior to randomization (p. e36).

The evaluation plan demonstrates that it ties the research questions to the logic model (p. e34). For example, one research question is related to increased confidence and engagement, (pp. e34, 585). The applicant also provides a discussion of the validity and reliability of measures, including state assessments, which will be used as the outcome measures (p. e37). As an additional strength, the applicant will consider fidelity of implementation using measures such as dosage and a rubric of instructional quality (p. e20).

### **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 demonstrates its thorough guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication. For example, the applicant presents evidence that it will analyze the findings by student subgroups to provide important information about replication in other settings (p. e10). In addition, it will extend the current model of tutoring into new states and contexts, which will provide information about implementation in new settings (pp. e18, 21). The application provides letters of support from various states to demonstrate potential implementation in a variety of settings (pp. e25, 492). The applicant provides evidence that its tutoring dosage is an effective strategy, as students who received the full 900-minute treatment gained 59 instructional days (p. e20).

The evaluation plan will detail the cost-effectiveness of the project (pp. e21, 28). For example, an early estimate of the per student cost is \$100 per year (p. e27). The materials produced will be openly-licensed, which will lower costs, and increase potential for adoption (p. e28).

The applicant demonstrates that it will create guides using school-level contextual data to identify project components critical for successful implementation (p. e39). For example, it will create a guide for implementation planning, instructional resources for tutors, and a guide of technical assistance (p. e39). The applicant details dissemination activities such as meetings with state leaders, state-level briefings, national conferences, public webinars, and an online repository of resources (p. e28).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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 presents strong evidence that the evaluation plan will measure fidelity of implementation, as one of the research questions relates to fidelity and factors that facilitate or hinder implementation (p. e34). In addition, the applicant presents targets for its goals, including implementation thresholds (p. e32). In addition, the applicant provides Table 8 with thresholds for each indicator (p. e41). For example, 80% of students at treatment schools will meet the dosage target (pp. e32, 41).

The applicant provides feedback mechanisms of the project to ensure acceptable implementation through monthly meetings with school teams (p. e23). In addition, there will be structured observations, program interviews and scoring rubrics (p. e38).

As an additional strength, the applicant will use a mixed-methods approach to study variation in implementation quality (p. e40). For example, data sources such as tutor surveys and interviews will capture data on treatment schools (p. e40).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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 presents strong evidence that its strategies are effective. The applicant builds on a prior grant that produced evidence of the effectiveness of its tutoring program in math, which demonstrated that fidelity, dosage, and instructional quality were important factors (pp. e10, 18). Providers of tutoring with high fidelity added 90 instructional days of growth, while students who had the full dosage gained 59 days of growth (p. e20). The applicant also provides evidence of growth in reading due to high impact tutoring (pp. e60-64,68).

The applicant will use state assessments, which are considered valid and reliable (p. e37). The applicant provides an implementation study, which will triangulate data of contextual factors, stakeholder surveys and implementation fidelity to determine critical replication information (p. e42). As an additional strength, the applicant presents evidence that it will analyze the findings by student subgroups to provide important information about replication in other settings (p. e10). For example, one of the research questions is the determination of which student subgroups benefit most from the intervention (p. e34).

The applicant demonstrates that it will create resources for adaptation and adoption such as toolkits, observation guides, cost estimators, and fidelity thresholds (p. e28). In addition, feedback will be provided to state leaders which will form part of the implementation resources (p. e42).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/17/2025 02:32 PM