

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 10:30 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

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

	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	34
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	69
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Midphase - 14: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

## 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 project demonstrates a significant level of innovation through its adaptation of evidence-based Science of Reading (SoR) training for rural high schools, utilizing an Initial Adopter/First Follower teacher-led model that emphasizes local educational control and scalability (e9). The integration of high-impact tutoring within English classes, coupled with a curriculum-agnostic approach, distinguishes this project as a novel method for addressing literacy gaps in high school settings, especially where existing supports are limited (e9). Additionally, targeting 9th and 10th grades, the project strategically focuses on critical transition points in students' literacy development, aligning with national priorities and addressing a gap in high school literacy support (e12, e13). The partnership with Tribal Education Agencies further expands the project's scope, introducing a culturally responsive and innovative component to the intervention (e9). The use of a teacher-led dissemination model rooted in research by Dr. Justin Reich enhances the potential for sustained impact and broader adoption (e14).

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses observed.

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: 34

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 project's strategy to scale effectively responds to the significant unmet demand in rural high schools for intensive literacy professional development and targeted literacy support, addressing a critical gap in current services (e16). The plan to implement comprehensive literacy training for Grade 9 and 10 English teachers, including participation in established programs like TNTP's SoRT, demonstrates a clear approach to meeting the needs of under-resourced rural districts (e16). The recruitment, training, and funding of High-Impact Tutors to provide tiered, intensive literacy supports directly responds to the lack of time and resources faced by high school teachers, ensuring broader implementation of evidence-based practices (e16). The focus on building teacher capacity in understanding and teaching reading at the high school level reflects an understanding of the demand for effective literacy interventions among this population, which has historically been underserved (e16). Furthermore, the project's acknowledgment of rural-specific barriers and tailored strategies to overcome them suggests a realistic and targeted approach to scaling in communities with limited access to research-based literacy programs (e17).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no observed weaknesses.

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 demonstrates a comprehensive and well-structured approach to achieving project objectives on time and within budget by clearly defining responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for each phase, supported by extensive experience of the leadership team in successfully managing similar grants (e17-19). The plan incorporates detailed activities, regular leadership and advisory meetings, and a tiered leadership structure that ensures ongoing oversight, coordination, and accountability across all levels of implementation (e19, e124-130). The inclusion of specific roles, responsibilities, and scheduled reviews ensures continuous monitoring, timely adjustments, and alignment with project goals, indicating a high level of feasibility and strong capacity to deliver results (e18-19). The project timeline's phased approach with explicit deliverables and milestones enhances confidence in the management plan's ability to meet the project's goals within the designated timeframe and budget (e124-130, 133-141).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses observed in the management plan.

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 project thoroughly addresses the criterion by establishing a broad and committed partnership network involving school districts, tribal agencies, and regional organizations, which ensures strong relevance and active engagement in the implementation and success of high-impact tutoring. Signed letters of support and formal commitments from districts such as Del Norte County, Fall River, Fortuna Union, and tribal entities like Blue Lake Rancheria and Yurok Tribe demonstrate a high level of stakeholder buy-in and collaboration (e53-58, 73-78). These partnerships facilitate

**Sub**

local staffing, implementation, and student monitoring, which enhances the program's cultural relevance and sustainability. The engagement of regional organizations such as the California Small School Districts' Association and the National Rural Education Association further supports widespread dissemination, policy influence, and scalability, indicating a well-structured and committed partnership framework aligned with the project's goals (e85-86). Overall, the extensive and demonstrated commitment of diverse partners significantly strengthens the project's capacity to expand access to effective literacy interventions.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no observable weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The plan effectively addresses the criterion by initiating small-scale implementation with committed teachers, enabling demonstration of impact and building peer support, which accelerates adoption across schools. This approach leverages peer influence and a curriculum-agnostic model to facilitate quicker and more efficient scaling without requiring full departmental consensus, thus supporting both scalability and sustained effectiveness (e21). The use of in-person coaches, mentors, and online resources ensures ongoing fidelity and quality, contributing to efficient delivery of services as the project expands (e21). Overall, the strategy balances targeted early implementation with practical supports that promote efficiency and effectiveness at scale.

