

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2024 11:01 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

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

	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	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	24
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	106	24

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

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

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

## 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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale 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 extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project 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 applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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 extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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 and measurable.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

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 to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan utilizes a school-level intent-to-treat cluster RCT, meeting the WWC standards without reservations. The evaluation plan makes provisions for student attrition, the assessment of which is aligned with the WWC standards (p. e37).

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 15**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately addresses how they plan to disseminate information about the replicability of this initiative by publishing findings in various venues (p. e28). TNTP also plans to partner with organizations wishing to replicate this program and to support quality replication (p.e30). Section D.2. also presents effective strategies for ensuring quality replication. The inclusion of a power analysis is a helpful inclusion for detecting meaningful effects on high need students.

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan explicitly outlines the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, providing a clear framework for understanding the intervention and its impact (p. e37).

The inclusion of detailed research questions covering impact, implementation, mediating and moderating factors, and exploratory outcomes ensures comprehensive coverage of the evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

The thresholds for acceptable implementation (e.g., 75% completion) may be arbitrary and might not fully capture the quality of implementation.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/01/2024 11:01 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2024 02:50 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

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	40	39
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	73
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	106	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

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

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

## 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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The significance of the project is fully demonstrated as the applicant intends to implement and scale research-based intervention for teachers that reduce biases and suspension rates for minority students. The Empathic Instruction Model will be used to implement training and services for teachers. The approach is innovative as documented research has shown the model has led to lower and more equitable suspension rates overall, particularly for Black students and students with disabilities. The focus of the project will be high-needs, middle school students including Black and Latinx students, students with disabilities, and students who have been disproportionately suspended or have high rates of chronic absenteeism in Virginia (pgs. e14-e18).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 39

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly identifies three distinct barriers to mitigate chronic absenteeism, high suspension rates, and disparities in suspension rates. The barriers indicate that 1) current interventions fail to reduce racial disparities in disciplinary outcomes, 2) teachers suffer from burnout, including the pressures associated with implementing intensive, hands-on interventions, and 3) there are challenges in identifying high-quality evidence-based interventions. The successful implementation of the Empathic Instruction model will help to address the barriers identified as the model seeks to sideline bias in teachers and helps to reduce racial disparities thus lowering the discipline rate (pgs. e19-e22).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**Strengths:**

The management plan is clearly delineated with the timeline and milestones identified, including potential start dates to ensure an on-time/on-budget project implementation. The applicant identifies all of the partners, and their roles and responsibilities are thoroughly described. For example, Mindset Science Solutions (MSS) will provide a variety of services beginning July 2025 including developing individualized links for Empathic Instruction exercises for the cohorts and developing facilitator guidebooks (pgs. e23-e25).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's capacity is clearly demonstrated. The qualified personnel are highly capable of bringing the proposed regional project to scale. For example, the applicant has 650 employees and currently works with educators, system leaders, and communities in 39 states and 6,000 districts or more nationwide. The project partners are qualified and experienced and have a successful history of project implementation. For example, the Evaluation Lead from WestEd is currently examining the effects of Empathic Instruction in the elementary grades (pgs. e26-e28).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its**

**Sub**

**project so as to support further development or replication.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes having a national website and disseminating program information at conferences, meetings, and national reports for educational researchers and practitioners (pgs. e28-e30).

**Weaknesses:**

The dissemination plan for the targeted area of Virginia is only broadly mentioned and not detailed. The information does not describe if dissemination will include blog posts, subscriber email lists, and social media accounts as the applicant only indicates that information will be available nationally through the applicant's organization.

**Reader's Score: 9**

- 5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant fully demonstrates that the products resulting from the proposed project can effectively be used in a variety of other settings. The project components and findings will be made available through journal articles, conference presentations, policy briefs, and electronic media content. The applicant's collaborative work with the Virginia Department of Education will ensure effective monitoring of the project to ensure the goals and outcomes are met due to the successful implementation of Empathic Instruction. The data and findings will contribute to Virginia's Support Framework (VDOE, 2022) in alignment with incorporating school discipline supports (pgs. e30-e31).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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 extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant appropriately describes the conceptual framework. The theory of change is well-represented in the accompanying logic model which denotes the key project components, outputs, and outcomes. For example, one of the short-term outcomes is to improve teacher and student relationship goals and long-term students will perceive classrooms/schools as a more equitable and safer environment. The Empathic Instruction model focuses on minimizing teacher biases by reducing the tendency to label students as troublemakers and improving the social-emotional well-being of students (pgs. e31-e35).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Strengths:**

