



COLORADO
Department of Education

Funding Opportunity

Applications Due: **Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm**

Application Information Webinar: **Wednesday, February 8, 2017, From 1:00 – 2:00 pm**

Letter of Intent Due: **Friday, February 10, 2017**

Early Literacy Grant Program

Pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1211

For Program Questions:

Rachael Anderberg, Early Literacy Grant Manager

Anderberg_R@cde.state.co.us | (303) 866-6150

For Budget/Fiscal Questions:

Marti Rodriguez, Office of Grants Fiscal

Rodriguez_M@cde.state.co.us | (303) 866-6769

For Application Questions:

Kim Burnham, Office of Competitive Grants and Awards

Burnham_K@cde.state.co.us | (303) 866-6916



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Purpose | 3 |
| Eligibility and Continued Funding | 4 |
| Available Funds | 4 |
| Critical Components of the Proposal | 4 |
| Allowable Use of Funds..... | 7 |
| Duration of Grant | 7 |
| Evaluation and Reporting..... | 7 |
| Data Privacy..... | 8 |
| Technical Assistance | 8 |
| Review Process and Timeline..... | 8 |
| Submission Process and Deadline..... | 8 |
| Application Format..... | 9 |
| Required Elements | 9 |
| Part IA: Applicant and Recipient Information | 10 |
| Part IB: Program Assurances and Disclaimers..... | 12 |
| Application Scoring | 14 |
| Narrative Response Template Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric..... | 15 |
| | |
| Attachment A: Early Literacy Grant Program Rules..... | 20 |
| Attachment B: Letter of Intent..... | 22 |
| Attachment C: Literacy Evaluation Tool..... | 23 |

Early Literacy Grant Program

Applications Due Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm

Introduction

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is designed to distribute funds to local education providers, including school districts, BOCES, and district charter schools or Institute Charter Schools, to embed the essential components of reading instruction into all elements of the K-3 teaching structures in all schools, including universal and targeted and intensive instructional interventions, to assist all students in achieving reading competency. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) recognizes the importance of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) for all students. Comprehensive implementation of a multi-tiered system of support will contribute to more meaningful identification of learning problems related to literacy achievement, improve instructional quality, provide all students with the best opportunity to learn to read, accelerate the reading growth of advanced readers, and assist with the identification of students reading below grade level, including students with a Significant Reading Deficiency (as defined in the Rules for the Administration of the Colorado READ Act posted on the CDE READ Act webpage: www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index) and students with learning disabilities related to reading.

District and school leadership is critical to the successful implementation of the Early Literacy Grant. Thus, this RFP will support schools in developing and/or maintaining a School Leadership Team (SLT) for the purpose of leading the school's effort to embed the essential components of reading instruction into all elements of the mainstream K-3 teaching structures. (Note that a currently existing leadership team or school improvement team may serve the purpose of the Early Literacy Grant School Leadership Team). District support of the Early Literacy Grant is critical; therefore, all proposals must include a description of how district level personnel will be represented on a regular basis to support the activities of the grant. The SLT must meet regularly to review the school's K-3 student level data (interim and diagnostic assessments) and data related to the school's implementation of grant requirements. The SLT will also be responsible for developing and updating the school's professional development plan related to assessment and instruction in K-3 literacy.

Purpose

The purpose of this RFP is to solicit an application for funding from an eligible district, BOCES, district charter school, or Institute Charter school. The Early Literacy Grant Program will:

- Provide the necessary assistance to grantees to establish instructional systems related to the teaching of reading for all students in kindergarten through third grade based on Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR).
- Support schools in implementing a multi-tiered system of support in an effort to reduce the number of students reading below grade level, including students identified as having a Significant Reading Deficiency.
- Be used to provide significantly increased principal and teacher professional development to ensure that all principals and teachers, including teachers providing interventions for students (i.e., special education, English language development, Title I), have the skills necessary to effectively teach all children to read and understand the infrastructures that enable increased reading achievement for K-3 students.
- Provide assistance to grantees in administering and interpreting interim and diagnostic assessments as listed in the CDE READ Act State Board approved lists of interim and diagnostic assessments pursuant to the READ Act (www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/resourcebank).
- Provide support in implementing universal/core programs and programs designed for targeted and intensive instructional interventions, as listed in the CDE READ Act advisory list of instructional programming (www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/programming).
- Provide assistance to grantees in scheduling testing of students and interpreting assessment data, including scheduling of progress monitoring of students that are reading below grade level. Grantees must adhere to requirements provided by the Department regarding frequency of testing and deadlines for completing assessments and submitting data.

See **Attachment A** for the Rules for the Administration of the Early Literacy Grant.

Eligibility and Continued Funding

Districts and BOCES may apply on behalf of individual schools or a collaborative group (consortium) of schools. If applying as a consortium, the consortium as a unit will be held accountable for the demonstration of achievement targets; however, if the consortium does not meet one or more of the achievement targets, individual schools within the consortium that meet targets will continue to receive subsequent years funding, and the consortium will not continue to receive funding as a group. In order to be considered for subsequent year's funding, grantees must meet one or more of the following targets:

- Make above to well above average progress moving students out of the well below benchmark category as measured by the DIBELS Next Growth Tool www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/elatresourcesdocuments.
- Make above to well above average progress moving students into the benchmark category as measured by the DIBELS Next Growth Tool www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/elatresourcesdocuments.
- Move 50% of students scoring below benchmark up at least one performance category (well below benchmark to below benchmark/benchmark or below benchmark to benchmark).

