

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

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

	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	26
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	26
<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	26

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Midphase - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

## 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:

NA

#### Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

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: 26

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 proposes a Random Control Trial (RCT) grounded in prior RCT results (e8). The Cluster RCT design (e28, e31, e36) includes confirmatory data for main effects, subgroups, and mediating or moderating variables (WWC, V5, p12, p16). As proposed, the evaluation design meets the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations.

The sample populations, 80+ schools and 5,000 students (e21), are sufficient to produce significant findings of meaningful difference between treatment and control groups and to examine differential outcomes across subgroups.

Additionally, the applicant's plan to pre-register the statistical analysis (e25) prior to implementation demonstrates methodological rigor. The analyses plan (Appendix J19, e192-e193) details a three-level hierarchical linear model that accounts for variation within and between schools using random intercept techniques. These methods are appropriate to the intervention design and should yield robust, generalizable findings.

Also, randomization procedures at school level (e32-e34, e37) occur after baseline data collection and before informing participants of their treatment status. This sequencing reduces bias and enhances equivalence between treatment and control groups (WWC, V5, p32). Furthermore, school clusters are stratified by socio-economic status, baseline performance, and urbanicity (e34) to ensure valid comparative analyses across key contextual variables.

The power analysis (e189) is based on reasonable assumptions given the size of the study and the anticipated minimum effect size. Expected differences between groups should therefore reflect statistically and practically significant performance outcomes.

Finally, the applicant demonstrates attention to threats to research validity (e35) and attrition (e35-e36, e38). Attrition will be actively monitored, and any differential attrition exceeding acceptable thresholds will be addressed through evaluator oversight.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are observed.

**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 Center for Evaluation and Assessment (e25), serves as the project's external evaluation team. The evaluators are experienced in literary-focused research and evaluation design and have demonstrated expertise in preparing data and replication materials to inform would-be implementers.

The applicant provides a cost analysis (e31, e36) that details the per-student cost of intervention, connecting costs to student outcomes and illustrating costs over the implementation period. This information is critical for potential replicators seeking to understand the resources required for implementation and the potential return on investment in different contexts.

The evaluation also includes plans to disseminate findings related to dosage effects, subgroup outcomes, and implementation fidelity, accompanied by implementation guides, professional development descriptions, and outcome data (e37). These deliverables strengthen the project's capacity to inform scaling and replication efforts across diverse educational settings.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The discussion of the cost-effectiveness (e36-e37, e193) lacks sufficient detail to determine whether the data collection and analysis procedures will yield replicable and actionable insights. While the proposal references relationships between Train-The-Trainer (TTT) costs, student outcomes, and the facilitator time and material costs, the description does not sufficiently specify how these data will be collected and analyzed or translated into guidance for scalability.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes fidelity measures as being monitored in real time, with data made immediately available to implementers (e38) through the Foundations in Flight (FIL) dashboard. This practice enables continuous feedback, facilitates responsive implementation adjustments, and allows for timely identification of challenges.

The logic model (e29, e47) appropriately identifies fidelity as a critical component in determining program effectiveness and its relationship to student outcomes. The applicant demonstrates awareness of the importance of fidelity data in understanding how implementation quality moderates overall program outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

The rubric described by the applicant (e38) as capturing instructional integrity, which is noted as a key part of the fidelity study, is not presented with sufficient detail to determine its validity, reliability, timing, or sampling methodology. The absence of this information raises concerns about the robustness of this component and may compromise the accuracy of the overall fidelity measure.

Additionally, fidelity measures as reported as being collected by Foundations in Flight (FIL) and the Iowa Reading Research Center (IRRC), with the Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) performing the fidelity analysis (e24,e38). The structure introduces potential research bias, as the external evaluator is not directly responsible for validating the data collected to measure fidelity.

Finally, the fidelity threshold for effective implementation, defined as student tutoring time monitored by FIL (e26), is narrow in scope. Because it does not account for other key components of implementation, its validity as a measure of overall fidelity is limited and potentially insufficient to represent the project's full implementation quality.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**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 outcome measures identified in the proposal are valid, reliable, and are appropriately aligned with the project's expected outcomes (e32). These instruments are suitable for detecting meaningful differences between the treatment and control groups, thereby producing credible and replicable evidence. Such findings are valuable to potential replicators, as they provide a guide for what to expect for student gains in comparable contexts.

The Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) (e188) will produce mid-year, year-end, and final impact reports

**Sub**

that document implementation processes, results, and lessons learned. These reports will help potential replicators interpret the significance of the study's findings and identify how specific strategies may improve teaching quality and student performance in their own settings.

Additionally, the applicant commits to providing an array of replication resources (e26), including final technical reports, practitioner summaries, and data dictionaries. The inclusion of a public "frequently asked questions (FAQ)" website and connections with "mentor schools" from Cohort 1 for consultation further enhance opportunities for replication and informed adaptation by other entities.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are observed..

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/24/2025 03:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

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	27
<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	60
<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	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	1
<b>Total</b>	115	71

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Midphase - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

## 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 presents an innovative project that seeks to evaluate the WorkFlight online platform, which integrates individualized student practice with teacher-guided instruction and incorporates principles from both the Science of Reading and the Science of Learning. This combined approach reflects an effort to strengthen literacy intervention for students in grades 3-5 (e12). By merging evidence-based instructional design with adaptive technology, the project has the potential to contribute valuable insights into scalable and teacher-supported digital interventions for literacy improvement.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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: 27

#### 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 applicant identifies a clear need for improved literacy outcomes in rural schools, citing data from Wyoming and Iowa that demonstrate persistently low literacy scores and the need for more effective intervention strategies (e19). The focus on rural contexts aligns with the program's intent to address access and achievement gaps in underserved communities.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant states that demand for WordFlight platform exceeds its current capacity, it is unclear how this limitation supports expanding the project to additional sites (e19). The inclusion of literacy data from Oklahoma and Montana, without specifying their connection to the proposed implementation regions, does not contribute to the alignment between identified need and the proposed level of scale. Greater clarity regarding the program's current capacity and its readiness to expand would strengthen the case for unmet demand.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 identifies a management structure that includes representatives from key partner entities including the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE), Iowa Reading Research Center (IRRC) Foundations in Learning (FIL), and University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA), to oversee the implementation of the proposed project (e22). Project objectives are clearly stated (e11), and the applicant indicates that the project directors will convene quarterly to monitor progress and coordinate activities (e22). This multi-agency collaboration demonstrates a shared commitment to advancing the project's goals.

**Weaknesses:**

While the narrative references a project timeline in the Appendix J17, it does not appear to be included in the materials provided. The absence of defined milestones, deliverables, and time-bound benchmarks makes it difficult to assess whether the management plan is sufficient to guide the project's implementation and scale-up. Without a detailed schedule or performance monitoring structure, the feasibility of executing the plan within the proposed budget and timeframe remains uncertain.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**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 provides letters of support that clearly outline the commitments and roles of each partner organization. The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) will lead project administration, including contracting, budget management, invoice processing, district recruitment, and coordination of the 10% cost share among partners (e50-e51). Foundations in Learning (FIL) will contribute technical and instructional resources, including WordFlight licenses, platform infrastructure, and training, and will collaborate with other partners on implementation logistics (e52). The University of Iowa's letter of support affirms its ongoing collaboration and evaluation role (e53). Collectively, these commitments reflect a cohesive partnership structure with clearly defined responsibilities aligned to the project's goals.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 provides a clear description of responsibilities among each of the four partner organizations, ensuring coordination and accountability for project delivery (e23-e25). FIL will utilize telecommunication to provide timely support to site coordinators, facilitating efficiency and responsiveness in implementation. The CEA and the IRRC will oversee evaluation and logistical operations to maintain quality and consistency across implementation sites. The WDE will conduct quarterly reviews to monitor performance and identify areas for improvement (e26). This structured division of responsibilities reflects an intentional approach to scaling project services while maintaining fidelity and effectiveness.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 outlines a multifaceted dissemination strategy led by WDE, including hosting statewide webinars and practitioner briefs to promote the broader adoption of the project activities (e27). While the WordFlight platform is proprietary and cannot be shared, the applicant commits to making key implementation and evaluation resources publicly available. The consortium will host office hours, maintain a public FAQ, and identify mentor schools to assist future adopters, which extends the potential reach and impact of the project. These actions demonstrate a practical approach to supporting replication within and beyond participating schools.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not describe plans to disseminate research results through scholarly publications, or professional journals and conferences, limiting opportunities to share insights with the broader research and practitioner communities. Additionally, it remains unclear how the project's limited capacity may constrain future replication efforts for the project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a well-developed logic model that clearly demonstrates relationships among the project inputs, activities, outputs, and short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes (e47). The logic model also integrates the theoretical framework supporting the proposed project (e27-e29), illustrating how evidence-based instructional practices and project activities are expected to produce measurable improvements in student learning and educator capacity. The design demonstrates coherence between the project's foundation theory and its operational plan, strengthen the likelihood that the project will achieve the intended outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 provides objectives for the proposed project (e11) and provides goals and targets for performance in the appendices (e222-e236). The inclusion of these elements demonstrates an attempt to align project intentions with the broader purposes of the grant program.

