# REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

## Proposals Due: October 27, 2015 by 4:00 PM

| |
|---|
| **READ Act**<br>**Professional Development**<br><br>**School Year 2015-2016** |

**For more information contact:**

Alisa Dorman

Executive Director, Office of Literacy

Phone (303) 866-6016

Fax: (303) 866-6370

E-mail: Dorman_A@cde.state.co.us

Issued by:

**cde** COLORADO
DEPARTMENT *of* EDUCATION

Teaching and Learning Unit
Office of Literacy
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203-1799
Phone: 303-866-6016
Fax: 303-866-6874
www.cde.state.co.us

---

## Colorado Department of Education
### ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

As a *learning organization*, CDE actively partners with districts, schools, educators, families, and community agencies to assess needs, foster innovation, identify promising practices, learn from each other, and disseminate successful strategies to increase student achievement and ensure college and career readiness.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Background

House Bill 12-1238, the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act (Colorado READ Act) was passed by the Colorado Legislature during the 2012 legislative session. The READ Act repeals the Colorado Basic Literacy Act (CBLA) as of July 1, 2013, keeping many of the elements of CBLA such as a focus on K-3 literacy, assessment, and individual plans for students reading below grade level. The READ Act differs from CBLA by focusing on students identified as having a significant reading deficiency, delineating requirements for parent communication, and providing funding to support intervention. Other components of the Colorado READ Act include a competitive Early Literacy Grant and a resource bank of assessments, instructional programming, and professional development.

## Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to solicit Professional Development for inclusion on the 2013-2014 *Read Act Advisory List of Professional Development*, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209. This is not a competitive process. Any provider that meets the criteria specified below may be considered for inclusion on the provider list. The advisory list will be available to Colorado schools and school districts via the Colorado Department of Education's website: http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index.asp. This RFI does not include a provision for expenditure of state funds to providers on the list, and there is no guarantee that providers will be selected by schools/districts. The list of providers will be maintained by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). The list will be updated periodically. There will be an opportunity for new providers to apply to be added to the list by meeting the criteria specified below. Providers may be removed from the list if their professional development is found to no longer meet the stated criteria. The state may revise its criteria over time as needed.

The main purpose of the *Read Act Advisory List of Professional Development* is to provide districts and schools with a choice of professional development that adequately enhances teacher quality and is a major vehicle that schools/districts can utilize to upgrade their capacity as it relates to the implementation of the READ Act.

**Professional Development Providers that were previously reviewed and approved do not need to resubmit to remain on the advisory list.**

## Eligibility Requirements

To be included on the *READ Act Advisory List of Professional Development*, providers must meet the following eligibility requirements:

- Demonstrated knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development.

- Demonstrated experience in providing professional development at the school/district/state levels that specifically addresses the topics of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Experience in providing professional development in other topics such as reading research; assessment usage including screening, interim, and diagnostic; leadership and reading achievement; explicit and systematic instruction; strategies for teaching struggling and advanced readers; classroom management techniques; data analysis; comprehensive assessment plans; multi-tiered system of supports and literacy; problem-solving process; effective school structures for school-wide literacy instruction; whole and small-group instruction; effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction; scientifically-based reading research strategies for teaching English Language Learners.

- A history of providing professional development that has led to significant and improved changes in reading achievement and educator effectiveness.

- Targeted strategies for closing achievement gaps across all disaggregated student groups and proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to improved achievement.

- Aligned with the components of the READ Act including state board approved lists of interim, diagnostic,

and summative assessments and the advisory list of instructional programming.

- Demonstrated effectiveness in presenting to groups as reflected in a video file.

## Topics, Intended Audiences, and Formats

The CDE is seeking applicants that can address relevant professional development on a variety of topics, for various audiences and in numerous formats. Below is a list of suggested topics, audiences, and formats.

**Topics:**

- Reading research
- The 5 components of reading
- Assessment usage including screening, interim, and diagnostic
- Leadership and reading achievement
- Explicit and systematic instruction
- Strategies for teaching struggling and advanced readers
- Classroom management techniques
- Data analysis
- Comprehensive assessment plans
- The problem-solving process
- Response to Intervention and multi-tiered systems of support
- Effective school structures for school-wide literacy instruction
- Whole and small-group instruction
- Effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction
- Scientifically-based reading research strategies for teaching English Language Learners

**Intended Audiences:**

- Paraprofessionals
- Classroom teachers
- Special educators
- Interventionists
- School and district leadership
- Teacher leaders and instructional coaches Formats:
- On-going, job-embedded consultation
- Web-based
- On-line courses
- Topic-centered; one-time events

**Formats:**

- On-going, job-embedded consultation/coaching/professional development
- Web-based
- On-line courses
- Topic-centered; one-time events

NOTE:  To be considered for the Early Literacy Grants program schools, providers must be able to provide on-going, job-embedded consultation, coaching and professional development.

