

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 05:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

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	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	115	70

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - Midphase - 16: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

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 provided compelling support for the need for the proposed project due to the research provided to support increased student achievement using the proposed strategies of the project. Citing the decline in reading scores for 4th and 8th graders, the innovation involves tapping into students' capacity to learn in a blended digital environment, emphasizing collaborative learning with peers. The proposed project will use a series of scenarios and simulations to engage students in interactive inquiry, collaborations, critical thinking and creativity, and build literacy skills.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 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.

Sub

Strengths:

The narrative states that, although there have been small-scale studies conducted in over 400 schools, no large-scale experimental studies have been conducted. The proposed project also cites recent NAEP scores, which show a decline in the reading skills of secondary students. Three critical needs are proposed to be accomplished by this project, including the lack of evidence-based supplemental reading programs, the strong demand to expand the project statewide, and the need for centralized knowledge and innovative professional learning tools and infrastructure.

Weaknesses:

None 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 provided a detailed management plan that included the four goals of the proposed project, the related activities, the year(s) of implementation, the person(s) responsible, and the performance measures for each activity. For example, the executive director will be responsible for all management and partnership relationships, other individuals will be responsible for technology development, and ensure that all learning strategies are documented and published accordingly. As presented, the project's objectives should be accomplished within the budget and the prescribed timelines.

Weaknesses:

None 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 provided letters of commitment from each partner, outlining the specific contributions of each to the project's implementation. Letters provided included those from the Northeastern Utah Educational Services, Southeast Educational Services, Central Utah Education Service, and B & W Evaluation. The vitas, including the specialized skills of key personnel, were provided, and specific responsibilities were outlined.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes a very solid delivery plan through the Centralized Learning Hub, which will serve as the go-to resource for all regions, districts, schools, and teachers. It will house the technology guides, the implementation and alignment guides, and the professional learning resources. The teacher platform would provide access to

Sub

implementation support for teachers to inform teacher-driven instruction and feedback. The student-led platform will offer student-led activities, gamified with narratives and storytelling elements.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. (5) The quality of the mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information and resources on its project to support further development, adaptation, or replication by other entities to implement project components in additional settings or with other populations.

Strengths:

The applicant will use multiple mechanisms to broadly disseminate resources through the Centralized Learning Hub (CLH) and partner networks to support adaptation and replication in additional settings. Information will be available on the website. The publication of a scaling playbook is planned, which will be a guide for districts to use to adopt, implement and sustain their literacy project. Other strategies include webinars, presentations, the dissemination of policy briefs, infographics, cost snapshots, and publications in professional journals. Eventually, the applicant intends to add microlearning videos, model classroom recordings, and topic-specific webinars.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 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 comprehensive logic model addressed the key support components, the direct components, mediators, short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes. Some proposed outcomes included increased numbers of students graduating, an increased number of students enrolled in AP courses, improved reading skills, higher scores on ELA standardized tests, and fidelity of implementation. Related inputs include technology guides, training institutes, workshops, coaching cycles, and student collaboration.

Sub

Weaknesses:

Noine 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 proposes four primary goals for this project. These goals include 1) to create, test, and implement strategies to deliver services efficiently, 2) to evaluate the project through rigorous implementation research and random control, 3) to work collaboratively to disseminate findings, information, and resources, and 4) to track progress on scaling and sustainability. The narrative provided specific objectives, activities, person(s) responsible, and the timeline for implementation. For example, one aim for goal one is to build and improve a web-based Centralized Learning Hub. The related activity is to gather information from current Mission.io users around their perceived technology, implementation, alignment, and PL needs. These activities are the responsibility of the formative evaluator to complete from January through March of 2026. The goals are specific and ambitious yet achievable for the proposed project. The supportive appendix provided specific tasks and timelines for each goal. The long-term outcomes include increases in 1) reading skills, 2) high school graduation, 3) students enrolled in postsecondary schools, and 4) students enrolled in AP English classes.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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:

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 12/01/2025 05:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/02/2025 11:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

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 #14 - Midphase - 16: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

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 demonstrated sufficient evidence that the proposed scale-up of Mission.io was promising in supporting literacy development. For instance, research shows that treatment teachers reported higher student interest in motivation to learn (+34%), participation (+55%), and whole-class engagement (+64%) during Missions compared to "normal" classroom conditions. Students who used Mission.io at least once per week saw the following mean increases by end of year: knowledge (+26%), collaboration (+80%), critical thinking (+44%), initiative (+26%), and resilience (+13%) (Langford, 2023). Using Mission.io also helped increase student mean collaboration (+.10) and critical thinking (+.42) scores. The innovation proposed in this project centered around conducting a large-scale experimental study and including mediating and moderating effects and a detailed cost analysis.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

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 presented three unmet demands: (1) the lack of evidence-based supplemental reading programs for upper elementary students, (2) need to expand Mission.io's literacy program statewide in Utah, and (3) the need for centralized knowledge and innovative professional learning (PL) tools and infrastructure to support scale-up in other states. To address these demands, the proposal planned to develop and disseminate a web-based Centralized Learning Hub (CLH) which included technology guides, implementation and alignment guides, and professional learning resources.

