

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2025 06:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	32
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	81

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

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 approach, a modification of an evidence-based project component, is innovative in both its testing of a change in tutoring dosage and whether evidence-based tutoring maintains effectiveness when scaled across diverse contexts statewide (rural, urban, suburban, charter) (e8) The proposal is also innovative in its evaluation of the efficacy of college students from various majors delivering the tutoring program alongside professional tutors (e13).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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: 32

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 excellent. The applicant notes that as high-impact tutoring programs expand, dosage often declines as group size increases leading to an eroding of effectiveness (e15). A robust discussion of the unmet demand for high-impact tutoring that "meets research standards for dosage, group size and instructional quality" (e15) and maintains effectiveness is presented. Further, the applicant cites a 2024-25 Louisiana randomized control trial that used student performance on state assessments as evidence of unmet demand for broader implementation (e8,11). Additionally, Louisiana specific data (e.g., 72.5% of students are economically disadvantaged, and 63 out of 64 parishes serve majority low-income populations, approximately 46% of K-6 schools are rural, well above national averages, creating access barriers that virtual delivery can uniquely address) supporting scaling to the proposed populations is presented (e15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

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's response to this factor is very good. The management plan has good potential to support achieving objectives. Strong indication of management capacity and monitoring is presented via monthly, weekly, quarterly and annual activities to support implementation and improvement (e20-21). Multiple milestones across the 5-year project period are presented. Key personnel are identified with position titles of dedicated Air Reading project staff provided. (e18-19)

Weaknesses:

The management plan is slightly disjointed with some milestones vaguely stated. For example, "data pipelines and dashboards", "low-bandwidth configs" and "site readiness" do not clearly indicate action being taken. (e17-18) The party responsible for each milestone is not clearly indicated (e17-18). Additionally, timelines for some milestones are also broad. For example, five milestones are listed for school year 2028-2029 without an indication of a frequency of occurrence or the time of year during which the milestone is expected to be met (e17-18). The applicant does not provide clear indication of how the various milestones align with the objectives and/or goals.

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. Strong partner commitments that include active roles in the project are conveyed. Letters of support supplement the applicant's description of partner roles in alignment with project and grant objectives (e44-54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

maintain effectiveness.

Strengths:

The applicant's response to this criterion is excellent. The proposed study seeks to improve effectiveness of high-impact tutoring implementation with a new tutoring dosage for approximately 4500 students in grades 1 and 2 across 90 Louisiana schools (e8, 23-25). Efficiencies are obtained by ensuring fidelity to the model through standardization of program elements while allowing specific flexibilities that enable student personalization (e24-25). Comprehensive monitoring that includes multi-frequency assessment is designed to further ensure effectiveness is maintained (e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate project information are excellent (e14, 25-27). The plan for dissemination begins with considering accessibility, scalability and evidence translation (e24) and a national learning collaborative comprised of eight to ten state education departments. The plan is comprehensive, considers various target audiences and established a tiered product strategy (e24-25). Target audiences include state education agencies, local education agencies, researchers and policymakers. Resource design and development are differentiated for each of the target audiences (e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

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: 19

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. The proposal clearly articulates a rationale - a What Works Clearinghouse-standard randomized control trial that demonstrated effectiveness of +0.20 SD for grade 1 students - for implementing this study of extended dosage in grade 1 (e11). Key project components are discussed in some

Sub

detail (e28). Prior studies supporting the effectiveness of select components of the proposed study are discussed (e8, e11-14). The quality of the logic model is excellent as it clearly delineates inputs, activities, outputs and multiple short-, mid- and long-term outcomes (e91).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not clearly and adequately discuss the operational relationship among the extended high-impact tutoring dosage and one or more outcomes of this proposed study.

Reader's Score: 14

- 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. A set of goals, objectives and outcomes well-aligned to the purposes of the grant are clearly specified, measurable and ambitious (e31-34). The applicant provides multiple short term and long-term outcomes that, where appropriate, include quantitative measures (e91). For example, the student outcome of statistically significant literacy gains as measured on DIBELS is among the outcomes presented (e31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Sub

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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 met this competitive preference via option (a) in a solid manner. The Louisiana Department of Education is a state educational agency and will lead project implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 factor is excellent. The proposed study includes small-group instruction of two-three students per tutor, consistent tutor assignment throughout the intervention period, four 30-minute sessions per week, ongoing progress monitoring to inform instructional adjustments over the twenty-to-twenty-four-week duration, and tutor professional development (e11, e13)). The proposed study is well-aligned with the current evidence on high-impact tutoring and, as a virtual model, the program aligns with Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and state-adopted curriculum (e11).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/17/2025 06:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2025 04:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	31
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	80

