

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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	18
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	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Midphase - 8: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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 shows an extension of a statistically significant literacy program initiative. For example, Sarasota County Schools initiated the Strauss Literacy Initiative, which is a cohort and pilot model approach to support teacher professional learning around early literacy instruction with the ultimate intent of improving student literacy proficiency with its partnership through University of Florida's Lastinger Center (e13). Furthermore, the applicant noted increased student literacy proficiency in Grade 2 and outlined various growth measures for interventionist, student groups, and overall district scores (e13, e28).

The applicant adequately focuses on the proof of concept of the Straus Literacy Initiative around its current work in Grades K-2 (e14). For example, previous year pilot participants showed statistical growth (e13). The project demonstrates added validity as the district-level leadership proposes to move the project from its voluntary pilot participation to full integration.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 demonstrates sufficient longitudinal FAST data showcasing a literacy gap, or unmet need exists (e13). In addition, the implementation of structured literacy support during the previous program pilot of 1,000 students across twelve elementary schools displayed literacy proficiency improvements (e14). The extension of this project to Grades 3-5 will directly impact another 120 teachers and 4,200 students while keeping a focus on meeting the widening literacy gap for students with disabilities (SWD) and English Learners at Targeted or Comprehensive Support and Improvement (TSI/CSI) sites, which is meeting the current unmet demand (e14).

The applicant has standard potential to scale the proposed project to support literacy achievement. For instance, in the previous year, the applicant developed voluntary pilots using the University of Florida Lastinger Center's Flamingo small-group coaching, embedded professional learning, and intervention support and received positive comments from surveyed teachers that it heightened confidence in implementing Science of Reading practices (e14).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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 demonstrates exceptional organizational capacity, presenting a management plan that clearly exceeds expectations through its well-defined structure, realistic timelines, and strong alignment with project objectives and goals. For example, the milestones reflect an alignment to support professional learning (e22-e23). The milestones are measurable like 120 teachers complete the University of Florida (UF) Flamingo Literacy Science of Reading (SoR) professional learning modules and 26 school leaders complete Flamingo Literacy Leadership Series and participate in peer-learning communities (e22). At the conclusion of this proposed project, the milestones could be measured easily, which will support accomplishing project tasks on time and within budget.

The project demonstrates added validity as the district-level leadership proposes to move the project from its voluntary pilot participation to full integration. The defined responsibilities were well documented (e22-e23). For instance, the University of Florida's Lastinger Center, district literacy coaches and interventionist, and Sarasota County Elementary Director are clearly noted as ensuring completion of their designated milestones.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

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 clearly outlined the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each project partner (e22). For example, University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning is offering the sustained professional learning cohorts, coaching cycles, and fidelity monitoring while the Community Foundation of Sarasota County and Barancik Foundation are offering financial support to support the Science of Reading, which complements goal #1 and objectives 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 (e22, e42).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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's plan demonstrates a reasonable level of organization and feasibility. For example, the applicant demonstrated capacity to implement large-scale literacy initiatives with documented student increases in literacy proficiency (e43, e55). Therefore, it is plausible Sarasota County Schools would be able to continue to scale the project to additional grade levels with similar results. The applicant offered a powerful grade-by-grade approach to enhancing literacy achievement. For example, in Sarasota County Schools' previous Flamingo cohorts targeted grade-level approach yielded growth compared to schools not participating in the program (e41). The proposed plan demonstrates strong potential for sustained success by strategically extending its established and effective framework to grades 3-5.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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 application demonstrates a comprehensive and well-structured plan for assessing effectiveness and ensuring meaningful dissemination of results and resources, reflecting a strong commitment to transparency and sustained impact (e19). For example, partner University of Florida's Lastinger Center proposes to take the lead disseminating findings through its state-wide and national networks while submitting peer-reviewed journals (e46). In addition, there will be replication toolkits disseminated showcasing the impact and potential for other school districts to adopt a similar model (e16).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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: 18

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 proposal is grounded in the Science of Reading (SoR) as its conceptual framework. For instance, the framework "emphasizes explicit, systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension" (e13). The SoR is often cited as an evidence-based framework of model (e23).

The conceptual framework aligns closely to the project's measurable goals and outcomes. For example, project success will be measured through both teacher and students outcomes (e17). The inputs or activities are aligned in the applicant's timeline and aligns back to the project's measurable outcomes (e20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not represent a visual model of the logic model. Without the visual representation, the proposal lacked details to fully discern the relationships between the inputs and related outcomes.

Reader's Score: 13

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 outlines aligned project goals and objectives (e42-e43) within the proposed project. For example, each objective indicated "delivering professional learning and coaching cohorts, establish teacher-leader cadres, and increase teacher confidence and efficacy," which is clearly aligned to its parent-goal of strengthening teacher capacity around structured literacy instruction in grades 3-5 (e42).