**Weaknesses:**

None of the seven objectives are stated in measurable terms, making it difficult to determine whether they are ambitious or achievable within the project period. Only one objective directly references student reading outcomes, which limits the clarity of intended academic impact. The outcomes listed in the logic model are broad and lack quantifiable benchmarks, reducing the ability to assess progress or success over time (e222-e236).

**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:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

- 4. (4) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, 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:

The lead applicant is the Wyoming Department of Education, which is a state educational agency. Therefore, this applicant qualifies for this competitive preference priority.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 proposes to examine the WordFlight platform as a potential high-impact tutoring intervention to support students with persistent reading challenges in upper elementary and middle school (e29). The study's focus on literacy acceleration aligns with the intent of the competitive preference priority to expand access to evidence-based learning supports.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant provides limited detail on how tutoring will be structured, delivered, or integrated into participating schools. High-impact tutoring is not mentioned in the logic model, and no information is provided regarding key design features such as session frequency, duration, tutor qualification, or alignment with classroom instruction. As a result, it is difficult to determine whether the proposed.

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/24/2025 03:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/24/2025 03:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

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

	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	29
<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>	<b>63</b>
<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>	<b>10</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Expanding Educ Choice	5	1
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Midphase - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education (S411B250110)

## 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 innovative model that bridges research from the Science of Reading with the Science of Learning, integrating both individualized student practice and guidance for teacher-led instruction (e11-e13). The project demonstrates innovation by adapting evidence-based WordFlight intervention for a new population: while the original qualifying study focused on students in grades 6-7, this project will extend the research to grades 3-5 (e17, e240). The proposed design further strengthens its innovation through both the plan to modify an existing evidence-based project to serve a different population of students, and the unique composition of various project components to explore the combined effect on literacy development.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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: 29

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is unmet demand for broader implementation of the project

Sub

that is aligned with the proposed level of scale.

**Strengths:**

The applicant, a State Education Agency, demonstrates clear unmet demand for broader implementation of the proposed project by providing statistics on Wyoming and Iowa student performance in reading and citing relevant research to support the identified need (e19-e20). The proposal also shows strong alignment with state literacy priorities and recent policy changes promoting evidence-based literacy instruction. These factors suggest that the project is strategically positioned to meet or exceed the proposed level of scale (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 proposes a well-structured management plan supported by experienced organizations and staff with a demonstrated track record of successfully managing federally funded projects (e18, e22-e25). Both organizational and individual roles are clearly defined, and resumes for key personnel are provided (e55-e75, e184). The proposed timeline for scaling is thoughtfully staged to support deliberate and sustainable implementation (e22-e23).

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant provides evidence of demand for the WordFlight program, it remains unclear whether Foundations in Learning (FIL) has sufficient capacity to support the proposed expansion. The plan calls for nearly doubling the number of participating schools, despite the applicant's acknowledgement that current demand for FIL support outstrips current capacity (e21). Additionally, no information is provided regarding whether the WordFlight system has been stress-tested to confirm its ability to meet the proposed scale or to ensure that such growth can be achieved on time and within budget. These gaps raise concerns about the overall feasibility of meeting project goals as proposed.