**Weaknesses:**

Lack of detail on the timeline for teachers to recognize and adopt the "doable and replicable" methods hinders the speed of broader buy-in and scaling efforts (e21). This uncertainty may impact both the efficiency and the sustained effectiveness of the project as it seeks to expand beyond initial early adopters (e21, e22).

**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 project demonstrates a high-quality strategy to broadly disseminate information and resources, leveraging multiple channels including peer-reviewed publications, research briefs, and presentations at regional and national conferences. The partnership with TEAs and organizations serving American Indian communities will facilitate dissemination of findings across diverse networks, including rural and tribal stakeholders, which enhances the potential for replication and adaptation in other settings (e22). The use of openly licensed, accessible materials, and submission of reports to ERIC, ensures that resources will be widely available to support further development and scaling efforts. Additionally, the emphasis on sharing implementation fidelity and barriers to scale through formative evaluation findings strengthens the capacity of other entities to adopt and adapt the model effectively (e22-23). Overall, the dissemination plan is comprehensive, targeted, and designed to promote sustainability and replication of the project components.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no observable weaknesses.

Sub

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 project's design demonstrates a high level of quality, with a clear and logical connection between resources, activities, mediators, and expected outcomes, effectively aligning with the conceptual framework (e23). The logic model explicitly links inputs such as evidence-based professional development, coaching, and high-impact tutoring to mediators like improved reading and writing skills, which in turn lead to short-term gains like increased reading comprehension and long-term outcomes such as higher graduation rates (e23). The inclusion of structured, multi-year professional development aligned with proven practices, like the Five Principles of Effective PD, ensures that teacher practices are systematically improved and sustained, supporting the ultimate goal of increased student literacy (e23). The tiered intervention model grounded in MTSS principles, with specific strategies for core, targeted, and intensive supports, provides a comprehensive and evidence-based approach that directly addresses student needs at multiple levels (e24, e25). Moreover, the integration of data-driven progress monitoring and targeted coaching ensures that activities are responsive and adaptable, reinforcing the logical flow from activities to outcomes (e24, e25). Overall, the well-articulated conceptual framework and detailed design elements establish a robust foundation for achieving intended student outcomes.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no observable weaknesses.

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 project's goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified, measurable, and ambitious yet feasible within the project period, aligning effectively with the grant's purpose to scale evidence-based literacy practices (e31). The goals include precise targets such as teacher training, curriculum updates, and student achievement improvements, supported by detailed objectives that outline specific actions, timelines, and evaluation strategies, ensuring progress can be tracked and validated (e31-33). The incorporation of rigorous evaluation methods, including assessments and feedback loops, supports the achievement of outcomes and demonstrates a strong alignment with the long-term goals of capacity building and dissemination (e31). Overall, the goals and objectives are well-defined, realistic, and designed to produce meaningful, measurable impacts within the project timeframe.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

There are no observable weaknesses.

**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.**

**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

Sub

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:**

There was no strength observed.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not include any of the eligible entities specified under the priority, such as state educational agencies, tribal organizations, or consortia, which limits its capacity to meet the specific requirements of the criterion. This omission undermines the proposal's ability to demonstrate direct engagement with the entities designated to carry out the project, thereby weakening its alignment with the 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:**

The project effectively expands access to high-impact, accelerated learning through the implementation of a research-based model that trains local tutors, provides daily tiered instruction, and ensures alignment with classroom content, addressing key components such as tutor quality, dosage, and small group size (e21, e29-30). The evidence supporting this project is classified as strong, based on a comprehensive review of multiple studies that demonstrate statistically significant effects of reading interventions on students with reading difficulties in grades 4–9, including ninth-grade students in high school settings (e205). For instance, Recommendation 1 showed effect sizes of 0.09 to 0.18 on reading proficiency and comprehension, while Recommendations 2 and 3 demonstrated effect sizes of 0.09 to 0.27 with p values <0.05, indicating consistent positive impacts across domains (e205). These findings are supported by studies conducted in high school English classes and small-group settings, directly overlapping with the target population and settings of this project, thereby affirming the relevance and applicability of the evidence to the proposed intervention (e205). This robust body of research provides a strong foundation for the project’s goals to improve literacy outcomes through scientifically validated methods.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no observed weaknesses.