Note: Priority will be given to applications where the participating school(s) demonstrate a high percentage of students with significant reading deficiencies (SRD). Bonus points will be assigned as follows:

| SRD Percentage | Bonus Points |
|----------------|--------------|
| 15-24% | 5 points |
| 25% + | 10 points |

Available Funds

Approximately \$2 million is available for the Early Literacy Grant Program for the 2017-2018 school year. In awarding grants to schools that meet the expectations of this grant program, CDE will make awards that are of sufficient size and scope to support the costs associated with establishing instructional systems related to the teaching of reading for all students in kindergarten through third grade based on Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR). Applicants choosing to submit a consortia application (on the behalf of multiple schools) may not apply and be funded for more than \$1 million for the three years of the project.

Critical Components of the Proposal

It is critical that the proposal of each applicant:

- Demonstrates a deep understanding of the five essential components of effective reading instruction;
- Establishes that the proposed activities will operate in a coherent, seamless manner, including elements of effective literacy programs;
- Details how all activities incorporate Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR);
- Includes a plan for implementing a multi-tiered system of support in an effort to reduce the number of students reading below grade level, demonstrating a cohesive plan of instruction both system-wide and among the tiers of instruction within each grade level; and
- Addresses sustainability of the program established during the grant's implementation phase beyond the years of grant funding.

Critical components of the applicant's proposal are described in detail below.

1. Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction

Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) has identified five essential components of effective reading instruction. To ensure that children learn to read well, explicit and systematic instruction must be provided in these five areas:

Phonemic awareness: A subset of phonological awareness in which listeners are able to hear, identify, and manipulate phonemes, the smallest units of sound that can differentiate meaning.

Phonics: A method of teaching reading and writing by developing learner's phonemic awareness, that is, the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the sounds (phonemes) in order to teach the correspondence between these sounds and the spelling patterns (graphemes) that represent them.

Fluency: The capacity to read words in connected text with sufficient accuracy, rate, and prosody to comprehend what is read.

Vocabulary: Knowledge of words and word meanings and includes words that a person understands and uses in language. Vocabulary is essential for both learning to read and comprehending text.

Comprehension: The process of extracting and constructing meaning from written texts. Comprehension has three key elements: (1) the reader, (2) the text, and (3) the activity.

The applicant's proposal must demonstrate how the reading program, including universal/core instruction and targeted and intensive instructional interventions, will address appropriate systematic and explicit teaching of the five essential components of reading across grade levels K-3 and the design of school and classroom structures to support such a system of instruction.

2. Coherent Structure of Effective Reading Programs

An effective reading program is one that coherently integrates:

- A comprehensive assessment plan that includes interim and diagnostic assessments that are valid and reliable;
- Instructional programming and materials that include explicit and systematic instruction in the five essential components of reading instruction on a daily basis and that are of an appropriate level, duration, and content;
- An aligned professional development plan for principals and teachers that may include, but is not limited to, literacy and leadership coaching and on-going, job-embedded professional development for all educators including school level administration, as well as a plan to ensure that all teachers providing instruction to students reading below grade level are or will become highly knowledgeable in the teaching of reading;
- Dynamic instructional leadership, including school and district leaders;
- On-going monitoring of the reading program's implementation and effectiveness; and
- A plan aligned with the school/s and/or district's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) goals for reducing the number of students identified with a significant reading deficiency.

The applicant's proposal must address a plan for implementing a multi-tiered system of supports in an effort to provide effective universal/core instruction to meet the needs of all students. **Targeted and intensive instruction must be aligned with the universal/core instruction taking place in the regular classroom.** The applicant's proposal must address how the school, under the guidance of the School Leadership Team (SLT), will implement an effective reading program K-3 in a coherent manner. Each of the above components of effective reading programs must be addressed in the applicant's proposal. Please note that Early Literacy Grant schools will be required to participate in professional development provided by the Department as outlined below.

3. Scientifically Based Reading Research

Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) applies rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge that is relevant to reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties. Scientific research employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment. Scientific research may have been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review. It prevents the use of unreliable and untested methods that can actually impede academic progress.

The applicant's proposal must demonstrate that all instructional activities and materials and professional development provided to principals and teachers are supported by Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) and have been selected from the Department's advisory lists of instructional programming and professional development.

4. Sustainability of the Program beyond the Years of Grant Funding

Implementation research indicates that school or district level programs are more successfully sustained when certain factors are in place. These factors include the staff's understanding of the current state of affairs and the reason for the change; an acceptance and commitment to the program; a feeling of determination by the staff; a perception that the program is practical, useful, and beneficial to students; and administrative support and leadership. (Note: Administrative support includes both school level and district level leadership). The applicant's proposal must describe the school's current capacity for implementing the grant requirements and how the school will sustain the new structures and essential components of effective reading instruction in grades K-3. The proposal must also describe the role of the School Leadership Team (SLT) in sustaining the grant beyond the years of receiving funding.