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

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:

This applicant strongly proposes some innovative approaches to literacy in the state of Louisiana which may have impact beyond the state to other localities, particularly rural locations. There are three questions posed by the project: 1) Can evidence-based tutoring done virtually at different locales deliver consistent results? 2) What characteristics sustain program quality when moving from a single-district to a state-wide deployment? 3) Do extended tutoring results justify increased costs and do gains remain when tutoring ends? The state uses Air Reading and will implement the model in 90 varied schools. One year effectiveness has been documented, but not two years, so results will be instructive. This project will embed High-Impact tutoring into the Science of Reading infrastructure. In addition, they will test if this can be used as a recruitment tool for future teachers to help solve the teacher shortage. Findings could prove significant statewide and nationally. (e-10-15)

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: 31

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 project has strongly documented unmet needs from its first iteration of a high-impact tutoring project entitled "Accelerate" in 2023-2024. Those issues include: fidelity inconsistency across contexts; scheduling and operational barriers; and cost sustainability concerns. (p. e-16) The applicant indicates that this project will examine these issues and provide answers for potential scaling of the project across various venues. The state of Louisiana already has in place a number of services which will make scaling easier: universal screeners (DIBELS); Science of Reading High-Impact tutors; professional statewide learning networks; policy which mandates intervention and funding; and previous high-impact tutoring which meets WWC standards (Air Reading). (p. e-16) Thus, it is evident that there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project aligned with the proposed level of scale.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 as described is adequate and includes a number of defined responsibilities, a generalized timeline and milestone for accomplishing project tasks. (p. e.-18).

Weaknesses:

The plan does not relate objectives and goals to the overall plan and does not describe how it will achieve those goals and objectives on time and within budget and does not give details about how project tasks will be accomplished. (p. e-18) The management plan is very general and lacks significant details. Risk mitigation strategies are vague.

Reader's Score: 6

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

Strengths:

(p. e-44-54) The application provides strong evidence that partners are committed and will work together. Letters of support provide concrete evidence of commitment of each partner in the proposed project in the implementation and success of the project.

Weaknesses:

None noted. (p. e-21-23)

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant adequately discusses a number of design elements which will assist in delivering project services through standardization and flexibility such as instructional content, progress monitoring, grouping, dosage, and platform. These are commendable ways to keep the project on track. (p. e-24)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 strongly details a suite of possible ways to disseminate information and resources on the project to support further development, adaptation, or replication. This includes a tiered product strategy with some examples such as: SEA Blueprint for Statewide Tutoring Policy; LEA Implementation Playbook; Technical and Research Outputs; Policy and Practice Briefs; a National Learning Collaborative; and Evidence to Policy Translation. These and other methods will help to disseminate information with which to replicate this and similar models.(p. e-25-27)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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: 19

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-91-Logic Model & p. e-27-34) The applicant provides a robust logic model and a strong conceptual framework underlying the proposed project, explaining how inputs are related to outcomes. The applicant explains how various activities help to produce various outcomes. For example, by implementing its program over 90 schools, they can overcome the impact of various state conditions at each school. Random assignment to one-year, two-year, or

Sub

control groups isolates the impact of extended dosages of tutoring. (p. e-29-30) Likewise by embedding tutoring into an existing program enables the state to continue funding a program after the termination of federal funding. The Logic Model demonstrates how inputs, such as evidence-based intervention or state infrastructure, can relate to outcomes such as structural deliverables or short-term, mid-term, or long-term student outcomes. (p. e-91)

Weaknesses:

The application is missing references to past research which would justify its approach of different levels of tutoring for different populations. (p. e-91)

Reader's Score: 14

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:

(p. e-31-34) The applicant has strongly detailed goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project and that they are clearly specified, measurable, and ambitious yet achievable. Based on the information provided, each of these conditions appears to be present. They have included four goals related to scaling proven interventions with emphasis on dosage, persistence, cost-effectiveness, and sustainable implementation. Each goal is quantified, has objectives, and a rationale for being ambitious yet achievable.

