

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 01:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

Reader #1: *****

	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	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	63
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	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	115	66

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

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 would build on i3 validation grant evidence “by evaluating the model as a full-year, core ELA program delivered across 120 schools, extending both the dosage and population reach” (e19). Additionally, the proposed project integrates a number of innovative components including AI-enabled formative and summative autoscoring of writing and speaking, high-impact tutoring, and continuous improvement science cycles of improvement (e14).

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: 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.

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant's response to this factor is very good. The applicant summarizes data evidencing need to improve literacy outcomes in partner states. Specifically, Kentucky NAEP grade 8 data where only 29 percent of students performed at or above proficiency, Florida NAEP grade 8 data and Maine state literacy benchmark data are discussed (e16).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly discuss the extent of the currently proposed scaling relative to the prior study in a way that clearly conveys a broader implementation. For example, whether this current proposal seeks to engage a greater number of students or a greater number of schools is not clearly and adequately discussed. Thus, the proposed level of scale is unclear.

How the content of the prior study's module compares to the currently proposed full year curriculum is not sufficiently discussed. Thus, whether there is an unmet demand for the new content in this curriculum 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 as evidenced by multiple goals and objectives with clear timeframes, a responsible party and performance measure (e24). A second, more detailed management plan conveys milestones, including a start and end date for each, as well as the lead organization and the leading role responsible for each milestone (e161-168). The responsibilities of key personnel are clearly defined (e27-29). The budget includes impact and implementation study stipends for educator (e193) which may spur interest and commitment to the proposed project. Thus, the management plan provides information to suggest that the goals and objectives could be achieved on time and within budget. (e24, e161-168)

Weaknesses:

Some components of the project (e.g., high-impact tutoring) are not clearly articulated among the milestones or activities in the management plan.

The timeline for three key activities (leader training, enacting program cycles during year 1, iterative support from Carnegie) lack a clear start and end date (e161).

Reader's Score: 9

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 very good. One partner will lead any needed development and implement all training and support of the curricular program. The applicant will work with the evaluator to monitor and measure implementation fidelity. The Maine Department of Education and Impact Florida will provide state and district level connections to help with recruitment, program implementation, and research logistics (e25-26); The active role of the Maine Department of Education is clearly articulated as a commitment to helping identify interested districts and schools (e115).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The commitment of a partner lacks some clarity as the partner articulates a commitment that appropriately hinges on alignment of the proposed curricular program to the specific state's standards (e113-114). The absence of a clearly articulated plan to address curriculum program alignment to multiple state standards introduces uncertainty and is a shortcoming of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant's response to this criterion is excellent. The applicant clearly describes a robust plan for scaling across three geographically separated states and expanding treatment from a 2–4-week singular writing-focused unit into a full ELA curriculum cycle across an entire academic year. (e29). Efficiency in scaling is supported by the building of effective instructional leadership teams, a key lever of the proposed project (e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 that the applicant proposed to disseminate information are excellent. The dissemination plan is comprehensive and appropriately targets both practitioners and researchers, and leverages project partner platforms and websites (e30). Intentions to present at national research conferences, publish in peer-reviewed journals, and present to national practitioner and/or policy conferences is discussed. Resources made available include scaling guides, implementation guides, and cost effectiveness guides (e31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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: 17

Sub

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant's response to this factor is very good. The quality of the conceptual framework is very good. Key project components are identified in the logic model (e124). Multiple outcomes are also included in the logic model. The logic model reflects the theory of action that "knowledge-building, standards-aligned assignments—supported by embedded professional learning and continuous improvement feedback cycles—can measurably improve both teaching and learning (e152).

Weaknesses:

High impact tutoring and AI-enabled autoscoring of writing and speaking, two key components characterized as innovative (e14), are not included in the logic model among the key or direct components (e124) Research evidencing the operational relationship among a key project component of the currently proposed project and a proposed outcome is not clearly described or discussed.

Reader's Score: 12

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. Goals, objectives and performance measures are clearly specified, measurable and aligned with the purposes of the grant program. Outcomes, contained in the logic model, address short, medium and long-term outcomes, and include student outcomes such as "increased reading and language arts performance scores" and "increased ELA standardized test scores" (e124). The goals and objectives are both ambitious and aligned.