In addition to the 5 above mentioned components, all proposals must include each of the following:

- Purchase of DIBELS Next and either DIBELSnet or mClass for online reporting or documentation of participation in the Early Literacy Assessment Tool Project for use of DIBELS Next and mClass.
- Documentation of which diagnostic reading assessments from the State Board approved list for the READ Act is or will be used in the school.
- Purchase of one instructional program from the READ Act advisory list for the purpose of universal/core instruction (if not already utilized by the school or consortium).
- Purchase of one or more of the instructional programs from the READ Act advisory list for the purpose of providing targeted and intensive instructional interventions for students reading below grade level, including students identified as having a Significant Reading Deficiency (if not already utilized by the school or consortium).
- Budgeting for two days of professional development provided by CDE for the School Leadership Team (SLT), which should be representative of the following groups: building administrator(s) (Principal must attend); K-1 grades teaching team; 2-3 grades teaching team; literacy coach; and interventionist(s). This training will take place along with the Office of Literacy Reading Conference in October. Please plan on travel to the Denver metro area.
- Budgeting for one additional day of professional development for the literacy coach to take place at a different time than the conference. Please plan on travel to the Denver metro area.
- Budgeting for on-going, on-site consulting assistance (at least one day per month for each school) selected from the READ Act resource bank advisory list of professional development. On-site consultants will support Early Literacy Grant schools in incorporating Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) findings into instructional practice in all K-3 classrooms, including both universal/core and targeted and intensive intervention classrooms. On-site consultants will provide guidance to schools' leadership teams to maximize universal/core instruction and intervention time to ensure K-3 reading proficiency. School Leadership Teams, including the principal, must meet regularly with the consultant to review the school's K-3 student level data (interim and diagnostic assessments) and data related to the school's implementation of grant requirements. Meetings must include regularly updating the school's professional development plan based on the data that has been reviewed. (Note that meetings between the SLT and consultant may take place via a web-based conference format). The principal must routinely visit classrooms with the coach and consultant. **Two additional days must be budgeted for the consultant to attend the Office of Literacy Reading Conference with the SLT each year.**
- Budget for a K-3 literacy coach if not already present in the school. Schools with more than five K-3 teachers must budget a full-time coach. Schools with five or fewer teachers may budget for a part-time coach or include a plan indicating how the role of the coach will be filled by existing staff. If role is filled by existing staff, indicate the amount of time staff member will dedicate to coaching role. Coaches will be responsible for working with CDE and on-site consultant to assist in implementation of programs and assessments. Coaches will meet regularly with consultant and administration and will provide feedback and support to teachers between consultant visits. Additionally, coaches will attend required CDE trainings twice a year.

Allowable Use of Funds

Funds may be used to supplement and not supplant any moneys currently being used to embed the essential components of reading instruction into all elements of the K-3 teaching structures in schools. **Activities that will not be funded include the following:**

- Technological equipment (e.g., computers, laptops, LCDs) that is not related to assessment purposes (if supplemental funds are available after years one and two, technological equipment for instructional purposes will be considered);
- Capital needs (including bookshelves or other furniture);
- Out-of-state travel that is not directly related to the critical components of the Early Literacy Grant program;
- Professional development that is not from the advisory list of professional development for the READ Act;
- Assessment materials that are not from the State Board approved list of interim and diagnostic assessments for the READ Act;
- Instructional programming that is not from the advisory list of instructional programs for the READ Act; and
- Technical and/or coaching/consulting support that is not from the READ Act advisory list of professional development.

Duration of Grant

Grant applications must be submitted for three years of Early Literacy Grant funding. Applicants must include appropriate budget forms for all 3 years.

Funding for years 2 and 3 of the Early Literacy Grant is contingent upon appropriations made by the Colorado State Legislature and the school/consortium meeting one or more of the targets defined in the Eligibility and Continued Funding Section of this RFP.

Evaluation and Reporting

To determine the success of the Early Literacy Grant programs operated by districts and schools that receive grants, the Department may contract with an external evaluator to conduct an external evaluation of the Early Literacy Grant. Schools will be required to participate in the external evaluation of the Early Literacy Grant program if a review is conducted.

All schools participating in the Early Literacy Grant will be required to report interim assessment data to one of the online data collection tool associated with DIBELS Next (DIBELSnet or mClass). Schools will be required to submit interim assessment data periodically following the schedule and deadlines for submission provided by CDE throughout implementation of the grant. The Department will also use data collected annually through the READ Act data collection system as a component of the external evaluation.

The Department will collect qualitative data related to fidelity of implementation through the use of the Literacy Evaluation Tool. Additional forms to collect qualitative data may be developed and used by the Department during the grant cycle to monitor fidelity of implementation. Funded schools will be required to provide the necessary information to complete such forms. The Literacy Evaluation Tool is included in **Attachment C**. Additionally, all consultant reports will be submitted to the project manager after each site visit is completed. Additionally, all consultant reports will be submitted to the project manager after each site visit is completed.

Applicants must provide signatures of agreement on the Assurances page of the RFP (pages 12-13).

Data Privacy

CDE takes seriously its obligation to protect the privacy of student and educator Personally Identifiable Information (PII) collected, used, shared, and stored. Therefore, CDE provides a secure system to collect information, survey responses, and PII for this grant program. PII will be collected, used, shared, and stored in compliance with CDE's privacy and security policies and procedures.

Please note: Documents submitted in support of the application must not contain any personally identifiable student or educator information including names, identification numbers, or anything that could identify an individual. All data should be referenced/included in the aggregate and the aggregate counts should be redacted to remove small numbers under 16 for students or 5 for educators.

Technical Assistance

RFP Webinar: An application training webinar will be held on **Wednesday, February 8, 2017, from 1:00 – 2:00 pm**. Register for this technical assistance via Eventbrite at <https://elg1718.eventbrite.com>. If you have questions or issues regarding registration, please email CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us.