The proposed project goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable, and aligned with the activities described. For example, Objective 1 is to scale the Empathic Instruction to teachers in the middle schools and the long-term goal is by the end of year 5, 3000 middle school teachers will have completed the training, to implement the Pathways-to-Success project model with fidelity through 22 activities for all 8th graders in the targeted schools at the start of the school year (pgs. e34-e36).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project is mostly appropriate to the needs of the target population. The nationwide data provided indicates that historically there has been a higher rate of suspension and chronic absenteeism among Black and Latinx students and since e COVID-19 the rate has increased. To further show the need for the project, data provided for Virginia shows that Black students and students with disabilities have a higher suspension rate and Black, Latinx, and students with disabilities have high absenteeism rates (pgs. e15-e18).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide data regarding the suspension rate for Latinx students, and no data describing the social and emotional needs of the target population in Virginia which somewhat diminished the project design.

**Reader's Score: 9**

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

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works

**Sub**

**Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**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 in other settings.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:**

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

**Strengths:**

No strengths found.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not describe plans to address Competitive Preference Priority 1.

**Reader's Score:** 0

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents national data indicating that there has been an increase in absenteeism from 15% in 2018 to 28% in 2022 since the COVID-19 pandemic. The information clearly indicates that Black, Latinx, and students with disabilities experience a higher level of school suspensions compared to other populations. The Empathic Instruction project proposes to address the effects of COVID-19 by examining if Empathic Instruction improves disciplinary equity, academic outcomes, attendance/chronic absenteeism rates, and social-emotional well-being, especially for high-need students (pgs. e15-e18).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not describe plans to conduct community asset mapping and needs assessments for the project.

**Reader's Score:** 1

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/01/2024 02:50 PM





Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 08:35 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

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	40	40
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	74
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	2
<b>Total</b>	106	76

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

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

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

## 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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

TNTP's proposal provides evidence that Empathic Instruction as an innovative approach that differs from traditional anti-bias strategies with an aim "sidelining biases in teachers' decision-making processes, rather than directly combating them." (p. e14) Based on empirical evidence, Empathetic Instruction is supported by several studies (██████████ et al., 2022; ██████████, Paunesku, & Walton, 2016), and holds a potential to effectively reduce biases in school discipline, thereby contributing to more equitable educational outcomes. (p. e10)

The applicant lists several schools using Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to improve behavior, which needs a lot of resources and training. The applicant demonstrates that this approach works well in elementary schools but less so in higher grades, where suspension rates and racial issues can increase. The approach has sometimes helped white students more, making racial inequalities worse. (p. e19)

Empathic Instruction helps teachers manage their biases and improve their relationships with students. It aims to create a more respectful classroom and reduce suspensions and racial disparities. Tests have shown it works well, and applying it in more schools could lower suspensions, absenteeism, and improve outcomes for minority and disabled students. (p. e19, e 20 & e31)

#### Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of the barriers and presents several adjustments to the intervention delivery process. The proposal examines three barriers impacting implementation and outlines steps to mitigate and overcome these challenges. Challenges include finding effective interventions and addressing teacher burnout as noted in the descriptions of barriers 1,2 & 3 below:

Barrier 1 highlights mixed results in reducing racial disparities in school discipline. Policies may lower suspension rates but fail to prevent other forms of exclusion. Efforts to reduce bias often have limited, short-term success, leading to persistent disparities. Barrier 2 indicates teacher burnout as impacting teacher well-being and effectiveness, leading to strained student relationships and negative perceptions, which harm student outcomes. Barrier 3 shows that schools struggle to find and implement effective, cost-efficient interventions due to a "research to practice gap." (p. e21 & e22)

TNTP's proposal effectively addresses scalability barriers with these strategies: (1) Empathic Instruction is a 40–50-minute online exercise offered twice a year, allowing teachers to participate asynchronously over a 2-month period. This format, designed for personal reflection without group discussions, helps teachers reconnect with their core motivations and improve student-teacher relationships. (2) TNTP will support school leadership in implementing Empathic Instruction with high uptake and fidelity, providing comprehensive resources such as research background, communication templates, checklists, FAQs, timelines, and a data dashboard for real-time tracking. (3) In partnership with the Virginia Department of Education, the program will support middle school teachers in high-need schools, aiming to reduce suspensions, absenteeism, and improve academic outcomes over the 2025-26 and 2026-27 school years. The project is designed to be low-touch, cost-effective, and scalable, expanding the research base. (p. e21 & e22)

**Weaknesses:**

None

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

**Strengths:**

The proposed management plan is well-structured and clearly outlines the project leadership as well as long-standing professional and collegial relationships as a foundation to achieving the project goals and objectives in bringing the project to scale. (e26) Several key points provide evidence of a solid management plan: (1) TNTP will lead the project in collaboration with Mindset Science Solutions (MSS), the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), and WestEd, each bringing proven capacity and experienced personnel, (2) TNTP will manage the project, holding regular meetings with partners and bi-weekly sessions with external evaluators, WestEd, to leverage interim findings for continuous improvement.

