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**Background and Purpose**

The Colorado READ Act provides specific grant funding to Colorado Schools to support comprehensive literacy implementation for grades K-3. A portion of the funding awarded to each school must be allocated to select and utilize an Implementation Consultant to support their efforts throughout the duration of the Early Literacy Grant.

The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to solicit Implementation Consultants to be reviewed to meet the criteria for inclusion on the Early Literacy Grant Implementation Consultants list,pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1211. This is not a competitive process. Any provider which submits an application during this timeframe of solicitation and meets the criteria specified within this RFI may be considered for inclusion on the provider list. The Implementation Consultant list will be available to Colorado schools and school districts via the Colorado Department of Education’s website: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readact/grant>.

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.

**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 Alex Frazier at: Frazier\_A@cde.state.co.us by Monday, November 19, at 11:59 pm. In addition to the electronic version, please provide five hardcopies mailed to the Colorado Department of Education to the attention of Marisa Calzadillas 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 Monday, November 19, 2018. 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 Friday, November 9, 2018 will not be considered eligible for the review process.**

**Required Format**

In completing the application ensure to follow the required formatting 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.
* Implementation Consultants should also include a narrative, a more detailed description of no more than 20 pages describing how the professional development meets the 4 criteria (not including the video) outlined in the Eligibility Requirements.
* Video file directions**;** Contact Marisa Calzadillas at Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us for directions on submission
* 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 delivered by 11:59 p.m. on Monday, November 19, 2018 to:**

Marisa Calzadillas

Colorado Department of Education

P-3 Office – Literacy Team

201 E. Colfax Avenue, #106

Denver, CO 80203

**Submit an electronic copy of the proposal to:**

**Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us**

**Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| October 19, 2018  | Request for Information available on the CDE website |
| November 19, 2018  | Proposals and examples of instructional programs must be received by CDE by 4:00 pm |
| November 9, 2018  | Intent form submitted to the CDE <https://goo.gl/forms/YPx2F1DYZwL8WSJn1>  |
| November 26 – November 30, 2018  | CDE will review proposals. |
| December 7, 2018 | Applicants will be notified of the status of their proposal. |
| December 8 – December 21, 2018 | Applicants may appeal the decisions of the review process |
| December 22, 2018 - January 9, 2019 | The CDE will respond to any appeals to the review process |
| By January 18, 2019 | The Colorado Department of Education will post to their website updates and additions to the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming. |

**Early Literacy Grant (ELG) Application:**

**Implementation Consultant Provider**

**2018-2019**

# Part IA: Cover Page – Entity Information

|  |
| --- |
| **Application Type**(select one)[ ]  **Single Implementation Consultant Provider**[ ]  **Implementation Consultant Provider – One or more subcontractors**  |
| **Name of Entity (The name the implementation consultant provider operates under.):** |
| **Contact Person for the Proposal:** |
| Mailing Address: |
| Telephone: | Webpage:  |
| Email: |
| **If applying as an Implementation Consultant Provider which includes more than one consultant**, list names of additional consultants who will be contracted to support Early Literacy Grant schools:  |

# Part IB: Assurances and Disclaimers

The appropriate Authorized Representatives must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the application.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| On | (date) | , 2018, the representative of | (Entity) |

hereby agrees to the following assurances:

1. Commitment to supporting Early Literacy Grant schools in implementing Scientifically Based and Evidence based Reading Research and all other requirements of the Early Literacy Grant in collaboration with the Colorado Department of Education.
2. Ensure consultant(s) are sufficiently trained in DIBELS Next and corresponding data management and reporting platform selected by the Early Literacy Grantee – either Dynamic Measurement Group (DIBELSnet) or Amplify (mClass).
3. Ensure access, in cooperation with Early Literacy Grant awardee, to necessary reporting platforms for driving instructional and system supports.
4. Provide resumes to the CDE for approval for any additional consultants that are subcontracted to support Early Literacy Grant awardees. In addition, ensure all subcontractors are aware of the requirements of the ELG program as well as consultant roles and responsibilities within the ELG program, specifically able to support and implement in alignment with all Eligibility requirements included within this RFI.
5. Ensure responsive, timely communication of consultative support and progress in meeting grant goals with the Early Literacy Grant Manager for each ELG grantee(s) within the structures established by the CDE.
6. Participation in consultant meetings, webinars, or conference calls requested by the ELG manager.

If any findings of support by Implementation Consultants are found to be outside of evidence based practices or acceptable professional conduct, providers may be subject to removal from the approved list and/or current existing contracts with schools in the Early Literacy Grant program.

Approved providers may be subject for review and/or resubmission according to CDE timeline for ELG program.

By signing below, the undersigned agree to all Early Literacy Grant Consultant assurances listed above:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Name of Representative |  | Signature |

# Part II: Letter of Interest

Ensure the proposal for Implementation Consultants includes a no more than two-page letter of interest (brief summary) which addresses the interest in being considered for the advisory list of Early Literacy Implementation Consultants.