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.**

Sub

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

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 criterion is good. The applicant clearly situates the high impact tutoring as an element of Tier 3 instruction utilizing Carnegie Learning's high impact tutoring model, –one of only 24 tutoring programs badged by Stanford University's National Student Support Accelerator (e14) Tutoring is clearly funded in budget via matching funds from Carnegie Learning who will support implementation (e184)

A Manager of School Partnership, to be hired, is "responsible for working with teachers and instructional leaders to ensure that they are supported in their implementation of the curriculum and tutoring" (e188).

Weaknesses:

Tutoring implementation lacks clarity. Carnegie Learning math contributions reflect tutoring funding that begins in 2027 at \$4500, and increases to \$22500 in 2027 and 2028, then increases to \$90,000 in 2030 (e126). The rationale and number of students and tutors associated with this contribution over the project period is not clearly and adequately discussed in the proposal.

Tutoring is available only to "the 5% of students most in need", so the extent to which the proposed project will expand access to high-impact tutoring is significantly constrained (e184).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 01:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 12:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

Reader #2: *****

	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	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
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	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	115	67

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

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 has concretely proposed a project of significance which is innovative and which will involve two other states. The states of Kentucky, Maine, and Florida, along with Carnegie Learning and WestEd, the evaluator, have joined forces on a project entitled, "Lenses on Literature." It is a grades 6-12 ELA program which is research-based, comprehensive, and focuses on "thinking critically, reading joyfully, and writing confidently." (p. e-12) Rural and high-needs students will particularly benefit from the program. The project is the culmination of many years of federal research and combines assessment, instructional materials, professional learning, and high-impact tutoring into one program. Students are able to improve their comprehension and analyze and read high-level texts. It embeds five levels of innovation into one package. (p. e- 14) This program is a significant scaling up of previously funded federal programs. All three states involved show challenges in the literacy competency of higher-grade students, which will eventually impact their higher education success rates. The potential of this program is great for secondary and postsecondary success and can be scaled up to other states and will build local and organizational capacity.. (p. e-16-18)

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: 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates adequately that there is unmet need for broader implementation of this project throughout the United States. Disappointing reading and comprehension scores have shown up throughout the country since the pandemic and Kentucky is only one of many states which has a documented need. Kentucky, Maine, and Florida are all exhibiting concerning patterns in reading proficiency. There is the potential for scaling up the project. With three states located in different parts of the country involved in this project, the potential for replication and lessons learned in other states is possible. Previous studies have documented improvement as a result of the Lenses program. The conceptual framework integrates instruction, learning, and continuous improvement. (p. 20-22) The project also creates sustainability for rural districts so that lessons learned are embedded in their instruction and professional development. (p. e-23) The capacity for data collection will enhance the development of future projects. Lenses is grounded in research, and continual implementation will result in more data to back up the success of the project for future sites. (p. e-23)

Weaknesses:

There is a noted lack of clarity about the content of the new model. It is unclear how it differs from previous models implemented. (p. e-16)

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:

(p. e-23-26) The applicant demonstrates adequately that the management plan proposed is feasible and will enable the project to achieve project objectives and goals on time and within budget with defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. The applicant has provided complete lists of goals with responsibilities and timelines by year documented to ensure that the project stays on track. (Appendix J.3) Competent and experienced staff (resumes) are leading the project and will work with the state literacy teams to meet project objectives. WestEd will lead the evaluation and Carnegie Learning will provide any development needed. Each state will hire a project coordinator. Evaluation activities and results will guide continuous improvement. In short, the management plan described appears to be feasible and durable.

Weaknesses:

There are a few inconsistencies within the management plan. It is not clear where the High-Impact Tutoring fits into the plan. In addition, within the timeline, some activities lack start and end dates.

Reader's Score: 9

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that the relevance and commitment of the partners as described will contribute to the implementation and success of the project. Each state voluntarily entered the project, demonstrated need and demonstrated commitment to the project. Letters of support (p. 55 – 62) from each partner demonstrate independent commitment and support for the project and for the evaluation portion of the project in order to determine success of the Lenses project and to integrate other school districts at their request. All partners are currently working on some type of literacy project and have shown interest in scaling successful projects. Competent staff are engaged from each entity and each has provided resumes and background information on all upper-level staff involved. All parties see the potential for expanding to rural school districts throughout the U.S.

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.