**Weaknesses:**

None

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

The applicant's capacity to bring the proposed project to scale both nationally and regionally is evident. The proposal provides evidence that TNTP can leverage national infrastructure and resources to collaborate across research, finance, communications, IT, and project teams. TNTP's project team appropriately demonstrates experience with teachers, leaders, and researchers, building on past successful collaborations while operating as a 650-employee team across 39 states and 6,000 districts. Furthermore, the proposal makes note of two decades of educational experience, managing complex, multi-year projects, including federal grants. (p. e26)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 10**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

A noted strength in the proposal for dissemination of information to further duplication is TNTP's reputation as a well-respected thought leader in education with the capacity, systems, and relationships to produce high-quality reports and to disseminate them broadly. For example, the avenues for dissemination are extensive such as digital outreach to share final reports through blog posts, subscriber email lists, and social media accounts. Also noteworthy is TNTP's website which receives 85,000 views monthly, and its email distribution list has 36,000 subscribers, as well as TNTP's work being noted in large media outlets, and creation of national level reports such as The Opportunity Myth conference presentations, executive leadership presentations, research dissemination in the forms of briefs, infographics and journal articles. Furthermore, the applicant effectively notes TNTP's ability to provide quality replication of information using TNTP's infrastructure and resources to support school districts post-impact study. (p. e28 & e29)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 10**

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

The proposal demonstrates the likely utility of products that will result from the proposed project can potentially impact the field of education. These include: (1) Educational conferences and workshops to disseminate evidence-based practices and practical strategies, (2) Academic journals providing rigorous evidence to advance equitable education discourse, (3) Policy briefs and reports to guide policymakers in resource allocation and interventions, (4) Leadership meetings to support informed decisions on adopting and scaling interventions, (5) Teacher training programs to equip educators with essential skills, (6) Community and parent sessions to foster support and involvement, and (7) Electronic media to broaden awareness and understanding of effective practices. (p. e31 & e32)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None

**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 extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides detailed information about TNT's conceptual design and framework as noted in the theory of changes, evidence-based approach, logic model, a well-thought-out implementation plan. For example, the logic model presents a theory of how punitive disciplinary practices rooted in bias can be disrupted by enhancing empathy, perspective-getting, and growth mindsets among teachers. This theory is well-supported by research. The framework, grounded in evidence, cites multiple studies that link high suspension rates to racial bias and show how empathy-focused professional learning can mitigate these disparities. (p. e31, e32 & e33)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project plan provides well designed, clear, and concise goals inclusive of objectives, outcomes, and measures for action planning to improve academic outcomes for Black and Latinx students, students with disabilities, and students with prior suspensions. Outcomes include decreasing suspension rates, improving student-teacher relationships, cultivating students' belonging, deepening trust with adults and improving attendance rates. (p. e34, e35 & e36)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The design of the proposed project is mostly appropriate to the needs of the target population. The proposal effectively shows 50,000 students in grades 6-8 will be served by the project. Definition of high-need students: Black and Latinx students, students with disabilities, and students with prior suspensions, all of whom are either disproportionately suspended or have high amounts of chronic absenteeism nationally and/or in Virginia where the project will take place. (p. e10)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide specific data regarding the target population and instead provides clusters of data that is specific to school and enter grade levels across Virginia which is not helpful when addressing the needs of the target population.

**Reader's Score: 9**

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

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**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 in other settings.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable**

Sub  
implementation.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

The applicant does not address CPP1.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address CPP1.

Reader's Score: 0

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families;

and

**(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal clearly states the impact of COVID-19 on absenteeism and discipline as increased following the pandemic. Furthermore, the proposal substantiates the claim by providing evidence, "Nationwide, chronic absenteeism nearly doubled from 15% in 2018 to 28% in 2022, particularly in districts with low achievement and high poverty (Malkus, 2024). Increased classroom disruptions and disrespect toward teachers have also been reported (NCES, 2022). (p. e17)

The proposal also provide relevant information about the project partnership with Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) in up to 30 of their school divisions, and 75 middle schools, as supported by Virginia's Superintendent of Public Instruction, [REDACTED], stated that, "Our students and our schools are facing different issues than they faced before the pandemic," (VDOE, 2024) and the rise of chronic absenteeism is an issue they are tackling. (p. e15)

**Weaknesses:**

A significant limitation is that the COVID-19 information available is only at the national level. This data does not provide the local level student specific information needed to understand the students being served within the district. Additionally, the absence of community mapping hinders the ability to effectively assess and address student needs through localized assessments.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2024 08:35 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 01:50 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	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	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	24
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	106	24

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

## 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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

n/a

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale 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 extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

#### Strengths:

n/a

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

**Sub**

**Reader's Score: 0**

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project 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 applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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 extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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 and measurable.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

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 to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

The proposed evaluation plan is fully described and would generate evidence about the intervention's efficacy which will meet WWC standards without reservations. The evaluation plan provides evidence of meeting standards through proposing a cluster RCT (with randomization), a plan for minimizing attrition, valid and reliable outcome measures, power analyses with manageable MDES, adjustments for clustering, and efforts to establish baseline equivalence using blocking (p.e36-43).