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:

Weaknesses:

Sub

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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(I)), 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 for this project is the Louisiana Department of Education. The abstract indicates that the application meets CPP 1. (p. e-8)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 indicates in the abstract that it meets CPP 2. (p. e-8) The program proposed is an extension of a high-impact tutoring program which is Science of Reading-aligned and provides explicit, systematic, and intentional instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. (p. e-10); (p.e-13)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/17/2025 04:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2025 02:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	25
Sub Total	100	25
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	0
Sub Total	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	115	25

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education (S411A250019)

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: 25

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 presents its good design, which is a cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT) across 90 schools in order to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations (pp. e8, 34). The design is reflected in the project logic model (p. e91). As a strength, the design will use school-level clusters to prevent contamination and will consider effect size of .1, based on prior studies, which is appropriate (pp. e28, 35). The applicant provides details of the power calculation (p. e35). The outcomes are the DIBELS assessment and the state English assessment, which are valid and reliable (p. e35). In addition, the evaluation plan details its baseline covariates such as prior literacy scores and demographics (p. e36). Furthermore, the evaluation plan presents its plan to mitigate attrition through district partnerships, and its plan to conduct sensitivity analyses if needed (p. e37).

As an additional strength, the evaluation plan documents its fidelity of implementation analyses and the plan presents ways to mitigate threats to internal and external validity (pp. e8,21, 36, 37).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan lacks a description of its treatment of missing data as well as the impact of joiners to the study (p. e37). It is unclear how the addition of students or missing information will impact the analyses.

In addition, the budget lacks clear funds for the external evaluator (pp. e19, 94-101). The letter of support from the evaluator does not clearly indicate an alternative funding source (p. e52). The quality of the evaluation may suffer without adequate funding.

Reader's Score: 10

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 presents strong evidence of the project's efficacy across various contexts, including rural, suburban, and charter schools in multiple states (pp. e8,11, 16). In addition, it will consider the impact school resources such as staffing have on the project's outcomes (p. e38). The applicant demonstrates that it will conduct moderator analyses to determine the effect of socio-economic status, race, and English learner status (p. e36). These analyses will test if the intervention achieves consistent results across various contexts, which will enhance replicability (p. e38).

As an additional strength, the evaluation plan will include cost-effectiveness of implementation (p. e8). The applicant will create benchmarks on cost per student and cost per .1 standard deviation of gain in literacy (p. e16). The applicant details various financial factors it will consider, including technology costs, materials costs, and personnel costs (p. e41).

Furthermore, the applicant details its dissemination plan that will include a state blueprint for tutoring, an implementation playbook, and policy briefs with implementation recommendations (p. e26).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

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 evaluation plan presents thorough evidence of a plan for fidelity of implementation (pp. e8, 20-21). As a strength, fidelity of implementation is incorporated into the project logic model (p. e91). The applicant presents evidence of continuous monitoring of the fidelity of the project, including aspects of tutoring dosage, instructional quality, and retention (p. e14). For example, there will be monthly meetings of the steering committee for feedback (p. e17). The applicant documents a schedule of multiple meetings for data monitoring (p. e25). In addition, the applicant provides a table of ways that it will mitigate risk to fidelity of implementation (p. e20).

The applicant presents evidence for thresholds of acceptable implementation. For example, the project must have a level of 80% fidelity overall (p. e8). The applicant details typical expectations such as 4 tutoring sessions weekly at 30 minutes per session in groups of two or three students per tutor (p. e39). In addition, the applicant details key performance indicators such as 80% of students need to receive the prescribed tutoring dosage and have 80% school attendance (p. e21).

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 has a strong plan to guide replication of project activities. The applicant builds on a prior study of the effectiveness of one year of virtual tutoring (p. e12). The applicant details its tutoring program which has strong evidence for effective activities based on the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) criteria (p. e8). For example, the virtual tutoring has .12 standard deviation gains based on a randomized control trial (RCT) in a high-need population (p. e11). In addition, the applicant will test replication across 90 schools to identify contextual moderators that should deliver the outcome of establishing external validity and implementation guidance in various contexts (p. e29). For example, the applicant will conduct moderator analyses to determine the effect of race, and English learner status on learning growth from the tutoring program (p. e36). As an additional strength, the outcomes measured, the DIBELS assessment and the state English assessment, have established validity and reliability (p. e35). Furthermore, the applicant demonstrates how its evaluation design will maximize internal and external validity as well as determine if literacy gains are sustained when intensive supports are removed (pp. e37, 42).

The applicant presents its dissemination plan that will guide possible replication at the state and LEA levels. For example, it will create executive summaries for legislative audiences, practitioner briefs for district leaders, and hold webinars directly with implementation teams (p. e26).

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 02:38 PM