Letter of Intent: If interested in applying for this funding opportunity, please submit the Letter of Intent (see **Attachment B**) via SurveyMonkey at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/elg1718> by **Friday, February 10, 2017, by 11:59 pm**. This allows CDE to plan for the review process and communicate with prospective applicants should a need arise.

Review Process and Timeline

Applications will be reviewed by CDE staff and peer reviewers to ensure they contain all required components. Applicants will be notified of final award status no later than **Friday, May 12, 2017**.

Note: This is a competitive process – applicants must score at least 80 points out of the 100 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 80 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to a fundable level. There is no guarantee that submitting an application will result in funding or funding at the requested level. All award decisions are final. Applicants that do not meet the qualifications may reapply for future grant opportunities. Applicants, including the School Leadership Team (SLT), may be asked to participate in a selection interview conducted by personnel from the CDE Office of Literacy.

Submission Process and Deadline

An electronic copy of the application (in PDF format) and electronic budget (in Excel format) must be submitted to CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us by **Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm**. The electronic version should include all required components of the application as one document. Please attach the electronic budget workbook in Excel format as a separate document. Faxes will not be accepted. Incomplete or late applications will not be considered. If you do not receive an email confirmation of receipt of your application within 24 hours of the deadline, please email CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us. Application materials and budget are available for download on the CDE website at www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readact/grant.

Submit the electronic copy of the application and electronic budget to:

CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us

By: **Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm**

Application Format

- The narrative template portion of the application (Part II, Sections A-E) cannot exceed 15 pages. Please see below for the required elements of the application. Note: Application narrative templates that exceed 15 pages will not be reviewed.
- The signature page must include original signatures of the lead organization/fiscal agent.

Required Elements

The format outlined below must be followed in order to assure consistent application of the evaluation criteria. See the narrative template and evaluation rubric for specific selection criteria needed in Part II (pages 16-19).

Part I: Application Introduction (not scored):

Part IA: Cover Pages – Applicant/Recipient School(s) Information
Part IB: Program Assurances and Disclaimers
Executive Summary

Part II: Narrative Template (not to exceed 15 pages):

Section A: Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction
Section B: Coherent Structure of Effective Reading Programs
Section C: Scientifically Based Reading Research
Section D: Sustainability of the Program beyond the Years of Grant Funding
Section E: Budget Narrative
Electronic Budget Form (separate Excel template – not counted in page limit)

Early Literacy Grant Program
Applications Due Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm

Part IA: Cover Page – Applicant and Recipient Information

| Application Type (select one) | | | |
|--|----|-----------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single School/Institute Charter School Application (one single school application) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-School Consortium Application (one district, BOCES, or the Charter School Institute applying on behalf of multiple schools within a single district, multiple districts, or CSI) | | | |
| List all participating districts and schools and/or Institute Charter Schools (add rows as necessary) | | | |
| District(s) | | School(s) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Lead Local Education Agency (LEA)/BOCES Information | | | |
| LEA/BOCES Name: | | LEA/BOCES Code: | |
| Mailing Address: | | DUNS #: | |
| Region (indicate region of Colorado this program will directly impact) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Metro <input type="checkbox"/> Pikes Peak <input type="checkbox"/> North Central <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest <input type="checkbox"/> West Central <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast | | | |
| District/BOCES/CSI Authorized Representative Information | | | |
| Name: | | Title: | |
| Telephone: | | E-mail: | |
| Signature: | | | |
| Program Contact Information | | | |
| Name: | | Title: | |
| Telephone: | | E-mail: | |
| Signature: | | | |
| Fiscal Manager Information | | | |
| Name: | | Title: | |
| Telephone: | | E-mail: | |
| Signature: | | | |
| Amount of Funding Requested | | | |
| Year 1: | \$ | Year 2: | \$ |
| Year 3: | \$ | 3 Year Total: | \$ |

Note: If grant is approved, funding will not be awarded until all signatures are in place. Please attempt to obtain all signatures before submitting the application.

Recipient Information

Complete this page for each participating school. Include additional copies for each school as necessary.

| Education Provider Information | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| LEA/BOCES Name: | | | |
| Board President: | | Board President Signature: | |
| Superintendent: | | Superintendent Signature: | |
| Recipient School Information | | | |
| School Name: | | | School Code: <input type="text"/> |
| Mailing Address: | | | |
| Principal/Designee Information | | | |
| Name: | | Title: | |
| Telephone: | | E-mail: | |
| Signature: | | | |
| Program Contact Information | | | |
| Name: | | Title: | |
| Telephone: | | E-mail: | |
| Signature: | | | |

| Number of students to be served at the following grades: (Use data from the 2016 READ collection for number of students and SRD numbers.) | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Total Kindergarten | Total 1 st Grade | Total 2 nd Grade | Total 3 rd Grade | Total Students |
| | | | | |
| SRD Kindergarten | SRD 1 st Grade | SRD 2 nd Grade | SRD 3 rd Grade | Total SRD K-3 |
| | | | | Number Percent |
| <p>Please list the research-based reading programs to be used for universal/core instruction. Programs must be selected from the READ Act Resource Bank Advisory List. (Please provide name(s) of program. Explain whether the program(s) will be purchased with ELG funds or if the program(s) is/are already in place.)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please list the research-based reading program(s) to be used for targeted and intensive instructional interventions. (Remember to be inclusive of all 5 components of reading, which may require more than one program based on the specific needs of students.)</p> | | <p>List all programs from the Approved List that are already in place in the school(s):</p> | | |
| | | <p>List all programs from the Approved List to be purchased with ELG funds:</p> | | |
| <p>List the diagnostic assessment(s) to be used for students in grades K-3. Assessments must be selected from the READ Act Resource Bank Approved List.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please list the professional development selected from the READ Act Advisory List, including on-going, on-site coaching. (Provide the name of the consultant/consulting firm applicant will be contracting with for on-going, on-site coaching. List any other PD to be purchased with ELG funds.)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Does your school receive any other supplementary reading grants? If so, please list grants and the number of years your school has received these grants.</p> | | | | |