The applicant's proposed objectives are measurable with clearly defined indicators that allow for consistent assessment of progress and impact. For example, objective 2.1 and measures stated, increase the percentage of grade 3-5 students meeting or exceeding proficiency on FAST Reading by 10 percentage points while comparing results longitudinally to FAST and STAR data offers the quantifiable measures to determine success, past and present (e15). As evidenced by the proposal's comprehensive vision and measurable outcomes, the applicant demonstrates an ambitious scope of achievement, reflecting a strong commitment to innovation, growth, and measurable impact.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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,

Sub

including valid and reliable information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

There were no strengths identified.

Weaknesses:

The applicant identified as Sarasota County Schools (e11), which is not a State Education Agency or Indian Tribe, Tribal organization, or Tribal Education Agency, which is preferential for Competitive Priority #1.

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 proposes serving high-need student populations and strengthening the educator workforce through sustainable, evidence-based professional learning (e22), which is directly connected to its attempt to accelerate learning. In addition, the applicant is expanding an evidence-based literacy intervention with demonstrated positive impact on student achievement, which aligns to high-impact tutoring (e23).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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	18
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	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Midphase - 8: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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 seeks to build upon the Strauss Literacy Initiative that has consistently shown positive impacts in the school district for grades K-2. This program, grounded in sound literature, has outperformed the district literacy averages in percentile growth and academic achievement level growth. (e.13) The project is a progressive, innovative approach to explore the positive impact of modifying the current initiative for an older student population. (e.13) The applicant proposes to build upon the success of the program by extending this proven learning system to the upper-elementary grades to sustain the gains earned in the early years and ensure equitable literacy outcomes for all students. (e.13). In addition to the data from the previous school years, the applicant presents data from teacher surveys that corroborate the outcomes with over 90 percent reporting a significant impact on their practice. (e.13) These results underscore the scalability and replicability of the model.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 offers longitudinal data revealing that literacy gaps widen as students move into grades 3-5. The applicant cites research that states without extended structured literacy support, struggling readers continue to fall behind. (e.13) The applicant shares how more than 1,000 students in the program outpaced the non-participating students in the district, which supports the broader implementation of the project. (e.14) Extending this framework to double teacher participation and increasing student participation to 4,200 ensures the resources reach the highest need population to include students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. (e.14)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 offers a structured management plan to support the expansion of an existing literacy initiative. (e.13). The approach aligns with all the goals with primary focus to scale-up and implement systems for continuous improvement. (e 16) The applicant offers the school district's demonstrated ability to implement large scale literacy initiatives noting their past success. (e.16). The applicant provides several clearly defined goals such as providing professional development along with product that will be used to provide the service, verification of outcomes of activities and the responsible parties. (e.49). This plan also includes milestones that align with the goals and timeline aiding in the accomplishment of project tasks. (e.49). The reasonable budget adequately aligns with the project goals and objectives to ensure the financial obligations of the project are met. (e.72-74).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Many of the key personnel and partners who are committed to the success of the project, were involved in the successful implementation of the K-2 initiative and are fully prepared to replicate and scale for grades 3-5. (e.48) The applicant clearly outlined the experience and responsibility requirements for the key personnel ensuring that the most highly qualified personnel will be responsible for leading the tasks required for the project's success. (e.22-23). The local community foundations demonstrate partner involvement and commitment to the project's success by matching federal funding. (e. 49). For example, Strauss Fund and Barancik Fund will provide \$1.5 million ensuring sustainability during as well as beyond the federal funding period. (e.44)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The current literacy initiative, grounded in The Science of Reading (SOR) has been implemented with fidelity across the schools in the same schools that the replication and the expansion will be implemented. (e.40) The previous phase in of the grade-by-grade method has proven successful and demonstrates sufficient efficacy and scalability to warrant the project's replication with grades 3-5. (e.41)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 offers an extensive plan to disseminate evidence of the project's effectiveness. (e16). They propose a quasi-experimental evaluation comparing impact of the project on student literacy outcomes. Additional they will publish findings through peer-reviewed journals as well as develop replication toolkits that will aid in the adoption by school districts and state systems. (e.16)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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: 18

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 offers a project grounded in the Science of Reading framework that aims to provide the structured literacy instruction to a diverse population of students in grades 3-5. (e.24). The project's success will be measured through both teacher and student outcomes (e.17) to reflect the impact of teacher training and implementation of the model and student gains in literacy. (e23)

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not present a visual logic model to represent the relationships between the input, outputs and outcomes which would aid in fully understanding the project's implementation plan.

Reader's Score: 13

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:

They clearly define the goals and objectives, such as improving delivery instruction for diverse learners, as well as services and mechanisms imbedded for outcome verification, all of which align with the purposes of the grant. (e.22)
The success, experience and data from the previous proven program, at a smaller scale, allows the applicant the leverage to remove barriers that may impede the project's success as well as demonstrate the ability of goal attainment within the project's timeframe. (e.75)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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.

Sub

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:

No strengths were indicated.

