

**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:** Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

**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	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	68
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	83

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

## 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 addresses how it builds upon an existing project component Montana's Early Literacy Targeted Intervention (ELTI) initiative which demonstrated measurable success in improving early literacy outcomes for young learners in its first year. This is an adaptable, comprehensive, multi-tiered strategy that can meet the specific context of school communities. The ELTI program provides targeted literacy intervention by integrating school, home, and summer programming that aligns to state priorities for early learning and third-grade proficiency (e18-19).

The project is innovative in that it will provide virtual high-impact tutoring featuring certified educators as it is difficult for rural and tribal systems to retain such teachers. Applicant states that it plans to build upon a state initiative: Early Literacy Targeted Instruction Act of 2023, and to make high-impact tutoring available to high-needs students (including those in rural and Tribal communities) to accelerate learning (p. e12).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly demonstrates the need for such a project through their detailed breakdown of ways in which Montana students, especially in the target audience of this project which are schools with greater than 60% receiving free or reduced lunch. American Indian students, part of the target population, demonstrate only 20% proficiency on grades 3-8 reading assessments (p. e 14).

There is a dire need for highly effective literacy educators as 94% of reservation schools experience extreme teacher turnover.

In addition, a 2023 Montana Department of Labor study found that teachers in rural and tribal schools earn an average of more than \$13,000 per year less when compared to their urban counterparts (p. e15), thus helping to drive the turnover.

**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 ELTI management plan outlined in Exhibits 2 and 3 (pp. e26 – e28) enumerates the activities to be accomplished, including milestones and, in Exhibit 3, clearly establishes the responsible party for each milestone. The project's goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly identified in Exhibit 5, pp.31-32.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. (3) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

**Strengths:**

Appendix C contains 23 letters of support from a variety of entities ranging from individual classroom teacher to a United States Senator. The commitment of the project's partners is evident throughout the proposal.

Sub

**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:**

Applicant states that the Montana's Office of Public Instruction has proven expertise and capacity to scale such projects, and the application provides several examples of such (p. e28). The Project Leadership Team will meet biweekly to guide planning and implementation to address any issues. The program director is responsible for initiating a corrective action plan should data show a decline in performance or inability to meet a milestone (p. e29) thus ensuring that the project maintains effectiveness.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant and its partners plan to disseminate the project's findings through open-source knowledge products, social media, educational conferences and publications (p.e30). The Office of Public Instructional create a video describing the project and its outcomes, as well as putting the results on its website. The OPI will also provide online professional development modules, an implementation toolkit and a family engagement toolkit.

**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: 18**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The quality of the logic model or other conceptual framework underlying the proposed project, including how inputs are related to outcomes.**

**Strengths:**

In Exhibit 4: Conceptual Framework the applicant provides excellent detail on the resources; needs; implementation; and short-, medium- and long-term impact (p.e 31).

The Logic Model presented in Appendix G pp. e139-140 elaborates on the conceptual framework.

**Weaknesses:**

Although touched upon in Exhibit 4, how the inputs are related to the outcomes needs further explanation.

**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 goals, objectives and outcomes are very clearly identified in Exhibit 5 pp.131-132. They appear ambitious yet achievable.

**Weaknesses:**

How the outcomes are to be measured is unclear. What percentage of parental engagement is considered a success, for example.

**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.**

Sub

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

### **Priority Questions**

#### **Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Office of Public Instruction is the state of Montana's Department of Education.

**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 many references supporting the need for Montana High-Impact Tutoring throughout its proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

**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	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	67
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	82

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

## 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 will utilize certified educators to build on the state-initiated Early Literacy Targeted Intervention (ELTI) to significantly impact achievement gaps between subgroups and accelerate learning by adding high-impact tutoring for high needs students, in rural and tribal communities (Pg e15, e18-e19).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 35

#### Sub

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

This proposal clearly describes an unmet need in the combination of not enough fully licensed teachers, poor training for the licensed teachers and funding based on a per pupil rate that produces an environment where persistent literacy gaps abound in places such as rural, low-income, and high need communities. (Pg e14-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 proposal outlines specific barriers that are present in the current educational environment of Montana and provides suggested solutions to be delivered if the proposal is funded in Exhibit 1 (Pg e22-e25).

The proposal further narrates the strategies proposed with more details provided in addition to including Exhibits 2 and 3 which provide phases for project implementation, activity and milestone charts, and clearly establishes the party responsible for each activity (Pg e26-e28).