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly described a slow, deliberative process to ensure that services can be scaled up efficiently and remain effective. (p.e-29-30) The first year will be used to slowly implement the project in three states. Lenses is expanding from a two-week course to a lengthy ELA curriculum which includes Tier 1-3 supports, AI-assisted assessments, leadership development, and competency-based professional learning. Thus, it will take a full year to implement all supports and evaluative results may not be available until the second year. Massive amounts of data will be collected and will be available in a central depository for all partners and will document all successes and challenges. Regular meetings will be set to share findings. Scaling guides will be developed and disseminated to ensure that services can be scaled and remain effective.

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 has shown that all partners are committed to broad dissemination of information and resources to support further development, adaptation, or replication in other settings. All three states involved will disseminate information at the state level to researchers, parents, and teachers and will emphasize scaling and replication. (p.e-30-32) Scaling, implementation, and cost-effectiveness guides will be disseminated widely on public websites. Presentations will be made at national conferences and articles published in peer-reviewed journals. Carnegie Learning and WestEd will disseminate information widely as well. They will offer to re-design professional development programs, improve current offerings, and inform educators through publications. All of these efforts will contribute to the knowledge base of literacy training.

Sub

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: 17

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a fairly clear conceptual framework for its project which relates inputs to outcomes. They have used previous research (p. e-32-35) to support the development and expansion of their project. Their framework demonstrates how all involved parties can work together to improve literacy in the schools so that students improve their comprehension, knowledge, and reading and writing. The conceptual framework begins with complex, grade level texts and content and progresses through various knowledge-building and assessment phases until they reach high-quality implementation with supports built in.

Weaknesses:

There are some key points missing from the conceptual framework, which were discussed in other sections. This includes the High-Impact Tutoring and the use of AI. (p. e-124)

Reader's Score: 12

- 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 are clearly specified, measurable, and ambitious, yet achievable. They are detailed in the program narrative (p. e-32-36 and Table J.3 in the appendices.) Research underpins each goal and objective. Goals are: 1. Implement strategies to deliver services efficiently and effectively at scale; 2. Evaluate the implementation and impact of Lenses on Literature; 3. Dissemination of Resources and Findings; and 4. Evaluate sustaining and scaling efforts. The objectives, activities, start and end dates, lead organization, and lead role provide a roadmap for carrying out the project as they are complex and detailed. Successes and challenges will be documented along the way and corrections made. This framework is aligned with the purposes of the grant program.

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.

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.

Sub

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 clearly addresses CPP 2. In order to address Competitive Preference Priority 2, the project focuses on Lenses on Literature, which incorporates NSSA recognized high impact tutoring as a core component for Tier 3 students and small group and whole-class components for Tier 2 students. The impact of these subgroups will be considered in all analyses. (p. e-12)

Weaknesses:

The budget is a bit unclear about the rationale for the increase in funding for high-impact tutoring over the years.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 12:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2025 02:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

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	29
Sub Total	100	29
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	29

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (S411A250022)

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: 29

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 strong evidence that the project will meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. For example, the applicant demonstrates its intention to conduct a randomized controlled trial (RCT) of its curriculum program (p. e12). The evaluation will be a school-level RCT, with participating schools assigned to treatment or control status using blocked random assignment (p. e38). This blocking should ensure that school size, state factors, and prior literacy outcomes are considered. Students will be clustered within teachers within schools, which is appropriate, as the project is generally a school-wide program (pp. e38, 40).

As a strength, the applicant has considered the impact of attrition as well as joiner bias on the project. Attrition is expected to be minimal based on the applicant's experience with school-level randomized studies (p. e40). For example, student attrition is estimated to be less than 20% and students who join after randomization will not be included in the analytic sample (p. e40). The applicant also presents its treatment of missing data, which will appropriately include multiple imputation (p. e172).

As a strength, the applicant considers power and effect size. For example, the sample size will be 120 schools with half assigned to business as usual (p. e38). The minimum detectable effect size is .16 (p. 38). The applicant also includes a power analysis (p. e169). Effect sizes are provided for the intervention, which range from 4 to 9 months of additional growth in reading ability (p. e19).

The applicant details the variables that will be considered in the student outcome model, including enjoyment of reading, engagement, and standardized test scores in reading (p. e36). The evaluation plan connects research questions to data sources. For example, the impact of the project on reading engagement will be measured by the direct behavior rating (p. e37). As an additional strength, the research questions are reflected in the logic model. For example, one research question concerns increased teacher use of evidence-based instructional practice, which is part of the logic model (pp. e37, 124).

