

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

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	30
Sub Total	100	30
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	30

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Sub

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Sub

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a thorough and comprehensive evaluation plan and includes a discussion of various evaluation methods that will provide sufficient evidence of effectiveness that meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations, including statistical power and effect size benchmarks across projected outcomes, attrition rates, hierarchical linear models for the main impact analysis, moderator and mediator analyses, and strategies for handling multiple comparisons and missing data. (p. e79-e83)

The applicant presents clear and relevant research questions that are aligned to specific data sources and measures and are also aligned to key project impact, implementation, and cost-effectiveness outcomes. (p. e31)

The applicant provides a discussion of the well-explained and thorough evaluation methods used to produce evidence of project effectiveness, including a three-armed cluster RCT design, a pilot study, randomization within blocks of districts or groups of schools, and confirmatory and exploratory analyses incorporating student and teacher outcomes (p. e32).

The applicant presents a detailed evaluation plan with activities for each phase and component of the project, clearly delineated milestones, and monthly timelines for each year of the project (p. e69-e72).

The applicant provides a comprehensive table of teacher and student outcome measures and assessments, including the evidence-based or administrative data source, general description, reliability estimate, and WWC domain for each outcome measure. This evidence-based and peer-reviewed information strongly supports the evidence of effectiveness of the evaluation methods and instruments used to assess the project outcomes (p. e77-e78).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 a thorough explanation of effective strategies that can be adapted and replicated nationally, in that the project provides direct access to an open-access version of the AI integration professional development course. The applicant also proposes to offer an integration toolkit that includes templates, pacing guides, exemplars for embedding SRSD into existing instructional schedules, as well as fidelity and pacing exemplars documenting successful implementation models across diverse school contexts. (p. e23-e24)

The applicant clearly describes strategies to scale effective SRSD strategies and identify the settings and populations where it has the greatest impact by testing for differential effects across school, teacher, and student characteristics and by informing tailored strategies that align with specific student needs, school settings, and instructional contexts. (p. e37)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 describes a collaborative plan to establish clear thresholds for acceptable implementation, to refine these thresholds during the pilot phase to develop an implementation rubric, and to test and finalize these thresholds. (p. e38)

The applicant presents a clear and specific fidelity matrix that specifies examples of fidelity indicators, how they will be measured, and what thresholds will be used for determining no, partial, and full fidelity of implementation at each level (i.e., teacher/coach, school, and sample level). (p. e84-e85)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 clearly discusses design strategies to include valid and reliable evaluation data about project effectiveness, to guide replication, to inform continuous improvement, and to generate insights on how to scale and sustain SRSD efficiently and effectively. (p. e38)

The applicant presents a strong plan to explore sustained implementation and its association with outcomes and to identify key factors that support or hinder sustained implementation and effective strategies. One of these activities or strategies includes collecting qualitative data from four site visits each year (eight site visits total) at the schools with the highest levels of SRSD implementation and student achievement in literacy. These visits will include observations of staff and PLC meetings, collection of pacing guides and lesson plans, focus groups with teachers, and interviews with coaches and administrators. (p. e38-e39)

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(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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

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:

Not reviewed

Weaknesses:

Not reviewed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

Reader #2: *****

	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	0
Sub Total	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	115	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

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 proposal clearly communicates how the project is introducing an innovative approach. For example, the project extends Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) by developing and rigorously testing an innovative AI integration professional development (PD) course that supports coaches and teachers in embedding SRSD into their schools' existing curricula, content, and schedules. (p. e11). This new course will provide systematic tools, exemplars, and AI-driven planning supports to help coaches and teachers embed SRSD into diverse instructional contexts with greater ease and fidelity – all based on the years of experience the applicant brings to bear in providing professional development and supporting schools with SRSD integration. (p. e12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

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

Sub

that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.

Strengths:

The proposal clearly explains that there is unmet demand for a broader implementation of the project. For instance, the proposal cites research that shows teachers' desire for more effective writing instruction approaches. (p. e15). Moreover, the proposal cites research that states that principals and instructional leaders report significant pressure to improve writing outcomes, particularly for struggling students and those with disabilities. (p. e15). The proposal also cites research that shows state education agencies report needing better tools and resources to support districts in implementing evidence-based writing instruction (p. e15). This research collectively shows the unmet demand for the writing instruction that the proposed project will provide. Moreover, the integration of AI with the professional development to efficiently reach larger number of teachers clearly aligns the unmet demand with the level of scale the project is proposing (p. e11-e12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 proposal provides a management plan that is generally feasible to achieve the project objectives and goals. For example, in general, the roles of the three partner organizations are communicated (p. e16-e17). In addition, the project activities and milestones are communicated over the course of the project implementation (p. e17-e18). These activities and milestones are associated with project partners which shows who is responsible for those activities and conveys a level of accountability for completing those activities (p. e17-e18).