Weaknesses:

None 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 included a detailed management plan with the objectives, goals, roles, and responsibilities. For instance, Objective 1.4 of this project was to build internal capacity of regions and districts for sustainability. To achieve this objective, Mission.io will work with region and district leadership to understand the program, its goals, and all resources in the CLH. Mission.io will also implement a train-the-trainer model to ensure all districts have capacity for onboarding new teachers going forward. The proposed activities and milestones were feasible and reasonable.

Weaknesses:

None 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 involved a partnership between Northeastern Utah Educational Services, Mission.io, and B&W Evaluation. Each partner provided a letter of commitment and their letters outlined their expertise and contributions to this project. For instance, Mission.io will provide license access to the platform for all participating schools, with the needed training, onboarding, and support to be successful. They will assist teachers with supplemental support for their 5th grade literacy curriculum. Mission.io will also provide implementation support for participating schools to lead effective professional development for best practices and integration with their lesson plans and focuses.

Weaknesses:

None 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 presented sufficient evidence to deliver the project efficiently and effectively through centralized infrastructure, scalable professional learning, flexible integration, and continuous improvement systems. The CLH would help achieve efficiency by reducing redundancy, shortening onboarding time, and ensuring that all districts, regardless of size, resources, or prior experience, have access to the same high-quality materials, thereby supporting consistency of implementation across the state. Mission.io's professional learning components were designed to scale while maintaining the effectiveness. It included multiple levels of support, ranging from initial training institutes to a train-the-trainer model, to equip teachers, administrators, and coaches with the knowledge and skills needed to incorporate Mission.io into curriculum and to implement Mission.io with fidelity.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. (5) The quality of the mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information and resources on its project to support further development, adaptation, or replication by other entities to implement project components in additional settings or with other populations.

Strengths:

The proposal included a convincing dissemination plan that would disseminate project findings to different audiences. For instance, the project team would create a Scaling Playbook, a practical guide for districts and states adopting, implementing, and sustaining Mission.io Literacy. B&W Evaluation will lead dissemination to researchers and policymakers through publications, conference presentations, policy briefs, infographics, and cost snapshots. The project will also share updates and project products using their websites, newsletters, and social media channels.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 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.

Sub

Strengths:

The proposal included an adequate logic model that includes the inputs, mediators, and outcomes. The inputs included support key components and direct components. The support components included the CLH, teacher and student platforms, and professional learning components. The direct components included the integration of Missions into teaching and student collaboration in Missions. The short-term outcomes focused on the implementation of Mission.io in schools by teachers with fidelity and increased student enjoyment of reading and student self-efficacy. The medium-term outcomes included increase in reading skills and increase in ELS standardized scores. The long-term outcomes included increased statewide investment in Mission.io PL and implementation, increase number of students enrolled in AP English course, etc.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The proposal clearly specified the goals and objectives of the project and how these objectives would be measured. For instance, to reach the project's goal 2 around evaluating the implementation and impact of Mission.io, the project planned to measure and assess the implementation fidelity, and measure the impact of Mission.io using an RCT. To evaluate project's goal 4 around dissemination, the project outlined plans and timelines for national policy or practitioner conferences and journal manuscripts. These objectives were measurable and reasonable, and aligned well with the purpose of the program.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

N/A

Sub

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 applicant is not an eligible entity for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The proposed work does not include individualized or small-group tutoring programs to accelerate learning. It was not clear whether the proposed work aligns with principles of high-impact tutoring.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/02/2025 11:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 04:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - Midphase - 16: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Northeastern Utah Educational Services (S411B250080)

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: 30

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 presented a strong and comprehensive method of evaluation which will, if well implemented, produce evidence meeting the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The applicant proposes a school-level clustered randomized controlled trial (RCT) examining the impact of the intervention on fifth-grade student literacy skill development and performance on national and state assessments. (pp. e32-33) 80 schools will be randomly assigned to the applicant's intervention model and business-as-usual control. (p. e34) The analysis will use hierarchical linear modeling when using the acceptable sample size. (pp. e34-35) The applicant will employ the intent-to-treat design with student joiners excluded from the analysis. (p. e36) The expectation of low attrition is also presented. (p. e36)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant's discussion of guidance about effective strategies for replication is excellent. The primary design of the evaluation is to inform broader adoption with findings from the evaluation identifying which contexts produce the greatest impact on student reading achievement and teachers. (pp. e36-37) The evaluation will also identify adjustments needed for specific populations. (p. e36) There will be a generalizability study analyzing moderating variables to inform continuous improvement and guide replication. (p. e37)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant's quality of the evaluation plan addressing fidelity of implementation was complete and well-designed. The fidelity of implementation, including teacher and student logs, continuous improvement approaches, and a generalization model, is comprehensively discussed. (p. e38) The fidelity implementation thresholds were presented as a 90% completion rate for teacher professional development and 90% adherence to district plans. (p. e38)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to guide replication is comprehensive. The strong generalizability and scalability study will provide information to potential replicators on context, potential mediation and moderation, which aspects of the intervention work best for certain students, and which teachers are most impacted with this proposed intervention. (pp. e38-39) Scaling guides and sustainability guides, along with the cost analysis, will be disseminated as the project evolves and expands. (p. e40)

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: 11/24/2025 04:03 PM