Fidelity of implementation is a major project feature, as evidenced by multiple project goals that consider fidelity of implementation (p. e24). In addition, the applicant provides a discussion of reliability and validity. For example, the applicant details the outcome variables, such as standardized state scores in reading, which are considered valid and reliable by the What Works Clearinghouse (pp. 38-39). As an additional example, the direct behavior rating has an inter-rater reliability of .80 and test-retest reliability exceeding .70 (p. e39).

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 presents strong evidence of the potential for implementation and scaling of the project. For example, the Maine Department of Education and Impact Florida will be the partners for this expansion (p. e12), and represent rural and other high-need student populations (pp. e17, 21). The proposed project contemplates multiple tiers of intervention, which lends itself to potential implementation in multiple settings (p. e13). The utilization of the in-person launch institutes will substantially strengthen adoption efforts, as targeted guidance enables district and campus leadership teams to understand the intervention program (p. e22).

Sub

As a strength that will allow for adoption in many settings, the research questions explore how the project is working for all students by subgroup (p. e41). For example, one research question considers teacher and classroom characteristics as moderators for the impact of the study (p. e37). In addition, the study will be conducted in a wide variety of school contexts, which increases generalizability of the study (p. e41).

The applicant details a plan to track and analyze costs and sustainment efforts during the grant period (p. e24). The evaluation will include how factors such as cost influence adoption (p. e36) and are included in the research questions (p. e37). The total costs as well as costs per student will be calculated (p. e42). This is a significant strength, as cost and sustainability will be of high importance in the adoption decision of potential implementing schools. The applicant will create cost effectiveness guides as well as implementation guides for districts (p. e31).

The applicant demonstrates its plan to disseminate the findings, including costs, success and challenges with program implementation (p. e42). Dissemination methods include webinars, conferences, journal articles, as well as social media (p. e42).

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 provides good evidence of a plan for measuring fidelity of implementation. One of the project's goals is to measure and evaluate the fidelity of the lenses project (p. e24). In particular, the applicant intends to have 100% of the new project components tested in at least 2 schools (p. e24).

The applicant details several fidelity measures including in the area of instructional materials, tutoring, workshop attendance, virtual conference attendance, and coaching cycles, with measures for both high and medium fidelity provided (p. e43). Fidelity scores will be assigned to teachers from 0 for low fidelity and .8 for high fidelity, in order to be considered in multiple research questions (p. e37). Program fidelity is also part of the project logic model (p. e124).

The project will conduct impact analyses for short- and medium-term outcomes in reading performance and standardized test scores (p. e35). Specific models are detailed in Appendix J.5 (p. e170).

The evaluator will provide fidelity information to inform program and systemic adjustments as well as targeted supports for schools or teachers (p. e44).

Weaknesses:

The application lacks clarity in the responsibility for and roles of program fidelity. Two partners, the main intervention partner and the evaluator, will monitor and measure implementation fidelity (pp. e24-25). The applicant discusses the role of the evaluator partner (p. e44), but it is unclear which duties related to program fidelity will fall to the intervention partner.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

strategies employed by the project.

Strengths:

The applicant provides excellent information about the effectiveness of the strategies proposed. For example, there are several What Works Clearinghouse reviews on the lenses around literacy strategy that show moderate to high evidence for its effectiveness (pp. e10,22). Possible replication in other settings is considered by the inclusion of analysis by subgroups (p. e12). The applicant presents evidence that it has expanded its prior study that focused on one tier of support, extending the validated model (p. e15). The applicant also provides an estimation of the impact of the intervention, which is four to nine months of additional literacy growth (pp. e17, 19).

The applicant presents reliability and validity considerations in the evaluation plan. For example, the applicant details the outcome variables, such as the elementary reading attitudes scales, which have a reliability of .79 (p. 39). In addition, the applicant demonstrates evidence of a plan for measuring fidelity of implementation, as one of the goals is to measure and evaluate the fidelity of the project (p. e24).

The applicant presents a dissemination plan that will guide possible replication. For example, one of the project goals is for dissemination of two resources reports per year, and three conference presentations (p. e24). As a particular strength, the applicant will disseminate findings to both research and practitioner audiences (p. e24). These findings will include guides in the areas of implementation, costs, scaling, and sustainability (p. e44).

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(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:

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 02:47 PM