Part IB: Program Assurances and Disclaimers

The appropriate Authorized Representatives must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the application for the Early Literacy Grant Program, and the receipt of program funds.

On _____ (date) _____, 2017, the Board of _____ (district) _____ hereby agrees to the following assurances:

1. The applicant agrees to assemble a School Leadership Team (SLT) or demonstrate how an existing team will complete the requirements of the SLT outlined in the proposal. Membership must include at a minimum a district administrator, building administrator, K-1 teacher, 2-3 teacher, and an interventionist. The SLT agrees to meet regularly to review the school's K-3 student level data and data related to the school's implementation of grant requirements. The SLT also agrees to develop and regularly update the school's professional development plan related to assessment and instruction in K-3 literacy.
2. District leadership is committed to supporting Early Literacy Grant schools in implementing Scientifically Based Reading Research and all other requirements of the Early Literacy Grant.
3. The applicant agrees to work with the Department and the selected coach/consultant to embed explicit and systematic instruction of the five components of reading into all elements of the K-3 teaching structures, including universal/core instruction and targeted and intensive instructional interventions, and agrees to grant the consultant access to school level data.
4. The applicant agrees to participate in required professional development provided by the Department and the selected coach/consultant and will ensure that all other professional development provided through Early Literacy Grant funds is aligned with the purpose of the grant program and has been approved by the Department.
5. The applicant agrees to work with the Department and the selected coach/consultant to incorporate Scientifically Based Reading Research findings into instructional practice in all K-3 classrooms.
6. The applicant will provide the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) such information as may be required to determine if the grantee is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals of the grant. This includes participation in the collection of qualitative data through the use of forms developed and used by the Department during the grant cycle to monitor fidelity of implementation (i.e., consultant reports, Literacy Evaluation Tool, etc.).
7. The applicant will cooperate with CDE in the development and submission of certain reports and individual student data to meet statutory and rule requirements. The applicant agrees to report interim assessment data to the online data collection tool associated with their chosen assessment, following the schedule and deadlines for submission provided by CDE throughout implementation of the grant.
8. Staff at each participating school is committed to implementing the Early Literacy Grant program as described in this application.
9. The school will not discriminate against anyone regarding race, gender, national origin, color, disability, or age.
10. The work product in this grant application is the original work of the school/applicant and its agents who worked on the application.
11. If any findings of misuse of these funds are discovered, project funds will be returned to CDE.
12. The grantee will maintain sole responsibility for the project even though subcontractors may be used to perform certain services.

Funded sites will be expected to cooperate with CDE in the development and submission of certain reports to meet statutory requirements. All grantees must work with and provide requested data to CDE for the Early Literacy Grant program within the time frames specified.

In addition, funded projects will be required to maintain appropriate fiscal and program records. Fiscal audits of funds under this program are to be conducted by the recipient agencies annually as a part of their regular audit. Auditors should be aware of the Federal audit requirements contained in the Single Audit Act of 1984.

IF ANY FINDINGS OF MISUSE OF FUNDS ARE DISCOVERED, PROJECT FUNDS MUST BE RETURNED TO THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. The Colorado Department of Education may terminate a grant award upon thirty (30)

days' notice if it is deemed by CDE that the applicant is not fulfilling the requirements of the funded program as specified in the approved project application, or if the program is generating less than satisfactory results. The applicant may subcontract for work to be performed, but shall retain sole responsibility for the project and shall be the only direct recipient of funds.

The work product in this grant application is the original work of the district/applicant and its agents who worked on the application. If a discovery of plagiarism is made known or brought to the attention of officials at the Colorado Department of Education during a current grant competition, then at the discretion of the Department, the Department has the right to remove the grant application for funding consideration because of the occurrence of cause.

Project modifications and changes in the approved budget must be requested via e-mail and be approved via e-mail by the Colorado Department of Education before modifications are made to the expenditures. Please contact Rachael Anderberg (Anderberg_R@cde.state.co.us | 303-866-6150) in CDE's Office of Literacy for any budget modifications.

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

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Name of School Board President/BOCES President | Signature |
| Name of District Superintendent or Charter School/BOCES Executive Director | Signature |
| Name of Fiscal Agent's Authorized Representative | Signature |

Early Literacy Grant Program
Applications Due Wednesday, March 15, 2017, by 11:59 pm

Application Scoring

CDE Use Only

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Part I: | Applicant Information and Executive Summary | No Points |
| Part II: | Narrative | |
| Section A: | Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction | /16 |
| Section B: | Coherent Structure of Effective Reading Programs | /36 |
| Section C: | Scientifically Based Reading Research | /18 |
| Section D: | Sustainability of the Program Beyond the Years of Grant Funding | /20 |
| Section E: | Budget Narrative and Electronic Budget | /10 |
| | Sub-total: | /100 |
| | SRD Bonus Points: | / |

Priority will be given to applications where the participating school(s) demonstrate a high percentage of students with significant reading deficiencies (SRD). Bonus points will be assigned as follows:

| SRD Percentage | Bonus Points |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| 15-24% | 5 points <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25% + | 10 points <input type="checkbox"/> |

GENERAL COMMENTS: Please indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments will be provided to applicants with their final scores.