**Weaknesses:**

None

Reader's Score: 15

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation is designed to provide guidance for replication and further testing in multiple ways. The plan includes a power analysis that incorporates the smaller sizes of the student subgroups of interest (p.e41) and a 3-level RCT which incorporates the subdivision contextual component which will allow the evaluation to provide further contextual information about the intervention. The plan also includes analyses of fidelity and mediation, which will provide important evidence about how the intervention works and plans for a cost analysis using proven cost analysis methods (ingredients methods) to generate cost information for potential adopters. Finally, the evaluation is taking place in a representative sample of schools throughout the state of VA which will provide evidence for the intervention in a variety of contexts (p.e39).

**Weaknesses:**

None

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

The logic model clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes on p.e33 and is further supported by an explanation of the theories of change on p. e31-33.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide clearly defined thresholds for acceptable implementation. Thresholds for acceptable implementation are mentioned on p.e39, however, they are not yet defined clearly, and will be defined later according to the proposal. The provision of clearly defined thresholds would support an acceptable project implementation.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

### Priority Questions

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

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/02/2024 01:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 09:49 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	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	40	40
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	2
<b>Total</b>	106	77



# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (S411B240019)

## 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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The proposal clearly demonstrates the research, population and areas of need that will be addressed in the project (p. e16-18). There is substantial need to address suspensions and chronic absenteeism, especially for students that are historically underserved. The project is building upon existing strategies to have a significant impact on students' social emotional well-being (p. e18).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 40

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies four barriers that have impeded scale and sustainability. Each barrier is sufficiently explained and has a corresponding strategy to address the barrier(p. e19-22). For example, Barrier 2 describes teacher burnout and the applicant adequately addresses this barrier by utilizing a strategy that is minimally intrusive

**Sub**

(p. e21).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**Reader's Score: 10**

2. (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately identifies roles and responsibilities (p e24) and outlines clear timelines and the associated responsible party. For example, TNTP is responsible for creating sub-awards and scope of work agreement by 3/25 while MSS is responsible for developing individualized links for Empathic Instruction exercises for Cohort 1 by 7/25 (p. e24).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has adequately demonstrated the capacity to scale the project. The project team members have years of collective experience and TNTP has demonstrated the capacity to bring projects to scale. This is demonstrated in their two decades of experience managing complex, multi-year projects (p. e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

TNTP sufficiently demonstrates the mechanisms to broadly disseminate the information for this project because it has a large reach in the education sector, including partnerships with 39 states and 6,000 districts (p. e26). The applicant has a strong history of disseminating materials and plans to use that infrastructure and key personal to share the findings (p. e28-29 There is a clear timeline for sharing information (p. e35-36). For example, there will be yearly documentation of new non-study schools & districts using Empathetic Instruction in Y 4-5 of the project, with a total target of 40 schools and 3 districts by EOY 5 (p. e36).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the products can be used in a variety of setting because in their dissemination plan, they plan to target specific audiences to inform conversation and methods to reduce disparities in schools (p. e31).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

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 extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

**Strengths:**

The logic model clearly outlines the research findings and how the inputs will lead to the intended outputs (p. e33). For example, the applicant identifies that there are clear links between high suspension rates and racial bias (p. e31). The logic model illustrates how the project will focus on teacher bias through semesterly teacher support (p. e34).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Strengths:**

The proposal clearly specifies three goals and lists three or more objectives for each (e34-36). The objectives are clearly broken down with appropriate measurable outcomes. For example, the applicant's goal is that it will cost \$116.19 per student for the entirety of the grant (p. e35).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

**Strengths:**

This application effectively proposes to decrease overall suspension rates and reduce racial disparities in discipline (p. e20). The applicant clearly explains why this is necessary for students in Virginia due to the disproportionate suspension that black students receive in school (p. e36).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**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 in other settings.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable

**Sub**  
**implementation.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:**

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

**Strengths:**

Not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

**Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:**

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families;**

and

**(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.**

**Strengths:**

The project is utilizing coaching and ongoing support to educators as an evidence-based method for supporting students due to COVID-19 (p e19).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not clearly address sub-criterion A in the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2024 09:49 AM