

**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: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

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: 25

Sub

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes strong evaluation methods that will produce evidence of effectiveness for relevant literacy outcomes. The applicant proposes to implement two RCTs, each with three treatment arms, that have well-documented student randomization procedures, adequate sample sizes, and evidence-based minimum detectable effect sizes (p. e38-e39).

The applicant thoroughly describes the inclusion of specific evaluation methods, such as regression adjusted impacts to control for student characteristics, baseline measures of achievement, attrition-controlling attributes, and an intent-to-treat (ITT) framework (p. e42, e110, e111).

The applicant presents a comprehensive discussion of how the evaluation will conduct subgroup analyses to explore which student groups benefit most from early intervention, as well as to examine key outcomes and impacts by race, gender, grade level, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, and baseline reading levels (p. e42).

The applicant provides detailed and specific research questions that are aligned with the evaluation plan and evidence-based evaluation methods and outcomes (p. e37-e38).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide an adequate explanation of why schools are given the choice to choose tutoring type and how this decision will impact the evaluation analysis. There is no discussion of how potential bias will be acknowledged and adjusted for, nor how the tutoring selections will be balanced among the schools, especially if more schools choose one type of tutoring over another (p. e38).

The applicant does not adequately explain why more rural than urban districts will be sampled and how this may lead to potential bias or sample imbalance that can negatively affect the evaluation outcomes (p. e38).

Reader's Score: 12

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 provides valuable information on effective strategies for replication by informing whether schools and districts can implement Air Reading at lower intensity and ECRI with higher tutor-student ratios (p. e43).

There is a convincing discussion of how both tutoring strategies can shed light on projected costs, allow states and districts to achieve scale, as well as to provide helpful information to allow other districts and settings to make an informed decision about the trade-off between intensity and cost when replicating and scaling the project (p. e43).

The applicant clearly describes how the project will provide useful insights on potential supports and barriers for replicating and scaling up the programs, thoroughly analyze tutoring outcomes data, and conduct semi-structured small group interviews with staff from each district to identify key takeaways for districts seeking to replicate these programs. These strategies will support the successful replication of the project strategies in other settings (p. e43).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicates that there will be two additional districts in the first and last school years, but it is not clear what will be studied with these two districts, what the expected outcomes are, if and how these two districts will be included in the project evaluation, and what specific guidance from these two districts will be produced to support replication of the project (p. e43).

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 clearly describes the main sources of data on tutoring implementation for both tutoring programs, including tutoring implementation logs and formal observations (p. e44).

The applicant presents detailed thresholds for acceptable implementation and implementation data sources for both the virtual and in-person tutoring programs, including the frequency, duration, and overall quantity of tutoring sessions per school year (p. e114-e115).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant provides a minimum threshold of 85% for the percentage of tutoring sessions attended for the in-person tutoring program, there is not a similar threshold provided for the virtual tutoring program (p. e111). Therefore, the acceptable implementation threshold for this component is not clear.

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 strategies employed by the project.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly proposes to utilize valid, reliable, and grade- appropriate measures of students' literacy achievement; utilize literacy assessments approved by the state and administered multiple times per school year to measure progress and effectiveness (p. e41).

The applicant presents detailed models of important mediators and moderators, baseline literacy proficiency measures, and tutor fixed effects to determine tutor effectiveness. This valid and reliable implementation data will provide important context on not only whether the tutoring programs are effective but for whom and under what conditions that can be replicated in other settings (p. e45).

The applicant provides thorough guidance for decision makers on cost effective strategies for implementing each evidence-based tutoring program by informing decisions about the tutor-student ratio and the frequency of tutoring sessions. These implementation findings will describe supports, barriers, and key aspects related to the effective impacts of the evaluation design (p. e45).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Sub

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:

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: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	70
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	70

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

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 presents an innovative approach to addressing improved student outcomes. First, the project will combine and monitor the overall effectiveness of two innovative methods for delivering tutoring: a virtual tutoring platform and an in-person model using paraeducators as tutors (p. e14). Additionally, the project will use the applicant's innovative approach for measuring tutoring efficiency and cost-effectiveness so that they consider not only whether the tutoring programs work, but how efficiently they generate learning gains (p. e15). The proposal goes on to explain that this is an emerging innovation that requires further testing as it can provide valuable information via standardized metrics for school system leaders who must make budgeting tradeoffs when they implement even successful interventions (p. e15-e16). These two components—the combination of two tutoring methods and the framework to measure tutoring efficiency—fully address this criterion.