Strengths:

-
-

Weaknesses:

-
-

Required Changes:

-
-

RECOMMENDATION: Funded _____ Funded with Changes _____ Not Funded _____

Narrative Response Template | Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Part I: Application Introduction (No Points)

Cover Pages and Assurances

Complete applicant information and program assurances and include as the first pages of the application. Cover Pages, Assurances, and the Executive Summary are not included in the 15-page narrative template limit.

Executive Summary

Provide a brief description (no more than 500 words) outlining the proposed Early Literacy Grant program, highlighting how applicant will use scientifically based reading research to embed the essential components of reading instruction into all elements of the K-3 teaching structures in all schools, including universal and targeted and intensive instructional interventions, to assist all students in achieving reading competency. If funded, this summary may be posted on CDE's Website for inclusion in an overview of funded Early Literacy Grant programs. The executive summary does not count in total page limit.

Click here to enter text.

Part II: Narrative (100 Points)

Template with included narrative responses must not exceed 15 pages. The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application as a whole. In order for the application to be recommended for funding, it must receive at least 80 points out of the 100 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.

Scoring Definitions

Not Addressed/Met No Criteria: Information Not Provided

Met One or More Criteria: Requires Additional Clarification or Development

Met All Criteria: Concise, Thoroughly Developed, High Quality, Well-Written Response

Section A: Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction

1) Describe current understanding and integration of the 5 components of reading. Examples may include any previous or proposed professional development the staff has had regarding research and the integration of the components or the lack thereof.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 4 | |

2) Describe how classroom teachers will be provided professional development or understanding of the 5 components in universal/core instruction and targeted and intensive instruction in order to create seamless and aligned systems of instruction.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 4 | |

3) Provide a clear description of the how the School Leadership Team (SLT), including the district, supports or will support full implementation of the systematic and explicit teaching of the 5 components of reading in all instructional environments.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 4 | |

4) Describe how enhancing the knowledge of teachers regarding the 5 components of reading and the integration of the 5 components of reading into instructional practices will enhance the current state of reading instruction.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 4 | |

Section A: Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction

Reviewer Comments: /16

Section B: Coherent Structure of Effective Reading Programs

1) Describe a comprehensive assessment plan (interim and diagnostic) the school will use to ensure 90-95% of students are at grade level by 3rd grade, including the schedule for conducting each assessment (frequency).

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |
|---|---|---|--|

2) Describe instructional programming and materials that are research-based, and the applicant includes a process for implementation that ensures explicit and systematic teaching of the 5 components of reading will be integrated at an appropriate level, content, and duration of time in each K-3 classroom. The applicant describes how intervention instruction and materials will be aligned with universal/core instruction and designed to meet the needs of individual students.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |

3) Provide specific intervention strategies and/or activities and describe how instruction will be responsive to student data and timelines. Describe how intervention teachers will assure alignment with regular classroom instruction and clearly articulates the problem solving process, including progress monitoring, that will assist in reducing the number of students reading below grade level.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |

4) Provide a professional development plan that ensures the learning of formal knowledge of Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) supplemented with “craft” knowledge - assuring teachers can see the relevance of what they have learned applied to their profession. The plan should specifically address how professional development will be provided to those providing instruction to students reading below grade level. Demonstrate how outside coaching/consultation has a meaningful place in the plan.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |

5) Outline a clear process for how the implementation of the reading program initiative will be monitored with a direct link to the coaching/consulting requirements. Describe the role of the School Leadership Team in monitoring fidelity and implementation.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |

6) Demonstrate how the Early Literacy Grant will support current Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) efforts.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 6 | |

Section B: Coherent Structure of Effective Reading Programs

Reviewer Comments: /36

Section C: Scientifically Based Reading Research

1) The Comprehensive Core Program was selected from the READ Act Advisory List.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------|
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 0 | 3 | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|
| 2) All Interventions being used in the school are on the READ Act Advisory List. | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|
| 3) All professional development is provided from a provider listed on the approved list. | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|
| 4) A consultant from the approved list has been selected and the budget reflects monthly visits at each school . | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|
| 5) Training from the publisher has been budgeted for each program to be purchased with ELG funds. | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|
| 6) Travel and release time for the annual CDE Office of Literacy READING Conference has been budgeted for the SLT for all three years. | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Section C: Scientifically Based Reading Research | |
| Reviewer Comments: | /18 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Section D: Sustainability of the Program beyond the Years of Grant Funding | | | |
| 1) Describe the school's current capacity for implementing the requirements of the Early Literacy Grant program. | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | 5 | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| 2) Describe how the school will sustain the new structures and essential components of effective reading instruction in grades K-3, including information about how structures will remain in place once grant funds expire. For example, describe how capacity will be built to continue quality SBRR-driven K-3 reading intervention programs once the grant has expired. | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | 5 | |

3) Provide evidence that the staff is willing and ready to implement the Early Literacy Grant with program fidelity. A culture of high expectations for students and staff exists. There is an agreement by school leaders to meet regularly with the selected coach/consultant to review data and conduct classroom observations.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 5 | |

4) Describe the role of the School Leadership Team (SLT) in sustaining the grant beyond the years of receiving funding.