## Review Process

The format outlined below must be followed in order to assure consistent application of the evaluation criteria. An electronic version of the proposal must be submitted to Marisa Calzadillas at: Calzadillas_M@CDE.state.co.us  and Alisa Dorman at: Dorman_A@cde.state.co.us by Tuesday, October 27, 2015 at 4:00 pm. In addition to the electronic version, please provide 5 hardcopies mailed to the Colorado Department of Education to the attention of Marisa Calszdillas at 201 E. Colfax Ave., Room #106, Denver, CO 80203. Applicants must also submit a video presentation. Video presentations will be uploaded to an internal secure cloud server, to receive those directions, please contact Marisa Calzadillas at Calzadillas_M@cde.state.co.us. The submission must be received no later than Tuesday, October 27, 2015. The electronic version should include all required pieces of the proposal as one document. Faxes will NOT be accepted.  Incomplete proposals will NOT be considered.

The written submission of the proposal and the video will be reviewed by a team of readers with experience in the content areas outlined in this Request for Information. Proposals will be scored using the attached rubric.

**Please Note: Submitters who do not complete the intent to submit form by end of the day October 9, 2015 will not be considered eligible for the review process.**

## Timeline

| | |
|---|---|
| September 28, 2015 | Request for Information available on the CDE website |
| **October 9, 2015** | **Applicants indicate electronically via this form intent to submit which is REQUIRED to be considered for the review process.** |
| October 27, 2015 | Proposals and examples of instructional programs must be received by CDE by 4:00 pm |
| November 11, 12 and 13 2015, | CDE will review proposals. |
| November 20, 2015 | Applicants will be notified of the status of their proposal. |
| November 23 – December 8, 2015 | Applicants may appeal the decisions of the review process |
| December 8 -December 30, 2015 | The CDE will respond to any appeals to the review process |
| By January 8, 2016 | The Colorado Department of Education will post to their website updates and additions to the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming. |

## Required Format

Proposals should include the RFI required elements outlined below. Do not send the full RFI as part of the organization's proposal.

- All pages must be standard letter size, 8-1/2" x 11" using no smaller than 12 point type.
- Providers who have an interest may submit no more than a two-page letter of interest/narrative (brief summary) which addresses the criteria for the advisory list of professional development. The criteria may be found in the Eligibility Requirements section of this RFI.
- Providers should also include a more detailed description of no more than 20 pages describing how the professional development meets the 5 criteria (not including the video) outlined in the Eligibility Requirements.
- Use document footer with the name of the entity and page numbers.
- Use 1-inch margins.
- Proposals will only be considered complete when the following have been received; electronic document in PDF format, 5 additional hard copies submitted via mail, video presentation submitted electronically or by mail, and any supplemental materials referred to in the proposal.

All materials should be sent to:

Colorado Department of Education
Attn: Office of Literacy; Marisa Calzadillas
201 E. Colfax Ave., Room 406
Denver, Co. 80203

## Required Elements

A complete proposal includes:

Part I: **Cover Page**

Part II: **Letter of interest and/or narrative** (maximum 2 pages with a brief overview/summary describing how the professional development meets the outlined criteria)

Part III: **Detailed descriptions** (limited to 20 pages) **of how the PD meets the 5 criteria outlined in the Eligibility Requirements section.**

Part IV**: Video file (Contact Marisa Calzadillas at Calzadillas_M@cde.state.co.us for directions on submission).**

Part V: **Letter of reference from a customer you have served in the last two years.**

Part Vi: **Optional supplemental materials related to the proposed professional development**

---

**Deliver by 4 p.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2015 to:**
**Marisa Calzadillas**
**Colorado Department of Education**
**Office of Literacy**
**201 E. Colfax Avenue, #106**
**Denver, CO 80203**
**Submit an electronic copy of the proposal to:**
Dorman_A@cde.state.co.us and Calzadillas_M@cde.state.co.us

---

# READ Act Colorado State Board of Education Advisory List
# of Professional Development
**2015-2016**

| **PART I: COVER PAGE** *(Complete and attach as the first page of proposal)* | |
|---|---|

| **Name of Entity:** | |
|---|---|
| **Contact Person for the Proposal:** | |
| Mailing Address: | |
| Telephone: | Webpage: |
| Email: | |

**List topics for proposed professional development:**

**List targeted audience for proposed professional development:**

**List format for proposed professional development:**

## READ Act Advisory List of Professional Development

**Part I:** Proposal Form/Cover Page (Not scored)

**Part II:**
Letter of Interest/Narrative: Brief 2-page overview/summary describing how the PD meets the outlined criteria (Not scored)

**Part III:** Detailed description of how the PD meets the following 5 criteria outlined in the Eligibility Requirements section (20-page limit):

A. Demonstrated knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development (15 points)
B. Demonstrated experience in providing professional development in the areas outlined in pages 4 and 5 of this RFI (15 points)
C. A history of providing professional development that has led to significant and improved changes in reading achievement and educator effectiveness (30 points)
D. Targeted strategies for closing achievement gaps across all disaggregated student groups and proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to improved achievement (30 points)
E. Aligned with the components of the READ Act including state board approved lists of interim, diagnostic, and summative assessments and the advisory list of instructional programming (10 points)

**Part IV:** Video file plus a narrative description of the file's contents: (Eligibility Requirement #6)

- Demonstrated effectiveness in presenting to groups as reflected in a video file (20 points)

