

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2025 09:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Educatio (S411B250079)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	13
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	32
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	14
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	59
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	4
<b>Total</b>	115	73

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Educatio (S411B250079)

## 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: 13

#### 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 clearly defines the instructional coherence model (p.e14) it plans to develop to better ensure students' reading improvement. The proposed model provides for teacher professional development (PD) materials, High Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) and paid PD planning time for both teachers and administrators.

The proposal plans to invest in tribal leaders, governments and school boards to help ensure that the HQIMs, (High-Impact Tutoring) and professional development as proposed will be monitored through its System to Sustain Alignment which will help ensure their innovative approach will be effective (pp.e16-e18)

#### Weaknesses:

The proposal does not provide specifics on what investment in the Tribal Leaders, governments and school boards will be provided. Type and means of investment would be helpful.

Reader's Score: 13

### 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:**

Statistics provided in the application clearly demonstrate the pressing need for a broader implementation of the project. The target population's dramatic deficiencies compared to national averages (child poverty rate of 26% versus 16%, chronic absenteeism rate of 45% versus 28%, significantly lower reading proficiency rates, etc. pp.e19-e20) demonstrate the need for the project.

The Bureau of Indian Education recognizes literacy as a top strategic priority.

**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's management plan establishes a communication schedule which identifies when certain participants will meet and provides funding to ensure such meetings are held and reported upon (pp. e21 – e22).

Table in Exhibit 1 (pp. e22 – e24) clearly identifies the milestones to be achieved, the timeline by which the milestones are to be met, and the parties responsible for accomplishing the identified tasks.

**Weaknesses:**

The vast majority (32 of 38) of the tasks have been assigned as the responsibility of either of the two consulting partners (TNTP and WestEd). The budget narrative does not address how the tribal leaders, schools, and teachers will be compensated if at all.

**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:**

The proposal shows that the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education is chartered and funded by Congress to act as a bridge between the Bureau of Indian Education and the Tribal Nations (p.e26).

**Sub**

The proposal clearly identifies the interrelationship of the parties to the project (and the history of them working successfully together).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 proposal's goal is to create a replicable model for Tribal and rural schools by developing leaders and Tribal council facilitators within each school in a train the trainer model. Thus the teachers and leaders who have been trained will be paid to provide "on-going, job-embedded coaching to their peers (p.e28).

The proposal plans to develop 2-year cohorts of schools to share practices and solutions through virtual communities of practice during the life of the grant and beyond (p. e28).

**Weaknesses:**

The manner in which the high-impact tutoring is to be conducted and by whom is unclear.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 (NFEAIE) participates in national awareness efforts and can disseminate effective practices and materials across all Bureau of Indian Education Schools as well as other schools planning similar initiatives.

Through blog posts, social media accounts and presentations at national educational conferences, in conjunction with its partners TNTP and WestEd, the applicant will disseminate its materials and methodology nationwide.

**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: 14

### 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 clearly explains how its Instructional Coherence model combines HQIM development and high-impact tutoring as stated in this section, in concert with alignment of curriculum, instructional strategies and professional development. The Instructional Coherence model is research-based and is designed to achieve the desired coherence of instruction it desires.

The proposal plans to utilize curriculum embedded assessments to enable teachers to better assess students' skills gaps in order to better place them in tutoring groups with similar skills needs as described in Appendix C (p.e60).

#### Weaknesses:

On page e111 of the Budget Narrative, it states that TNTP is providing the tutoring services but on page e22 in Exhibit 1 the chart of Milestones, Timeline and Responsible Party states, "Create scope of work plans for implementing high-impact tutoring utilizing school staff in various school models".

It is very unclear as to where the tutors are coming from, what qualifications they must possess, how much they are to be paid, etc. This is also not addressed in the Budget Narrative. In general the lack of specifics regarding the High-Impact Tutoring is a weakness of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 10

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 goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved are clearly specified in the chart on pp. e33 – e35. Many of these are measurable and achievable.

#### Weaknesses:

The measure of how the High-Impact Tutoring is progressing is not specified.

Reader's Score: 4

## 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:**

Proposal is submitted by the National Fund for Excellence in Indian American Education which is a Tribal Organization and 501(c)(3) Educational Agency applicant in partnership with the Bureau of Indian Education acting as an LEA/SEA as a rural applicant (p.e14).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides excellent research (four recent major studies) supporting their evidence for the Instructional Coherence Model which employs High-Impact Tutoring as one aspect.

**Weaknesses:**

The manner in which the High-Impact Tutoring is to be incorporated is unclear.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/19/2025 09:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2025 09:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Educatio (S411B250079)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	31
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Returning Educ to States	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	4
<b>Total</b>	115	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Educatio (S411B250079)

## 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 focus is K-3 literacy using HQIM and high-impact tutoring, together through the lens of instructional coherence, which is defined as deliberate, systemwide connection between what is taught (curriculum), how it is taught (instructional practices), and how learning is supported and reinforced (tutoring and intervention). The project will provide systematic scaffolding, cohort model, and a coherent instructional system described thoroughly in the narrative provided (Pg e16-e18). These features provide validity and lend significance to the proposal.

#### 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: 31

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

A literacy crisis among students of Tribal nations exhibited by comparison of National Assessment of Educational Progress NAEP scores, lack of resources including professional development for teachers, technology in the home, and geographic isolation that limits access to resources provides the rationale that proves unmet demand and the need for broader implementation of the project (Pg e19-e20).

Demand from Tribal leaders also contributes to the impetus proving unmet demand for the project (Pg e20-e21).