# Part III: Credentials

Ensure the proposal includes the lead Implementation Consultant’s resume to ensure education and certification demonstrates an expert level of knowledge in reading instruction and experience in consulting/coaching at school and/or district levels.

In addition to the resume, reference letters need to be included within the proposal. Provide at minimum two letters of reference from current references (within the last two years), in leading literacy school and/or district wide initiatives.

# Part IV: Narrative – Eligibility Requirements

To be included on the *READ Act Advisory List of Professional Development as an Early Literacy Implementation Consultant*, providers must address and adequately demonstrate proficiency in the following eligibility requirements. These requirements are further addressed within the scoring rubric on page 11:

**Scientifically and Evidence-Based Research Implementation**

Demonstrates deep understanding of scientifically and evidence based instruction through addressing at minimum the following:

* Current reading research
* Literacy Components - Phonology, including Phonemic Awareness, Basic and Advanced Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension, and Oral Language
* Reading instruction for English Language Learners
* Dyslexia – preferred

 **System Alignment - School Leadership, School Culture, and System Analysis**

Demonstrate an ability to analyze and align systems to support the work of the Early Literacy Grant and ensure sustainability. At minimum, address the following:

* Assessing strengths and opportunities within the system
* Understanding and supporting the role of school and district leadership
* Assessing and influencing school culture
* Understanding of the work of Early Literacy Grant program within a larger MTSS framework

**History of Improvement**

Demonstrate a history of providing professional development that has led to significant improvement in reading achievement, educator effectiveness, and the overall system (school or district).

**Professional Development and Supports**

Articulates a long-term implementation plan for support which includes professional development and consulting efforts. Specifically address the topics below through the lens of scientifically and evidence-based instruction targeting K-3 literacy and how the overall system will be supported over time:

Components of Instruction:

* Explicit and Systematic instruction
* Whole and Small-group instruction
* Effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction
* Classroom management techniques
* Targeted strategies for closing achievement gaps and improving outcomes for all disaggregated groups including:
	+ - Struggling readers including those with dyslexia
		- Advancing readers who are at grade level and beyond
		- English Language Learners

Assessment / Data Analysis:

* Demonstrated knowledge of DIBELS Next interim, DIBELS Deep diagnostic, and reporting systems that are associated with this assessment
* Data analysis
* Comprehensive assessment plans

School Wide Implementation:

* Effective school structures for school-wide literacy instruction
* Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
* Family and community involvement
* Sustainability of Implementation

In addition, include a plan for effectively communicating with schools, district contacts, and the department throughout the term of the contract with the ELG recipient.

# Part V: Video File – Data Analysis Sample & Presentation Style

In addition to the eligibility requirements being addressed through the proposal’s narrative, applicants must submit a video file to the CDE which demonstrates effectiveness in presenting to groups. Please include a video presentation which includes an example of analyzing early literacy data, as well as a way to demonstrate to reviewers the presentation style.

For video file submission and directions**,** please contact Marisa Calzadillas at Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us .

# Part VI: Optional Supplemental Materials

Applicant may choose to provide additional resources, artifacts etc. within their proposal to be considered in the review of their proposal. These materials are not required, but may be used to further inform reviewers in scoring the narrative portion of the rubric.

# Scoring Criteria & Rubric

The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application as a whole. In order for the application to be recommended for approval, it must receive at least 112 points out of the 140 possible points and all required elements must be addressed. An application that receives a score of 0 on any required elements will not be funded. Reminder to not exceed 20 pages in your submission.

**Required Elements – A complete proposal must include:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Points Possible |
| **Part I:** | **Cover Page, Assurances & Disclaimers** | No Points |
| **Part II:** | **Letter of Interest** *\*may be used to further inform scoring under eligibility requirements*  | No Points |
| **Part III:** | **Credentials** |  |
|  | Section A: | Resume Review | 5  |
|  | Section B: | Letter of Reference  | 5 |
| **Part IV:** | **Narrative – Eligibility Requirements** Provide examples and artifacts that demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and alignment to Eligibility Requirements  |  |
|  | Section A: | Scientifically-Based Reading Research Implementation  | 25 |
|  | Section B: | School Leadership, School Culture, and Systems Alignment | 25 |
|  | Section C: | History of Improvement*Submit actual letters from a school where data has changed with your support as well as the change results* | 20 |
|  | Section D: | Professional Development & Supports | 35 |
| **Part V:** |  **Video File – Data Analysis Sample & Presentation Style** |  |
|  | Section A: |  Sample Data Review | 10 |
|  | Section B: |  Presentation Style | 5 |
| **Part VI:** | **Optional Supplemental Materials***\*may be used to further inform scoring under eligibility requirements*  | No Points  |
| **Sub-total:** | **140** |
| **Dyslexia Bonus Points** | 5 |