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: 35

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 proposal fully communicates the extent to which there is unmet demand for the broader implementation of the project. For example, according to recent data, 45% of schools in the south region of the U.S. offer high-impact tutoring (p. e17). Meanwhile, just 23% of grade 4 students in the state of Oklahoma were proficient in reading on the 2024 NAEP 6, placing it among the lowest states in terms of grade 4 reading proficiency (p. e17). In addition, the proposal provides further need for academic interventions by presenting state data that shows the two partner school districts having elementary schools receiving a D or F grade (27 of 32 in one and 37 of 46 in the other (p. e17). These data clearly substantiate the unmet demand that is shown in the target region being served.

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 high-quality management plan for implementing the project. For example, the proposal includes a clear timeline that conveys the sequence of activities for the project (p. e33-e36). In addition, the timeline includes milestones, which communicate what the project will accomplish over the course of each year in the project (p. e33-e36). For accomplishing the milestones, the applicant also indicates the lead organization assigned to each of the milestones (p. e33-e36). This shows a level of accountability that the milestones will be completed. Overall, these details show that the project will be guided by a high-quality management plan.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 proposal provides a clear overview of the partner involvement in the project. For example, the proposal lists the primary partners involved in the project (p. e19-e20). In addition, the proposal describes the primary responsibilities that each partner will carry out. In addition, the proposal includes letters of commitment from the project partners (p. e72-e94). These letters further demonstrate the partners commitment to implementing the project and addressing the overall goals of the project.

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 provides a high-quality plan to deliver project services more efficiently at scale and maintain effectiveness. For example, scale and sustainability are embedded in every phase of the project (p. e13). This includes through data infrastructure, state education agency (SEA) leadership, and policy alignment (p. e13). This project will produce nationally relevant tools and cost-efficiency data to guide other states seeking to embed high-impact tutoring in their literacy improvement efforts (p. e13). Ultimately, it will serve as the catalyst for further state-led initiatives focused on bringing evidence-based practices. This focus on scaling shows that the project plans to deliver services efficiently and effectively at scale.

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 provides a comprehensive plan to disseminate what is learned from the project. For example, the proposal lists the various mechanisms that the project will employ for communicating this work (p. e24-e25). These mechanisms include a cost-analysis & ROI tool, practitioner guides, policy briefs, conferences, webinars and media engagement (p. e24-e25). In addition, the proposal clarifies what will constitute success for each dissemination mechanism (p. e24-e25). For example, with the practitioner guides, the project will highlight best practices in dosage fidelity, data integration, and cost management, and host quarterly webinars based on project findings (p. e24-e25). In total, the proposal fully communicates a detailed plan for sharing findings from the project.

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

Sub

project, including how inputs are related to outcomes.

Strengths:

The proposal includes a detailed logic model that thoroughly communicates the rationale for implementation of the project activities (p. e95-e98). For example, the logic model articulates the inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes for the project (p.e95-e98). To convey more specificity, the logic model aligns each of components with the four goals of the project (p. e95-e98). This clarifies the rationale for project activities and how those activities are aligned with the intended outputs and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly communicates how the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable and ambitious (p. e28-e33). For example, the proposal lists the four goals for the project. As an example, goal four is to establish sustainable state policies and data systems to support long-term tutoring programs in OSDE that can be applied nationally at scale (p. e32). Plus, the proposal aligns outcomes and anticipated impact with each of the objectives. For example, the outcomes expected from goal four will be the adoption of sustainable state funding mechanisms for high-impact tutoring and state education department staff being trained in data management, fidelity monitoring, and cost analysis (p. e33). This alignment and specificity of goals, objectives and outcomes shows that the project's impact will be measurable, as well as ambitious.

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address this competitive preference proposal since the project will not be carried out by a state educational agency or an Indian Tribe or a consortium of those two entities.