Click here to enter text.

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3 | 5 | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section E: Sustainability of the Program Beyond the Years of Grant Funding | |
| Reviewer Comments: | /20 |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| Section F: Budget Narrative and Electronic Budget | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Narrative is included in the 15-page narrative template limit. Electronic Budget Spreadsheet does not count toward page limit. | | | |
| <p>1) In addition to submitting the electronic budget spreadsheet (Excel file) which covers each of the three years, in compliance with CDE’s standard fiscal rules, include a Budget Narrative (included in the 15-page narrative template limit) in a narrative format that addresses the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide an explanation that summarizes the proposed uses of grant funds by budget category and is tied to the proposed program strategies. Costs are directly linked to proposed activities and include mandatory CDE training days. Provide an explanation of leveraging of funds with other private, state, or federal dollars (e.g., Title I) to maximize impact for students. If the applicant is partnering with other schools, describe how funds will be leveraged and how dollar efficiency will be increased. | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | |
| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
| 0 | 3 | 5 | |

2) Complete and attach the **Electronic Budget Spreadsheet (Excel file)**. List costs of the proposed project as presented that are reasonable, necessary, and are calculated to show how amounts are determined. The budget should be sufficient in relation to the measurable objectives, design, scope, and sustainability of project activities. Costs are reasonable, and connected to project goals and activities for each of the three years of the grant.

Item Description Example:
.X FTE for [role or title] at \$xxxxx per [hour or month or year] times [x per hours or months or year]

| Not Addressed/Met No Criteria | Met One or More Criteria | Met All Criteria | Score |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 5 | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Section F: Budget Narrative and Electronic Budget | |
| Reviewer Comments: | /10 |

Attachment A: Early Literacy Grant Program Rules

Adopted 10-17-12

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Colorado State Board of Education
RULES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF EARLY LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM
1 CCR 301-XX

0.00 STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE

These rules are promulgated pursuant to Colorado Revised Statutes section 22-2-107 (1) (c) and section 22-7-1209 (1) (f). Section 22-7-1211, C.R.S., authorizes the Colorado Department of Education to provide moneys to local education providers to implement literacy support and intervention instruction programs to assist students in kindergarten and first, second, and third grades to achieve reading competency. Section 22-7-1209 (1) (f), C.R.S., requires the Colorado State Board of Education to promulgate rules for the administration of this grant program.

1.00 DEFINITIONS

- 1.01 “BOCES” or “Board of Cooperative Services” shall have the same meaning as provided in section 22-5-103 (2), C.R.S.
- 1.02 “Department” means the Colorado Department of Education created pursuant to section 24-1-115, C.R.S.
- 1.03 “Evidence-Based” means the instruction or item described is based on reliable, trustworthy, and valid evidence and has demonstrated a record of success in adequately increasing students’ reading competency in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, including oral skills, and reading comprehension.
- 1.04 “District Charter School” means a charter school authorized by a School District pursuant to part 1 of article 30.5 of title 22.
- 1.05 “Institute Charter School” means a charter school authorized by the state charter school institute pursuant to part 5 of article 30.5 of title 22.
- 1.06 “School District” or “District” means a School District organized and authorized by section 15 of Article IX of the state constitution and organized pursuant to article 30 of title 22, Colorado Revised Statutes.
- 1.07 “Scientifically-Based” means that the instruction or item described is based on research that applies rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge that is relevant to reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties.
- 1.08 “State Board” means the State Board of Education established pursuant to Section 1 of Article IX of the state constitution.
- 1.09 “Local Education Provider” means a School District, a Board of Cooperative Services, a District Charter School, or an Institute Charter School.
- 1.10 “Significant Reading Deficiency” means that a student does not meet the minimum skill levels for reading competency in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, including oral skills, and reading comprehension established by the State Board pursuant to section 22-7-1209, C.R.S., for the student’s grade level.

2.00 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND TIMELINE

- 2.01 On or before April 30 of each year, any Local Education Provider interested in obtaining funding shall submit an early literacy grant application electronically to the department, using the application form provided by the Department. A Local Education Provider may apply individually or as part of a group of Local Education Providers.
- 2.02 Each application submitted shall include, but need not be limited to, the following:
 - 2.02 (A) Information concerning the percentage of kindergarten and first-, second-, and third-grade students enrolled in the applying Local Education Provider or group of Local Education Providers who have Significant Reading Deficiencies;
 - 2.02 (B) A description of the instructional program that the applicant(s) plan to implement using the grant moneys, including a description of whether the program is an Evidence-Based program and Scientifically-Based program that is proven to be successful in other public schools in the country;
 - 2.02 (C) A description of the professional development program(s) that the applicant(s) plan to implement for educators to assist students in kindergarten and first, second, and third grades to achieve reading competency;
 - 2.02 (D) A description of the methods that will be used to sustain positive student achievement outcomes over time to ensure that students who move out of the significant reading deficiency designation are able to sustain their improvement;

- 2.02 (E) An explanation of the cost of the instructional program that the applicant(s) plan to implement using the grant moneys and an explanation of how grant funding will be used to supplement and not supplant any funding currently being used on intensive literacy programs already provided for eligible students;
- 2.02 (F) The measureable student outcomes that the applicant expects to achieve as a result of implementing the proposed program and a description of the method that will be used to monitor and evaluate outcomes; and
- 2.02 (G) Any other necessary information, as identified by the Department.
- 2.03 On or before June 1 of each year, the Department shall review each grant application received and recommend to the State Board whether to award the grant and the duration and amount of each grant.
- 2.04 On or before June 15 of each year, based on the recommendations of the Department, the State Board shall award grants to applying Local Education Providers or groups of Local Education Providers.