**Reader’s Score:**      **5**

---

**Status:**                Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      12/01/2025 10:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2025 02:41 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

**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	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	69
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Midphase - 14: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

## 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 proposes an excellent project that describes two innovative approaches: 1) Adopting evidence-based Science of Reading Training (SoRT) using an Initial Adopter (IA)/First Follower (FF) approach as opposed to a mandate from administrators, and 2) Integrating high-impact tutoring in English classes using trained tutors who are members of the Tribal Education Agencies (TEA) (e9).

Another notable innovation is their approach in refining and scaling The New Teacher Project's (TNTP) SoRT for secondary teachers in 12 rural high schools in seven districts in Northern California. Literacy Plus (LP) will be shared with high school English teachers. This training will allow English teachers to understand the teaching of reading, training which preservice teachers typically do not receive. (e12). Then, the teachers' efforts are combined with the high-impact tutoring (e12). The applicant purports that as students' skills increase, they will become successful in other content-area classes such as history and science (e12).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were indicated.

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 provides compelling descriptions about unmet demands in schools in rural communities and their students' struggles. Rural schools are typically understaffed—or poorly staffed—and secondary educators expect to have high school students who are reading at grade level (e16). Several issues contribute to struggling readers at the high school level: 1) Literacy Professional Learning (PL) for secondary teachers is limited due to lack of availability and lack of funding, 2) Secondary teachers are experts in their content areas and not at teaching reading, 3) English teachers in grades 9-10 lack time to provide high-impact tutoring, and 4) English teachers often believe that they cannot teach reading to adolescents and must rely upon pull-out interventions, special education resources, and high-interest literature (e16-e17).

Furthermore, the applicant states that “a key issue facing students in the U.S. is the lack of preparation to achieve their goals upon graduation from high school and that this lack of preparation can lead to college enrollment in remedial courses or a student’s realization that they don’t have the necessary skills for the jobs they want (e12). The applicant states that many students do not receive four crucial resources in their education: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers with high expectations” (TNTP, 2018) (e12).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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 provides a comprehensive management plan that is likely to achieve project goals and objectives on time. For example, the Northern Humboldt Union High School District (NHUHSD) has extensive experience with Department of Education grants (e17). This experience will serve them well in this new project and will likely contribute to the project being completed on time.

The applicant shares details about their key personnel. It includes their clearly defined responsibilities. Six experienced key personnel are designated (e18, e124-e130), Their responsibilities include the following: 1) The Project Director (PD) who will lead the project, meet with leadership teams and evaluation teams, and ensure all implementation activities will align with goals, timelines, and federal requirements (e17), and 2) The Principal Investigator (PI) who will direct and oversee the evaluation process (e18).

A table designating Activities, Responsible Parties, and Time Frame are efficiently organized in the appendices (e124-e130). An additional table is included which shares the Timeline, Professional Learning, and Coaching. While milestones are not explicit, many of the Activities and Coaching tasks serve as milestones. The timelines and milestones presented demonstrate a great deal of planning, experience, and thoughtfulness. For example, within 90 days of project start, the Business Offices will contact Tribal offices and school district offices to hire staff and complete appropriate contracts (e124).

**Sub**

The TNTP provides a well-organized budget based on their previous experiences (e171). From March 2026 through May 2030, they plan to use \$1,431,716 to fund the following: 1) Summer Intensive, 2) School Year PL, and 3) Teacher Coaching (e171). This budget is broken down into both fiscal years and calendar years. Since they follow a “bundled” budget model, it will likely ensure coherence and cost effectiveness (e171). Therefore, it is expected that the management plan will be conducted on time and within budget.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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 satisfactorily establishes the relevance and commitment of its partners. The partners for this project include the Consortium School District Partners, American Indian Organizations Partners, and Rural Education Partners. This includes 13 partners in total (e20). The letters of support are impressive and include one from Congressional Representative Jared Huffman (e53-e90). Also, several letters of support were from several Tribes and each one wishes to partner with the applicant and dedicate one English teacher to this proposed project. For example, both the Yurok tribe and the Blue Lake Rancheria Tribal Education Agency both provided letters of support. Additionally, there was a strong letter from The National Rural Education Association that cites scalability and cost effectiveness, important for rural schools (e53-e90).