**Reader's Score: 6**

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

**Strengths:**

Letters of support were provided by three external partner organizations including Foundations In Learning, University of Iowa, and the University of Wyoming. Additionally, two district superintendents provided letters of support. (e195-e204) Each letter indicates a clear understanding of the project's purpose, goals, and activities. The letters of support from partner organizations also reference the level of funding to be allocated and the amount of matching funds each entity will contribute. This demonstrates the commitment of those organizations to participate and support successful implementation of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 applicant describes a disciplined operating model that incorporates multiple strategies for balancing efficiency and effectiveness during scaling, including the use of automated triggers activated by specific data thresholds (e15-e16, e26) to ensure continuous monitoring and improvement. The plan reflects an intentional approach to leveraging data systems to maintain quality while expanding the project's reach.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant proposes that the consortium and partners meet virtually only on a quarterly basis and in person once annually throughout the grant period (e22, e184). Given the project's size and scope, this level of engagement appears insufficient, particularly during critical early phases such as recruitment, selection, and project launch. The limited frequency of meetings could hinder coordination and timely decision-making among partners working across multiple states.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlines a multifaceted dissemination plan that includes hosting quarterly statewide webinars for practitioners to share implementation updates and insights, as well as distributing practice briefs through state education agency (SEA) listservs and regional service centers (e26). Project partners, including Foundaion In Learning (FIL) and Iowa Reading Research Center (IRRC), will publish an implementation toolkit and replication packet for local education agencies (LEAs), while the Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) will publish evaluation findings (e27). The consortium also plans to offer virtual office hours, maintain a public frequently asked questions (FAQ) document, and identify mentor schools to serve as demonstration sites for replication (e27). Collectively, these mechanisms provide multiple avenues to support awareness, engagement, and adoption by other entities.

**Weaknesses:**

Dissemination and replication efforts may be constrained by the proprietary nature of the WordFlight platform and software (e26). The intervention is not described in sufficient detail to allow others to fully replicate or adapt the model, limiting the overall utility of the dissemination strategy to support replication.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a clear description of the conceptual framework including an articulated theory of change that explains how the proposed activities will lead to the intended outcomes (e27-e29). Additionally, a detailed figure of the logic model is also included in the appendix, illustrating inputs, activities, outputs, and short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes (e47). The inclusion and quality of these components effectively demonstrate how project inputs are connected to the expected outcomes through a coherent and evidence-based framework.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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 clearly articulates the project's goals, objectives, and outcomes in the narrative (e29) and provides additional detail on measures and performance targets in the appendix (e222-e226). The goals are well aligned with the purposes of the grant program and demonstrate a coherent strategy for achieving meaningful and measurable improvements. If executed effectively, the described goals and objectives are likely to result in project success.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not identify the target number of high-needs students it intends to serve, which is a required Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measure. The absence of this detail limits the ability to assess the scope of impact and alignment with federal performance expectations.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

4. (4) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, 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:**

Applicant is a state education agency and therefore qualifies for this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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:**

Applicant proposes to implement a High Impact Tutoring program that meets the needs of students that consistently struggle with reading after receiving conventionally effective instruction. (e11)

**Weaknesses:**

It does not appear that High Impact Tutoring (HIT) is a component of the intervention, since it is not being tested on the sample in the random control trial (RCT) evaluation (e30, e36), nor is it evident in the project's logic model (e47). Therefore, it appears to be a separate and parallel strategy not integrated into the intervention in a cohesive manner.

Additionally, applicant provides little to no detail on the tutoring component proposed. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the extent to which it includes research-based elements found in HIT, such as: frequent and on-going sessions (3 or more sessions per week), tutoring sessions integrated into the school day, focused on building a strong tutor-student relationship, aligned with the school's curriculum, and including content and instruction tailored to each student's specific needs.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/24/2025 03:53 PM