3.00 APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 3.01 In reviewing grant applications to recommend which applicants should receive grant funding and the duration and amount of each grant, the Department shall consider the following criteria:
 - 3.01 (A) The percentage of kindergarten and first-, second-, and third-grade students enrolled in the applying Local Education Provider or group of Local Education Providers who have Significant Reading Deficiencies;
 - 3.01 (B) The quality of the instructional program that the applicant(s) plan to implement using the grant moneys, including whether the program is an Evidence-Based program and Scientifically-Based program that is proven to be successful in other public schools in the country;
 - 3.01 (C) The quality of the professional development program(s) that the applicant(s) plan to implement for educators to assist students in kindergarten and first, second, and third grade students to achieve reading competency;
 - 3.01 (D) The plan the applicant has to sustain positive student gains over time;
 - 3.01 (E) The cost of the instructional program that the applicant(s) plan to implement using the grant moneys; and
 - 3.01 (F) The rigor with which the applicant(s) intend(s) to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the proposed program.

4.00 DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

- 4.01 Each Local Education Provider that receives an early literacy grant shall submit information to the Department describing the following:
 - 4.01 (A) The instructional programs or services for which the Local Education Provider used the grant;
 - 4.01 (B) The number and grade levels of students who participated in each of the types of programs or services provided;
 - 4.01 (C) The progress made by participating students in achieving reading competency; and
 - 4.01 (D) Other information that the Department may deem necessary to monitor the effectiveness of the grant program.
- 4.02 The Department shall annually submit to the State Board, governor, the president of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the education committees of the house of representatives and the senate, or any successor committees, and shall post on the Department web site a report that includes a summary of the implementation of the early literacy grant program in the preceding budget year, including the number of grants, the Local Education Providers that received grants, and the amount of each grant

Attachment B: Letter of Intent

The Letter of Intent to apply for the Early Literacy Grant Program is due **Friday, February 10, 2017, by 11:59 pm**. Submit online via SurveyMonkey at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/elg1718>. Below is a screenshot of the information requested in the Letter of Intent.

Early Literacy Grant - Letter of Intent

Letters of Intent due Friday, February 10, 2017, by 11:59 pm.

- 1 Please complete the information requested below to indicate your intention to apply for the **Early Literacy Grant**.

Name of LEA:

Recipient Schools:

Name of Authorized Representative:

Name of Contact for the Proposal:

Contact Telephone Number:

Contact E-mail Address

- 2 Are any of the schools you are applying for Title I eligible schools?

- 3 If yes, please list all Title I eligible schools:

- 4 I affirm that I am the named authorized representative from the LEA, or that the named authorized representative is aware and has approved of the intent to apply for the grant opportunity.

Attachment C: Literacy Evaluation Tool

The Literacy Evaluation Tool should be used by consultants and specialists outside of the education program or by school district personnel to evaluate the literacy program used for increasing literacy outcomes at the elementary level. This tool will be provided as an Excel document to auto-sum all entries. This Word version is provided only as an example.

| Universal Instruction: There is evidence that substantiates every student is receiving effective, differentiated Tier I core literacy instruction from high-quality research-based curricula and instructional strategies aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS). | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date |
| 1 | Students receive at least 90 minutes of research based reading instruction daily. | At least 90 minutes of Core reading instruction is scheduled daily for all K-3 students. | The 90 minute reading block is protected time where only literacy instruction takes place | All instruction during the literacy block is explicit, systematic, and research-based. | Time and intensity of instruction is based on data and 90 minutes may not be adequate. | | | | | |
| 2 | The 5 components of literacy are taught in a systematic and explicit manner utilizing a research based scope and sequence, with an appropriate depth and complexity. | Some components are taught during the 90 minute reading block | All components are taught during the 90 minute reading block | Components are taught in an explicit and systematic manner using a research based scope and sequence (intervention and small group instruction are aligned to whole group instruction) | Time and intensity of instruction for each component is consistently adjusted based on data and student needs | | | | | |
| 3 | Literacy instruction is based on scientifically-based research that is reflective of the population of students and is implemented with fidelity. | All instruction is scientifically-based | Instruction and materials reflect the population/needs of students | Instruction is implemented with fidelity | Instruction is responsive to the differing needs of students in the class/group | | | | | |
| 4 | Teachers incorporate use of the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) related to literacy in their daily instruction. | Teachers are aware of the CAS that relate to the topic they are teaching | The correct CAS that relate to the lesson are posted in the classroom | The teacher makes connections to the CAS throughout instruction | Students can articulate the standard and demonstrate mastery of the concept | | | | | |
| 5 | Teachers demonstrate an understanding that literacy instruction includes both knowledge- and skill-based procedures. | Literacy instruction is focused on <i>either</i> knowledge <i>or</i> skill-based procedures | