

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/12/2025 04:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	33
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	68
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	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

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 provides evidence of Air Reading, a Science of Reading-based literacy intervention that incorporates high-impact tutoring, and is being studied in rural Texas (TX) with promising results. The applicant desires to expand this work to Arkansas (AK) (pp. e12-e13). The applicant is seeking to use the program state-wide under real-world, state-led implementation conditions. The modifications for AK include using the ATLAS Reading/ELA instead of NWEA MAP as well as DIBELS8/FastBridge. Further expansion is from 6 schools in TX to 100 in AK and using college students as tutors (pp. e14-e15).

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: 33

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 shares evidence that shows a need for early literacy intervention, stating 70% of rural fourth-graders read below grade level nationally. In the state of AK, 217 rural elementary schools serving over 3,200 first-graders score well below grade level. Previous efforts to intervene statewide reflected the unmet demand but revealed gaps in the programs; variability in effects by schools; some schools not launching the intervention at all; and human capital absenteeism that cause sessions to be canceled. (p.e17).

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 detailed timeline with milestones and responsible parties (pp. e23-e24). The applicant provides a detailed budget justification for each part of the project (pp. e103-e104).

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 applicant successfully provides details of the partners in the project and their relevance to the success of the project. The partners include rural LEAs, Air Reading, Arkansas IHE Partners, and Stanford University (p. e25-e26).

Weaknesses:

The applicant shares there are formal commitments but does not adequately show proof of the letters of commitment (p. e26).

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the efficiency mechanisms of virtual delivery that eliminate travel costs and serve remote schools (p. e26). The applicant describes quality-preserving mechanisms by embedding tutoring in the master schedules to standardize structure to maintain effectiveness (p.e27). The applicant provides detailed fidelity monitoring of the project (p. e27). Virtual delivery with the statewide infrastructure is shared to show the reduced costs.

Sub

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.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates dissemination products by audience; for example, families and communities will receive summaries (English/Spanish); infographics and engagement resources will be shared through school communications and local media (p.e28-e29).

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 logic model is present in narrative (pp. e29-e34) and pictorially in Appendix G (p. e98) and is designed to support the project. The inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts are clearly specified, are measurable, are capable to be completed within the project period, and are aligned with the purposes of the grant program (p. e98).

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 project objectives are clearly defined with measurable targets, deadlines and differentiation of ambition and achievability (pp. e35-e36). The chart on p. e35 describes why the objectives are ambitious and achievable.

Sub

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

Sub

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

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:

The applicant is the state educational agency.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

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 demonstrates the use of virtual high-impact tutoring through Air Reading (p. e 13). College students will be hired to literacy tutors for the project (p. e15).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/12/2025 04:33 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	69
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	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	115	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

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 demonstrates the introduction of an innovative approach by using an extension of existing evidence-based virtual tutoring model (Air Reading). The project will involve 100 diverse Arkansas rural schools. The model will address rural staffing shortages by utilizing college students trained in Science of Reading. This effort is to both provide services and increase teaching interest (p e12-e16).

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: 34

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 proposed project clearly demonstrates the extent to which unmet demand will be addressed. The 100 school study will implement interventions that previous efforts--including a high-impact tutoring initiative implemented by the state during the 2024-2025--have not met consistently. With nearly 70% of rural fourth-graders reading below grade level nationally (NAEP, 2024), rural states face significant challenges in meeting the needs of those young readers (p e17).

The proposed project meet these needs by aligning tutoring with state standards, using systematic implementation protocols, testing duration impact on learning, and providing workforce solutions (p e18-e19).

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 applicant's management plan is feasible based on the clearly defined key feasibility metrics, specifically defined persons responsible for ensuring the completion of tasks, and timelines that will provide for the activities to be completed on time and within budget (p e24).

The management plan includes detailed timelines for the major milestones and deliverables for the proposed project. The monitoring of the progress including monthly partner coordination meetings ensure that the project goals and objectives are met in a timely manner (p e22-e24).

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 demonstrates the relevance and commitment of each key partner that will support the implementation of the project. Those partnerships include the Arkansas Department of Education, participating rural LEA's, Air Reading, Arkansas Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) partners and Stanford University. The applicant has clearly defined the roles of the partners (p e25-e26).

The letters of support that are provided demonstrate the commitment of the partners and ensure the success of the project (p e71-e82).