The essential, working partners include TNTP, Century Analytics, Policy and Research Group (PRG), and Cal Poly Humboldt. (e19-e20). TNTP possesses extensive expertise in coaching secondary teachers (e19). Century Analytics provides evaluation services as does PRG (e19-e20). Cal Poly Tech provides the evidence-based literacy expertise to train the high-impact tutors.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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 shares a high-quality plan to deliver services efficiently at scale. The power of Literacy Plus (LP) is that it is not a mandate for all teachers from administration and it is the applicant’s hope that word-of-mouth among educators is a significant incentive for educators to join the proposed project. The applicant relies on identifying a few Instructional Aides (IAs)– teachers willing to participate in LP, and then bring it to their students with the help of the high-impact tutor. Therefore, in many schools, especially rural schools, teacher consensus and positive student impact is more powerful than a top-down mandate. Therefore, it appears LP can be brought quickly to scale efficiently and effectively across many schools and districts (e21).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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 shares an exemplary dissemination plan that will fill a gap in evidence-based literacy interventions in rural high schools. There are 109 local TEAs in California, and their impressive network will be able share findings across the 574 tribes across the United States (e22). The applicant also plans to disseminate them in peer-reviewed journals and publications, and all research reports will be submitted to ERIC. The applicant will also utilize both the TNTP's website and the PRG's website to share research briefs. Importantly, all PL resources will be 508-compliant, openly licensed, and made publicly available (e22-e23). Lastly, the applicant plans to share findings at regional and national conferences (e22-e23).

Ultimately, the applicant will also provide detailed implementation protocols, guidebooks, and training to help ensure replication in different high schools which contributes to broad dissemination of information (e40).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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: 19**

**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 outstanding Logic Model describes an exceptional conceptual framework for this proposed project. The foundations of this program are the IA and FF classrooms that will implement the project components which are linked with desired short, medium, and longer-term student outcomes. Examples of the student outcomes include improved reading comprehension, improved GPAs, decreased dropouts, increased graduation rates, and increased career and college readiness (e23).

Project components will use three different tiers which represent different levels of interventions. Tier 1 utilizes whole-class instruction. Tier 2 is for students who require supplemental support and this will consist of the high-impact tutors (HITs) working with small groups. Lastly, Tier 3 intensive supports will provide individualized instruction (e25-e26).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant is unclear about the use of data to drive refinement of their monitoring system (e145), making it somewhat vague how some components will eventually lead to the desired outcomes.

**Reader's Score: 14**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a strong plan that is ambitious yet achievable. The proposed application provides the goals, objectives, and outcomes are specified, measurable, and aligned with the purposes of the grant program. In all, there are four stated goals which are aligned with a series of outcomes. For example, Goal 1 states: Update, align, and deliver, TNTP, Science of Reading Professional Learning program for rural high school English teachers. A measurable outcome for this goal is: Identify improvements to TNTP SoR LP program based on data and feedback (e31-e32).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**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**

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:**

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, 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:**

No strengths were indicated.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant failed to propose a project that partners with either (a) a State educational agency or (b) an Indian Tribe.

**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 shared a strong plan for implementing high-impact tutoring (e29). This plan is likely to accelerate learning for high school students who struggle with reading. The LP brings a trained TEA tutor to the student's English class where they will build a relationship with the students. Also, the English teacher can support the tutor with their knowledge of the student. Also, the tutoring will occur at a high frequency, in small groups, and with high-quality instructional materials (Kraft & Falken, 2022) (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were indicated.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 12/01/2025 02:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 04:01 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

**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 #12 - Midphase - 14: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Northern Humboldt Union High School District (S411B250086)

## 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 provides a very good evaluation plan that will, if well implemented, produce some evidence about project effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The independent evaluation will focus on program impact, fidelity of implementation, scale up strategies, and cost effectiveness (e33). A student-level randomized control trial study will be conducted using a linear regression model to estimate outcomes (e38). Three cohorts of students from 12 rural schools will be randomly assigned to one of three study groups: an initial group that will be assigned to receive the treatment in 9th grade; a delayed treatment group that will participate in business-as-usual English in 9th grade and the treatment in 10th grade; and a control group that will be business-as-usual in both grade levels (e35). The plan features various research questions to assess confirmatory and exploratory impact on reading comprehension. Interestingly, one of the research questions will focus on delayed exposure by comparing STAR reading assessment outcomes of students who participated in both 9th and 10th grade versus students who only received the treatment in 10th grade (e33-34). Results from a valid and reliable measure, the STAR reading assessment, will be used as a screening tool to identify eligible participants, for baseline data, and for the primary outcome (e37).