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 project aims to expand access to education services that accelerate learning. In particular, the project will do this through high-impact tutoring (p. e9). To do this, the project will rigorously evaluate how variations in tutoring delivery (virtual vs. in-person, frequency, and group size) affect both learning outcomes and cost efficiency (p. e9). The project's open-source cost analysis and Data Alignment and Tutoring Assessment Standards (DATAS) make it a national model for evidence-based budgeting and sustainability (p. e9).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	70
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	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Expansion Panel - 2: 84.411A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Accelerate: The National Collaborative for Accelerated Learn (S411A250025)

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 presents a strong overview of the proposed project's innovation that includes a multi-part Randomized Control Trial (RCT) that evaluates and compares tutoring delivery methods from a student impact and cost efficiency standpoint (p. e13). The RCT will follow the impact of tutoring delivered through a virtual platform and facilitated in-person by paraeducators. Tapping into the capacity of paraeducators also offers potential impact for scale that increases skill and potential to address the teacher shortage crisis. The applicant includes a detailed description of their innovative approach and defines key components to be measured, such as tutoring efficiency and cost effectiveness (p. 16). The applicant describes the tutoring methodology and training partner within the partner group discussions on p. e23. Taken together, these components represent a highly innovative approach.

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: 35

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 presents compelling data about low proficiency in reading among the majority of Oklahoma students (77%) (p. e17). Additionally, the applicant explains that high-impact tutoring is not currently available at scale and that cost is a barrier for large-scale interventions across the state. Leveraging a low-cost virtual option and/or existing personnel to support implementation are strong drivers for broader implementation. The applicant includes promising findings and evidence for the virtual intervention to support their discussion of meeting an unmet demand (p. e22). Therefore, the unmet need is very clearly established.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 includes a clearly detailed management plan that captures high-level descriptions and functions of proposed partners. This includes partners at the state- and local-level. The State Education Agency (SEA) will act as state implementation lead, while a training partner will ensure that paraeducators are trained and have the necessary skills to implement the in-person training model. A detailed management plan that outlines critical milestones and timelines, such as tutor recruitment and dissemination tasks, will ensure that the project is feasibly managed (p. e33-36).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

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 includes strong letters of support from partner groups expressing their commitment and enthusiasm to implement the intervention. This includes the SEA who've already secured 14 partner districts (p. e21). Letters from partnerships outline their roles and contributions at a high-level and indicate a deep understanding of potential impact for student achievement and agency implementation, such as cost-effectiveness and accessibility. Partner groups also are widely known as experts and have experience operating at the desired levels needed for scaled implementation.

Sub

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 thorough description of their scaling efforts across the management plan, timeline along with a discussion of key activities that will occur in partnership with proposed agency and organizational partners. The applicant discusses continuous improvement efforts that will be monitored continuously with their evaluation partner, Mathematica (p. e27). They indicate the inclusion of quarterly and annual reports that will produce insights and real-time perspectives on the intervention's strengths and needs. Taken together, these activities represent a very thorough and high-quality plan to deliver project services.

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 presents a comprehensive dissemination plan that maximizes partner group networks such as a research learning community and local/national conferences (p. e26). Additionally, they will host school site visits for partner groups to get a closer perspective of the tutoring impact (p. e26). Data fellows from Harvard will be tasked with creating content and materials, such as toolkits, that can be easily and broadly distributed to share promising results and positive impact.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 includes a high-quality logic model with key components, such as inputs, activities and outcomes clearly identified (p. e36). Assigned partner roles are included on the management plan (p. e37). Inputs are clearly aligned to outcomes and impact. For example, the cost analysis tool will be leveraged to generate cost efficiency for the pilot program. A potential impact would be the ability to share the tool with the field-at-large (p. e31).

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 provides clear goals and objectives that are measurable and sequential to the project lifecycle (p. e35). For example, the number of students who receive the intervention will gradually expand across the lifespan of the project (p. e28). They propose 80% of students who receive tutoring will have increased proficiency (p. e29).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

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.

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 meet the criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not meet the 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:

Applicant proposes the use of two high-impact tutoring programs for this intervention. Both intervention models have promising results among students who read below grade level and utilize an evidence-based methodology (p. e22-23).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

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