Weaknesses:

The applicant suggests that a barrier to equitable access and participation and increase in qualified tutors from area universities may cause issues with sustainability (p e121). However, the applicant does not provide specific information as to how IHE partners will be enlisted to work with this project. The applicant states that five to eight institutions will be in the partnership but does not identify the pool that will be used or how selection will occur. Only

Sub

two letters of support are included from IHE's. Without specific information, it is difficult to determine the strength and relevance of all the partners (p e25-e26 and p e71-e82).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The proposed project delivers project services including evidence-based tutoring at a statewide scale using a model that is designed for efficiency and consistency (p e26). The virtual delivery from Air Reading eliminates travel costs and serves remote schools. To provide consistency, all tutors will receive identical training including monthly refreshers (p e26).

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 proposed project demonstrates several quality mechanisms to be used to broadly disseminate information and resources. Two components include a Rural State Literacy Tutoring Toolkit and the College Student Tutoring Workforce Playbook. These tools will provide outreach to Arkansas Educators (p e28). Additional outreach includes to national policymakers, researchers, Higher Education Institutions, and families and communities. This outreach includes networks, website, journals and reviews (p e28).

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

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

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework and logic model are designed to support the project design. Air Reading's theory of action: foundational literacy accelerates for Level 1 early-grade students when explicit instruction is delivered frequently in very small groups; when Tier 3 tutoring is tightly aligned to Tier 1 scope-and-sequence, routines, and when delivery is reliable provides the basis for student success (p e29). This theory is critical for the interventions planned to be successful.

The logic model provides clearly defined inputs that relate to the outcomes of the project. For example the partnerships will support the appropriate training for tutors to work successfully with students (p e98).

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 overarching goal is clearly measurable and aligned with the purpose of the grant program. That goal is to establish a proven, scalable, sustainable model for delivering evidence-based foundational literacy instruction that significantly improves K-3 outcomes for Level 1 students in rural, high need Arkansas schools and is replicable in states with similar rural populations (p e33).

The objectives are linked to measurable targets. The applicant clearly links the objectives and the targets to the rationale, demonstrating why each target is both ambitious and achievable (p e35-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 What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbooks.

Strengths:

N/A

Sub

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:

The applicant indicated that Returning Education to the States was a priority (p e121 and p e9). The proposed project is a statewide tutoring program.

Weaknesses:

No weakness was found.

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 proposed project does for the most part meet the Competitive Preference Priority 2 by providing high-impact tutoring (p e9). The proposed project delivers a Science of Reading-based literacy intervention (p e13). Those interventions and outcomes address phonological awareness, decoding, oral reading fluency and comprehension (p e 39).

Weaknesses:

The proposed project does not specifically address writing or promoting knowledge-rich materials in the activities planned. Those elements are part of the evidence-based literacy instruction required to fully meet this priority (p e11).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

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	27
Sub Total	100	27
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	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Arkansas Department of Education (S411A250020)

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 identifies a school-level RCT (randomized controlled trial) with hierarchical models nesting students within schools, aligning with WWC (What Works Clearinghouse) standards without reservation (e37). The applicant provides a clear table (Table 9, e37) that identifies random assignment and a plan to pre-register. Baseline equivalence is identified through prior achievement, demographics, and characteristics among students and schools (e37). The applicant identifies independent evaluators leading the evaluation to limit bias (e38). A power analysis is provided that indicates there is a sufficient sample size (e38).

Weaknesses:

The application lacks sufficient information about covariates being used in the analysis beyond general summaries of what is included in baseline equivalence.

Reader's Score: 14

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 identifies several products and components that are logged that can encourage replication for the program and the testing in other settings (e40-41). The applicant identifies a technical assistance network and national channels to address challenges and supplement adapting the model while ensuring essential ingredients. Tutor logs and observation notes in dashboards may also encourage replication (e41). Some contingency planning in regard to staffing is identified (e41).

Weaknesses:

The application might be strengthened by providing additional information on how the logged product and component tools can encourage replication or testing.

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 provides a table that clearly identifies the measurement and threshold for measuring fidelity of implementation (e42). The applicant also clearly justifies the decisions around measurements of FOI (fidelity of implementation) and the value of including measuring FOI as part of the instructional program. The FOI measures selected adhere to themes necessary for effective program implementation.

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide sufficient justification or information around the process by which the applicant underwent to determine the appropriate threshold. It is unclear if this is grounded in earlier research or evaluation decisions made for the program.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub

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 indicates that the data produced can be meaningful, valid, and accurate information about the effectiveness of the program. The applicant identifies internal and external validity for the measured outcomes in the evaluation (e44). The estimates addressing different cohorts (e.g., students who are English-learners, differences with respect to race and ethnicity, etc.) are collected and reported for transparency and to offer an equity-focused lens to replication (e44). Models and pathway documentation for timelines, sequences, and observation cycles offer significant insight into the program and evaluation framework (e45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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(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:

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