Weaknesses:

One aspect of the management plan are not clear. For example, the timeline is communicated annually, which does not make clear how the implementation of activities will unfold over the course of those years.

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

Each partner for the project is relevant and has fully demonstrated commitment to the implementation of the project. For example, fundamentally the proposal states that the project is anchored by a partnership among the Arizona Educational Foundation (AEF), SRSD Online, and the American Institutes for Research (AIR). In addition, the proposal includes letters of support that not only demonstrate the support and commitment of the main project partners, but also some of the schools with whom the project will work (p. e199-e207). Moreover, the roles of the partners are clearly communicated to show the relevance of the partnership and the capacity each bring to the project (p. e199-e207).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 proposal clearly communicates that the project services will be delivered more efficiently at scale and still maintain effectiveness. For example, the project will leverage SRSD Online professional development infrastructure and the Arizona Educational Foundations statewide networks. SRSD Online’s suite of asynchronous and synchronous courses—including modules for teachers, coaches, and leaders—has already demonstrated the ability to train large numbers of educators in cost-effective, flexible formats (p. e22). To ensure fidelity and quality, services will be delivered through a combination of asynchronous modules, synchronous coaching calls, practice-based professional development (PBPD) cycles in accordance with our existing PD scope and sequence, plus ongoing technical assistance (p. e22). SRSD Online will monitor engagement and progress within the course platform, provide feedback to coaches through PBPD structures, and ensure consistent pacing across treatment schools. AEF will support delivery by managing communications with districts, coordinating logistics, and ensuring alignment with state-level priorities (p. e22). Together, these components ensure high-quality scaling for the project.

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 proposal fully conveys that the project will employ a variety of mechanisms to disseminate what is learned from the project. For example, some of these strategies include a professional development course, a toolkit, and policy briefs, among other strategies (p. e23-e24). In addition, the applicant will produce conference presentations, newsletters, webinars and a variety of other strategies to communicate what is learned from this project to a diversity of audiences (p. e24). These multiple approaches of the dissemination plan shows that the project can effectively communicate what is learned from the project to a variety of educational professionals.

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: 20

Sub

Sub

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

Strengths:

The proposal provides a high-quality logic model that visually represents the rationale for the project (p. e47). For example, the logic model includes the core activities for the project that shows a relationship with the outcomes of the project (p. e47). In addition, the proposal details mediators that influences that relationship between activities and outcomes, such as improved classroom writing instruction (p. e47). Notably, the logic model provides contextual moderators, such as the characteristics of the coaches (p. e47), which reveals an understanding and appreciation of the complexity of the project's implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The proposal clearly lays out specific and measurable goals, objectives and outcomes for the project. For example, the proposal provides four goals for the project (p. e28-e29), such as goal one, which is to develop and refine supports for integrating SRSD into schools (p. e29). These goals are further specified by aligning objectives with the goals in the proposal (p. e29). Plus, to show how measurable these goals and objectives are, the proposal provides specific strategies for measuring the objectives as well as target outcomes that the project is anticipating (p. e28-e29). For example, the proposal states that the number of pilot participants completing the AI integration course as a measure and aims to have 10 coaches and 50 teachers as the target. (p. e28). The combination of the measurable outcomes and the targets established in the proposal communicate that the project team will be able to monitor their progress toward their project goals.

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 proposal does not address the criteria for competitive preference priority one. Specifically, the lead applicant is not a state educational agency, an Indian Tribe or a consortium of the two.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address the criteria for competitive preference priority one. Specifically, the lead applicant is not a state educational agency, an Indian Tribe or a consortium of the two.