The budget narrative supports the project as attainable and able to be completed within the proposed budget due to the balance of expenditures between administration and direct implementation (Pg e162-e168).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**3. (3) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

**Strengths:**

Each partner, beginning with the Montana Office of the Superintendent, has extensive expertise and the ability to scale the proposal as evidenced by narrative description, letters of support, and resumes provided in support of the project. Appendix C has numerous letters of support from various partnering organizations (Pg e28-e29, Pg e45-e131).

**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 proposed project dovetails and enhances effectiveness and scale with the early literacy plans that are already in place within the state of Montana. The introduction of the additional supports to be provided by this project

**Sub**

address vast areas of geography with the implementation of technology, the lack of fully licensed and experienced teachers by partnering with an agency to assist with provision of those personnel, providing professional development to school staff in high need areas to support just in time and future achievements, and being able to sustain gains made by the proposal (Pg e22-e26). All of these components lend depth and credibility to the proposed outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal suggests dissemination of information via open-source knowledge products, social media, conferences, and publications in addition to visits for educators, policymakers and funders to observe high impact tutoring in action. In addition, webpages and bulletin updates and a video will be created to describe the program and its findings (Pg e30). The usage of a broad array of dissemination methods demonstrates the ability of the proposed project to be scaled effectively.

**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: 17**

**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 logic model and Exhibit 4 provide ample evidence relating resources to implementation and suggesting immediate, short to medium results, and long-term impacts in a succinct visual (Pg e140, Pg e31). The use of a great deal of evidence to tie resources, implementation and outcomes is key to the likelihood that the project will be successful and meet grant proposal goals.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Exhibit 4 touched upon the inputs to outcomes. However, there was little to no explanation of the relationship between the two (Pg e31).

**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:**

Exhibit 5 further outlines the goals, objectives, and possible outcomes and deliverables for the proposed project . In addition, the use of percentages in outcomes lends validity (Pg e32).

**Weaknesses:**

Measurable outcomes are not provided for all goals and objectives. For Example, Goal 1 states that schools will have access to certified teachers who provide virtual 1:1, high impact tutoring. There are no measures of accomplishment provided for this goal (Pg e31).

**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 Montana Office of Public Instruction is the applicant for this proposal (Pg e8).

**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 premise of the project is to have High Impact Tutoring (HIT) to boost the early literacy intervention project by adding the HIT for high needs students particularly in rural and tribal communities by utilizing virtual delivery systems. (Pg e 8, Pg e12).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

---

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

**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	28
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	28
<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	28

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Midphase - 7: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Montana Office of Public Instruction (S411B250098)

## 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: 28

Sub

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The proposed evaluation will employ a rigorous cluster-level randomized controlled trial (RCT) designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (e32-e33). The study's intended sample size of 90 schools, half of which will be assigned to the treatment or control group, and approximately 1,800 students will yield meaningful impacts and measures of achievement aligned with WWC domains (e33). The initial cohort will act as a pilot to refine the logic model, project training, and implementation materials for subsequent cohorts (e34). The proposed evaluation's attention to baseline equivalence, attrition, and adherence to WWC analytic standards ensures effectiveness of the project (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 evaluation study will create guidance for replicating and scaling programs using various strategies (e38). For example, the analysis and formative feedback will provide information that outlines conditions best suited for replication while also highlighting conditions that can be barriers to future replication (e38). The applicant will continue to revise the logic model throughout the four years of this program to reflect implementation success and challenges so that it may inform strategies for replication (e38). A comprehensive cost analysis will be conducted to provide others with an understanding of all components needed to reproduce this intervention (e39).

**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 evaluation's comprehensive and collaborative design will enhance the potential for implementation fidelity (e38). By co-developing an implementation rubric, the evaluation team will ensure that fidelity measures are in alignment with the logic model's core components (e38-e39). The rubric provides clearly defined benchmarks for low, adequate, and ideal implementation, thereby creating a structured framework for assessing variation in program delivery across sites (e39). The mixed-methods data collection plan will combine surveys, focus groups, and direct observations of tutors and educators; the use of both quantitative and qualitative will provide insights into how the proposed project operates in diverse school contexts (e39).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation does not clarify how the surveys will be generated or disseminated, or any details as to how the direct observations will take place (e39).

**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,**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

To guide replication of project activities or strategies, the evaluator will provide formative feedback to support the development and improvement of project activities (e40). Data will be collected from tutor surveys, tutor focus groups, observations of tutoring sessions, student surveys, and family focus groups (e40). The evaluation will highlight program barriers that arise in the data to inform program improvement; they will also provide annual reports to summarize information on the implementation and impact studies, and a final report at the end of the project (e40).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide details regarding the focus groups, such as who will facilitate, how often they will occur, how long they will last, and/or how they plan to engage participants.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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