**Scoring Definitions**

**Minimally addressed or does not meet criteria**: Information Not Provided

**Met some but not all identified criteria**: Requires Additional Clarification or Development

**Addressed criteria but did not provide thorough detail**: Adequate response, but not thoroughly developed or high quality respons*e*

**Met All Criteria with High Quality:** Clear, concise and well thought out response

**Scoring Rubric:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Part I: Cover Page, Assurances, & Disclaimers** |
| The required elements for Cover Page, Assurances, & Disclaimers were met with satisfication.  | [ ]  **Yes** | [ ]  **No** |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Non Scored Element**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part II: Letter of Interest** |
| Letter of interest was provided.  | [ ]  **Yes** | [ ]  **No** |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Non Scored Element**  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part III: Credentials**  | **Minimally Addressed or does not meet criteria** | **Met some but not all identified criteria** | **Addressed criteria but did not provide thorough detail** | **Met All Criteria with High Quality** |
| 1. The lead consultant’s education and certification demonstrate an expert level of knowledge in reading instruction and experience in consulting/coaching at school and/or district levels.
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. The lead consultant has current (within the last two years), strong references in leading school and/or district-wide literacy initiatives.
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Total** | **/10** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part IV: Narrative - Eligibility Requirements**  | **Minimally Addressed or does not meet criteria** | **Met some but not all identified criteria** | **Addressed criteria but did not provide thorough detail** | **Met All Criteria with High Quality** |
| **Scientifically-Based Reading Research Implementation**  | 1. **points possible**
 |
| 1. Phonological Awareness (including Phonemic Awareness) (e.g., understanding of the continuum and how it relates across ages, finding gaps, instructional implications)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Basic and Advanced Phonics & Encoding (e.g., understanding of the continuum and how it relates across ages, finding gaps, instructional implications)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Fluency (e.g., understanding of the continuum and how it relates across ages, finding gaps, instructional implications)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Vocabulary (including Oral Language) (e.g., understanding of the continuum and how it relates across ages, finding gaps, instructional implications)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Language and Reading Comprehension (e.g., understanding of the continuum and how it relates across ages, finding gaps, instructional implications)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **School Leadership, School Culture, and Systems Alignment**  | **25 points possible** |
| 1. Demonstrates a coherent instructional design for support (e.g., diagnostic review, implementation benchmarks, and outlined activities).
 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Includes a variety of support opportunities in a variety of formats (e.g., ability to utilize technology for check-ins, face to face walk-throughs and PD, use of video for feedback, digital sharing platforms of resources to support implementation).
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Demonstrates ability to facilitate change management within individuals, teams, and organizations.
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Addresses how capacity will be built to sustain efforts beyond the grant.
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **History of Improvement** | **20 points possible** |
| 1. Letters, additional evidence, and description provided – all to indicate history of improvement in student and system outcomes.
 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 20 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Professional Development & Supports**  | **35 points possible** |
| 1. Describes what training would be provided to ensure implementation across tiers of instruction over multiple years in order to establish evidence—based literacy instruction throughout K-3 (best first instruction, targeted and intensive).
 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Demonstrates a clear understanding of how schools target programming and strategies for closing achievement gaps across all disaggregated student groups.

Targets proven, research-based strategies that lead to improved achievements including, but not limited to, struggling readers, advancing readers at grade level or beyond, and English Language Learners. | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Demonstrates the ability to support a comprehensive assessment plan (use of READ Act interim, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools) to guide instruction to ensure 90-95% of students are at grade level in reading by 3rd grade.
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 14) Demonstrates an understanding of Multitired System of Supports (MTSS) and how the work of an early literacy grant fits within the System of Supports. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 15) Demonstrates an effective plan for communication with related stakeholders.  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Total** | **/105** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part V: Data Analysis Sample & Presentation Style – *Video file***  | **Minimally Addressed or does not meet criteria** | **Met some but not all identified criteria** | **Addressed criteria but did not provide thorough detail** | **Met All Criteria with High Quality** |
| 16) Plans and facilitates data analysis protocols to support schools/districts in analyzing data effectively | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| 1. *Demonstrated effective in presenting to groups as reflected in a video file* (e.g., ability to utilize adult learning theory, presentation strategies, professionalism, effective delivery, etc.)
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Total** | **/15** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Dyslexia Bonus Points**  |
| Optional points are available for proposals which address dyslexia, both the knowledge of dyslexia as well demonstrating how ELG schools would be supported in their understanding (what it is, identifying risk factors, etc.) as well as instructional strategies and implications for those with dyslexia.  | **Minimally or Not Addressed**[ ]  **N**o Bonus Points Awarded | **Addressed with Adequacy**Up to 3 points | **Strong Understanding & Ability to Support Demonstrated**5 points |
| **Reviewer Comments:** |
| **Total** | **/5** |