**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 management plan is described with milestones, dates for completion and responsible parties. The information is further clarified through Exhibit 1 in a table format. Exhibit 1 provides milestones, timeline, and responsible party while Exhibit 2 thoroughly explains the personnel, their roles and responsibilities pertaining to the proposed project (Pg e21-e25). The provision of the detailed management plan provides more likelihood that the proposed project will meet the goals and objectives of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

Budget restraints are not addressed in the narrative or tables (Pg e108-e118).

**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:**

The National Fund for American Indian Education, Bureau of Indian Education, and the New Teacher Network's expertise in the proposed project are outlined with clarity providing the details necessary to demonstrate the buy in of the partners and increasing the likelihood of project success (Pg e26-e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 use of hybrid methods to facilitate the management process will provide consistent and more frequent support across large distances and for each cohort (Pg e27-e28). This is a strength because it demonstrates that hybrid

**Sub**

methods are necessary to successfully achieve proposed outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

There was no indication of the ratio of in person to technology-based interactions for each cohort (Pg e28). The suggestion of the hybrid methods is innovative due to the distances to be covered by the project. However, there are no details provided to support the implementation of the hybrid methods.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 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 entities involved in the project have broadly available resources to disseminate information during and after the project window with a variety of asynchronous methods such as websites and newsletters, as well as, in person presentation opportunities cited (Pg e28-e29). The use of a vast network of dissemination will provide increased scalability to 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: 15**

**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:**

Appendix G outlines the logic model with clarity and provides a description to assist understanding of the project (Pg e60).

The description of tying high quality materials and high impact tutoring with the coherence of the instructional program providing professional development for both teachers and school leadership, as well as, continued coaching and support during the proposed project provides good inputs for the possibility of positive results (Pg e31).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear which partner will provide the high-quality tutoring. The New Teacher Project (TNTP) is listed in the budget narrative, and the school staff is noted in the project narrative (Pg e111, Pg e22).

**Reader's Score: 12**

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

**Strengths:**

The chart clearly outlines the goals, objectives, measures for the project and the target/outline for each objective with measurable outcomes provided (Pg e33-e35). Utilization of the visual increases the clarity of the proposed project's outcomes and alignment with the grant purposes.

**Weaknesses:**

The project design lacks interim goals for monitoring progress of the proposal (Pg e33-35). Being able to course correct during the project is vital to the success of the project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Sub**

**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 National Fund for Indian for Excellent in American Indian Education, The Bureau of Indian Affairs, and individual Tribal nations are involved as partners within the project (Pg e14).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

High impact tutoring is referenced throughout the proposal in narrative, tables, and additional documentation as being implemented as one of three major components of this proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

The application lacks evidence of supporting accelerated learning methods such as high-impact tutoring.

Reader's Score: 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/19/2025 09:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2025 09:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Educatio (S411B250079)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: The National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education (S411B250079)

## 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: 25

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 applicant has identified a qualified independent research firm with which to partner to conduct a 3-level blocked cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT), which if well implemented, will meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (e35). The evaluation design, which will focus on recruiting and onboarding 60 of 96 schools across multiple states with a reported 100% of students meeting free or reduced-price lunch eligibility, will produce evidence of the project's effectiveness on relevant outcomes (e35). The applicant also clarified the decision to allow for joiners (individuals who join after the study has started), to be included the study because they do not pose a high risk of bias (e36).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant estimates that they will identify 32 high-need students per school to be part of the study, as well as 1,920 high-need students across the entire sample; however, these are exact numbers and therefore difficult to anticipate (e36).

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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 extent to which the proposed study findings will ultimately inform schools that serve Tribal student populations, and schools that operate in rural or remote areas, is high, as schools will remain in the treatment group for two years to ensure thoroughness in its investigation strategies (e39). Missing data will be addressed using multiple imputations in adherence with, and according to, WWC guidance requirements, thus resulting in a superior level of oversight (e39).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant only proposes effective strategies for replication in other schools in the two states currently involved in the proposed study, as well as two other nearby states (e39). Providing additional details as to how this research design could be replicated in other settings beyond the four states mentioned would be helpful to determine its effectiveness and potential for replication.

**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 intends to derive implementation data sources collected during the study, including tutoring logs and professional development attendance rosters and coaching sessions (e41). The applicant proposes to conduct thorough observations and focus groups with teachers from both the treatment and control schools (e42). To establish treatment-control contrast, the applicant will administer the teacher surveys with questions on literacy instructional practices, materials use, tutoring availability, and professional development (e41). Teachers will receive a \$700 participant stipend for completing the contrast survey, participating in focus groups, and allowing evaluators to observe their classrooms (e42).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant estimates that 240 teachers will participate in the study but does not provide context as to how they came to that number; for example, what percentage of teachers they are reaching out to, or what they plan to do should they not reach that figure. In addition, the applicant does not provide any details as to how, when, what frequency, which method through with which the focus groups will be conducted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

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 proposes to develop data collection tools to monitor progress and measure implementation fidelity that will allow for the documentation of emerging implementation challenges and successes (e42). The independent research firm intends to share information with relevant partners to identify and address implementation issues in real-time, make mid-course corrections, and share promising practices across schools ( e42). The applicant will provide formal annual reports at the end of each implementation year to allow for re-design of project activities and strategies (e42). In addition, the applicant intends to share preliminary findings and create a forum for schools to discuss implementation experiences and collaborate on solutions to common challenges (e43).

**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:**

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:** 11/19/2025 09:43 AM