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 proposal does not address competitive preference priority two.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address competitive preference priority two.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

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	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	67
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	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Arizona Educational Foundation (S411A250024)

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 an excellent description of the proposed intervention to extend the implementation and use of an existing evidence-based self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) program to teach writing by utilizing AI-supported professional development for instructional coaches (p. e12). The program solves an enablement issue where educators and coaches gain tools to blend SRSD into the existing curriculum and instructional practices (p. e12). Working with the program, coaches will build instructional programs that include an evidence-based literacy instructional support with measures in place for sustainable adoption and the reduction of systemic barriers. Currently, the program is being implemented in RCTs across the state in a variety of locations, with an emphasis on rural locations (p. e8). The applicant provides citations that discuss promising results and its impact on student populations, and proposes new ways the strategy can be leveraged into diverse instructional contexts and generate tools and exemplars that enable optimal results (p. e13). Additionally, they provide data and research on persistent writing performance challenges experienced by American students. The innovative intervention prioritizes teacher learning which extends positive impact to students beyond the project lifespan, and can transform teacher development alongside instructional coaches that includes AI integration (p. e13-14). The applicant includes example checklists and scope and sequence in the appendix (p. e50).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 effectively highlights two priorities in their comprehensive scaling strategy: to demonstrate the intervention's effectiveness and to build a sustainable infrastructure (p. e14). This approach encompasses multiple features that include a meaningful partner commitment and a structured management plan (p. e15). Unmet demand is discussed on multiple levels including teacher, school, district and state with relevant citations (p. e15-16).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 presents a feasible management plan that is reasonably aligned to project objectives and outcomes and allows for achievable goals within project lifecycle and proposed budget. They include a high-level overview of the project timeline with key activities and milestones (p.e17). The partner roles are mapped to activities organized by year (p. e17-18). Project activities include student writing, observations and surveys. The applicant describes a project advisory board that will leverage various experts and representatives to drive program implementation with letters of support in the appendix (p. e18). Risks and mitigation strategies are identified as critical to the project success (p. e18). Additionally, brief descriptions of the three key partners are provided with roles ascribed, such as project administrators and executive leadership team (p. e17)

Weaknesses:

More detailed information is needed to better understand the training timelines, implementation cycles and progress monitoring across the various partner groups and implementation of the project activities.

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 provides compelling letters of support in Appendix C that detail expressed commitments from proposed partner groups. Each partner outlines their commitment, such as conducting the evaluation (AIR, p. e203) or noting the impact of the existing intervention and commitment to scale within the Maricopa County School District

Sub

(p.204). Additionally, the applicant a brief discussion of their track records of success. For example, Arizona Educational Foundation (AEF) has proven success providing professional development to Arizona educators and representation on local efforts around workforce development (p. e20). The principal investigator, [REDACTED], has scaled the SRSD training across the country and has a deep understanding of the program and its success components (p. e21). American Institutes of Research, AIR, their evaluator partner is a reputable agency of experts and have a depth of experience in research and evaluation, and developing materials that are actionable and evidence-based.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 provides a strong plan to scale and effectively maintain the fidelity of the intervention. They include a detailed discussion of the sustainability methods, such as leveraging digital platform to make professional development more accessible and optimize delivery through synchronous and asynchronous learning. The platform content will be integrated within existing the school's scope and sequence, and offers AI-assistance (p. e22). Additionally, the integration within daily schedules and pacing guides extends familiarity and aligns the approach to desired teacher behaviors and practices. AEF will support oversight of the various scaling strategies to ensure alignment with state-level priorities and consistent delivery (p. e23).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 proposes a robust and cohesive dissemination plan that utilizes multiple communication strategies, such as research briefs, technical reports and policy guidance through their AIR evaluative partners (p. e21). Findings and lessons learned will be available at no cost and include an AI-integration PD course, toolkit and strategies, pacing exemplars and policy briefs (p. e24). Findings will be disseminated on the local and national level through newsletters and presentations across the partner networks and outlets.

Sub

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: 20

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a logic model that thoroughly outlines key project components, core activities, mediators and outcomes (Appendix G). There is a strong discussion within the narrative of the key intervention components that include relevant research aligned to key components and activities (p. 25-26). For example, job-embedded professional learning connects new practices to existing knowledge and beliefs for educators (p. e26). Applicant acknowledges the role of contextual moderators as outside influencers on student success (p. e28)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a well-defined outcome table organized by project years complete with aligned project goals, objectives and performance measures (p. e28-29). The sequence of goals and objectives is reasonable for the proposed timing of key activities and measurement. Applicant includes teacher-centered measures such as confidence in embedding SRSD, rigorous testing with and without AI supports.

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:

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.

Sub

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 does not address this criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this criteria.

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 does not address this criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:50 PM