Although the applicant does not address whether the study is expected to have low attrition, instead they offer a reasonable plan to check overall and differential attrition. Initially, they will monitor students' completion of the assessment and ensure that teachers in both the treatment and control groups administer it to as many students in their classes as possible, with makeup assessments given to students who are absent on the day(s) of testing. Additionally, baseline equivalence will be estimated for the final analytic sample, and the evaluator will run a statistical adjustment, if needed, to meet the What Works Clearinghouse attrition requirement (e38-39). Acceptable evidence was presented to demonstrate that the study will be sufficiently powered to detect the desired minimum effect size on student-level outcomes (e36, e93).

### Weaknesses:

The evaluation methods include the use of some inadequate measures. For example, students' course grades and grade point averages (GPA) are traditionally both sources of wide teacher variability; and therefore, could lack sufficient validity as outcome measures. Also, a method for analyzing the grades and GPA data was missing so it was unclear how the results would be used to answer the research questions and ultimately inform program impact (e32-34). The applicant also fails to explain the randomization method that will be used for student placement into the three groups. Because the randomization method is missing, the evaluation plan does not demonstrate that groups would be similar on characteristics so that differences in outcomes can be attributed to the treatment.

**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 evaluation plan is appropriately designed to offer guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication and potential implementation in other settings. Because the program will serve many high-need schools that vary in size, student and teacher demographics, and community characteristics, the diverse sample has potential to produce results to guide other similar schools and districts in how to implement the program (e40). The guidance will be provided through open science documentation of study activities, detailed assessment of impact moderators and mediators, and a cost study analysis (e39). Regarding the cost analysis, the overall program implementation costs and the per-student cost will be documented through an ingredients method that will identify and value the required resources for implementation (e41). Additionally, the applicant intends to produce implementation protocols, guidebooks, and measures of implementation fidelity to assist other high schools in potential replication. They expect to share conditions necessary for success, such as frequency and dosing of tutoring, scheduling, and administrator support (e40, e42).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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 presents a reasonable plan to measure fidelity of implementation to inform how implementation is associated with project outcomes. Part of the evaluation plan will involve a formative evaluation to assess adherence to the logic model, dosage of the professional learning and tutoring, and overall quality of implementation (e41-42). Data from program activities, such as teacher online learning engagement and classroom observations, will be documented along with any specific implementation barriers and facilitators. Teachers will also participate in surveys to learn their perceptions about the quality of the professional learning and their instructional practices (e96-97). This data collection will allow opportunities to examine variation in how the program works in practice, provide feedback for improvement, and identify features and conditions necessary for replication (e42-43).

Thresholds for acceptable implementation for most of the project components were described (e42-43). Details on thresholds for professional learning completion, observations by coaches, tutor assignment, and tutor instruction were provided. For example, a threshold of 90% of teachers observed in-person three times each year and six times virtually was proposed for the coaching component (e43).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation plan is missing thresholds for acceptable implementation for the student components (e43). For example, because the research study will examine reading comprehension, an expected threshold for student completion of tutoring sessions and/or small group instruction, should have been included.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant discusses barriers that they and other districts encounter in providing intensive literacy instruction and contends that this project will identify strategies to address those barriers (e44-45). One example of a barrier and strategy is that high school teachers have limited professional learning opportunities to receive intensive literacy instruction, and that this project will offer the Science of Reading program along with coaching (e44).

Also, a web-based dashboard will be developed and used to track implementation and share real-time monitoring to support continuous improvement (e20, e42). The leadership team, which includes project and evaluation staff, will meet twice each month to guide the project, review data, and measure progress using goals, objectives and implementation timelines (e19). One valid and reliable measure, the STAR reading assessment, will be administered to students for the reading comprehension outcome (e37).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation plan lacks evidence that appropriate data would be used to create the replication documents, because the applicant does not provide a thorough discussion on valid and reliable measures. A majority of the data collection will come from teacher surveys and coaching, tutoring, and teacher implementation logs but details were missing on the content or framework of those measures, such as which factors would be observed. (e43, e45, e96). Also missing are the methods for synthesizing these data into meaningful information for replication.

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

**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 04:01 PM