**TOTAL** (all areas): 120 points

**Part V:** Optional supplemental materials to be reviewed and considered when calculating scores above

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│  TOTAL POINTS: _____ out of 120 possible   │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** *Please indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments are used on feedback forms to applicants.*

**Strengths:**
(1)_____

(2)_____

**Weaknesses:**
(1)_____

(2)_____

**Recommendations:**

```
┌───────────────────────┐     ┌───────────────────────────┐
│ Recommended _____   │     │ Not Recommended _____   │
└───────────────────────┘     └───────────────────────────┘
```

**Signature of Reviewer**_____ **Date**_____

```

# READ Act Advisory List of Professional Development

Part III A: Provider has demonstrated knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development.

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 0-4 Points <br><br> __Points | Provider does not demonstrate knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development. | |
| 5-8 Points <br><br> __Points | Provider demonstrates knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development but content of professional development **in literacy** focuses on other areas of reading. | |
| 9-12 Points <br><br> ___Points | Provider has adequately demonstrated knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development. | |
| 13-15 Points <br><br> ___Points | Provider has included substantial evidence to demonstrate knowledge of scientifically-based reading research and research-based practices related to K-3 literacy development. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

**Part III B: Provider has demonstrated experience in providing professional development in the topic areas of: Scientifically-based reading research; the research on how to teach reading; assessment usage including screening, interim, and diagnostic; leadership and reading achievement; explicit and systematic instruction; strategies for teaching struggling and advanced readers; classroom management techniques; data analysis; comprehensive assessment plans; RtI and literacy instruction; multi-tiered systems of support and literacy; the problem-solving process; effective school structures for school-wide literacy instruction; whole and small-group instruction; effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction; scientifically-based reading research strategies for teaching English Language Learners.**

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 0-4 Points<br>____Points | Provider lacks experience in providing professional development. | |
| 5-8 Points<br><br>___Points | Provider has some experience in providing professional development but not in the areas outlined above. | |
| 9-12 Points<br><br>___Points | Provider has experience providing professional development in a few of the areas outlined above. | |
| 13-15 Points<br><br>___Points | Provider has extensive experience providing professional development in many of the areas outlined above. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

**Part III C.: Provider demonstrates a history of providing professional development that has led to significant and improved changes in reading achievement and educator effectiveness.**

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 0-7 Points ___Points | Provider has no evidence that previously provided professional development has led to significant and improved changes in reading achievement and educator effectiveness. | |
| 8-15 Points ___Points | Provider has evidence that the professional development they have provided has led to some change in reading achievement and/or educator effectiveness. | |
| 16-23 Points ___Points | Provider has evidence that the professional development they have provided has led to change in reading achievement and/or educator effectiveness. | |
| 24-30 Points ___Points | The provider has significant evidence that the professional development they have provided has led to significant change in reading achievement and/or educator effectiveness. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

**Part III D: The provider has targeted strategies for closing achievement gaps across all disaggregated student groups and proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to improved achievement.**

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 0-7 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider has not outlined specific targeted strategies to close achievement gaps across all disaggregated student groups and/or the proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to improved achievement. | |
| 8-15 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider has outlined some strategies to close achievement gaps across some disaggregated student groups and/or the proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to some improved achievement. | |
| 16-22 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider has outlined targeted strategies to close achievement gaps across disaggregated student groups and/or the proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to some improved achievement. | |
| 23-30 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider has outlined multiple targeted strategies to close achievement gaps across disaggregated student groups and has the proven ability to apply research-based strategies that lead to improved achievement. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

**Part III E: The professional development is aligned with the components of the READ Act including state board approved lists of interim, diagnostic, and summative assessments and the advisory list of instructional programming.**

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 0-2 Points<br><br>___Points | The professional development that the provider describes does not align with the components of the READ Act. | |
| 3-5 Points<br><br>___Points | The professional development that the provider has outlined contains components that do not align with the components of the READ Act. | |
| 6-8 Points<br><br>__Points | The professional development that the provider has outlined aligns to the components of the READ Act. | |
| 8-10 Points<br><br>___Points | The professional development that the provider has outlined is in complete alignment with the components of the READ Act and details a clear description of how their professional development would ensure accurate implementation of the READ Act. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

**Part IV: Provider should provide a video file plus a narrative description of the file's contents in order to demonstrate effectiveness in presenting to groups.**

| Points | Criteria | Be specific how each submission of professional development did/did not meet the outlined criteria |
|---|---|---|
| 1-4 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider does not include a video file or the video file does not demonstrate effective presentation of material to groups. | |
| 5-8 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider includes a video file, but the video reflects some ineffective presentation strategies. | |
| 9-14 Points<br><br>__Points | The provider includes a video file that demonstrates the ability to effectively present material to groups. | |
| 15-20 Points<br><br>___Points | The provider includes a video file that demonstrates the ability to effectively present material to groups. The video reflects engaged and active participants and the presenter's ability to use multiple strategies to engage the audience. | |

Please be specific about any other details you would like us to know about this provider of professional development in this area:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____