Weaknesses:

The project lead is not a State Education Agency or Tribal Education Agency as defined in 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:

The applicant proposes to scale a proven literacy learning instruction aimed at increasing literacy proficiency in upper elementary grades as well as closing the literacy gaps in subgroups. The project is transformational and impactful particularly in small group instruction. (e.13)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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 #6 - Midphase - 8: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: School Board of Sarasota County (S411B250062)

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

Sub

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

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:

The proposed evaluation plan is well designed and would, if well implemented, produce sufficient moderate-to strong evidence about the effectiveness of the project on relevant outcomes that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations (p.e39). The proposed evaluation plan aligns with WWC v4.1 standard (p.e17). The proposed evaluation plan is a quasi- experimental design (p.e12). The proposed evaluation plan, as written, aims to produce evidence of effectiveness measured through growth assessments, fidelity rubrics & surveys (p.e12, p.e39). The proposed evaluation plan includes clear and specific objectives tied to well defined metric-centered outcomes (p.e42). The proposed evaluation plan incorporates strong mix-method design with matched comparison groups aimed at producing rigorous insight (p.e43). The proposed evaluation plan incorporates clear and reasonable goals and a well-structured logic model, management plan, and specific timeline (p.e46, p.e.23). The proposed plan also includes strong objectives with clear metrics and well-defined measurable indicators in stated increments (annual, quarterly, etc.) (p.e15- p.e16). The proposed evaluation plan aims to build upon established research and integrate strategies to strengthen and expand partnerships to ensure continuity of literacy gains (p.e48).

Weaknesses:

The proposed evaluation plan is well aligned to WWC standards but is not specific about its ability to meet WWC without reservations. The proposed plan does not include specific and focused strategies to ensure this alignment and needs additional context on strategies that would meet this objective.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation, as written, would provide strong guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing and potential implementation in other settings. The evaluation plan incorporates well-established strategies and research based on the science of reading (p.e13). The plan is well crafted, and includes strategies aimed at ensuring fidelity across schools & partnership with University of Florida, community foundation of Sarasota, etc. (p.e.14). The proposed plan aims to integrate Flamingo small group coaching with embedded professional learning, & interventions support aligned with Florida literacy objectives (p.e.14). The evaluation plan includes several replicable strategies including the Straus Flamingo model that is included with the aim of applying and building off established framework (p.e14). The proposed evaluation plan has a sound and well-crafted plan that establishes continuous-improvement dashboards with various specified rubrics (p.e21). The proposal also includes a strong plan to integrate various oversight partners from district, independent and external evaluators (p. e22).

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

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 proposed evaluation plan demonstrates strong quality and fidelity of implementation. The proposed incorporates clear and well-defined outcomes tied to stated objectives (p.e15- p.e16). The proposed evaluation plan includes a strategy of Implementation that aims to build from and improve prior studies strategies. The proposed evaluation plan incorporates a well-defined system-level metric-centered outcomes (p.e.18). The proposed plan has

Sub

well-defined and time bound strategies including specific tracking and indicators by year 2; measured through instructional dashboards (p. e18). The proposed plan includes strong objective strategies including independent evaluation strategy via the Sarasota Research, Accountability, and Evaluation (RAE) department that would lead internal data collect & analysis (p.e18). The proposed plan integrates a strong evaluation strategy including leveled analysis, propensity score, and various specified evaluation indicators; student, teacher, subgroups (disabled, ELL, Disadvantaged) (p.e18).

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

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 proposed plan, as designed, has a clear and replicable explanation of project activities. The replicability of the proposed plan, as written, integrates core research questions with defined strategies for replication and scaling (p. e41). The plan includes measurable outcomes and objectives that are very well aligned (e42). The proposed evaluation plan includes an independent facilitator through the University of Florida Lastinger (p.e17). The plan has a strong continuity strategy with proposed 1:1 cost share (p.e17). The proposed plan has a strong and well-defined strategy for tracking outcomes to strategies including defined measurements of impact measured through state and national metrics, (p.e19). The proposed plan includes a well-crafted logic model with a timeline connected to objectives and indicators (p.e19- p.e21). The proposed evaluation plan includes a well-structured sustainability plan with considerations for local district and future funding (p.e20-21). The plan has strong alignment with previous study outcomes with specified goals to improve/expand (p.e29). The evaluation plan, as written, includes a specific plan for continuity with community foundation sharing cost of project after 2 years (p.e.47).

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

- (a) State educational agencies (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7801(49))**
- (b) An Indian Tribe (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(e)), Tribal organization (as defined in 25 U.S.C. 5304(l)), or Tribal educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7452(b)(3))**
- (c) Consortia of the entities identified under this priority.**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Expanding Education Choice (High-Impact Tutoring) (up to 5 points).

Projects or proposals that will expand access to education services that accelerate learning such as high-impact tutoring.

Note: Applicants are encouraged to review the evidence related to education services that accelerate learning, including high-impact tutoring, and to cite the highest-level of evidence supporting their response to the competitive preference priority in their application.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:54 PM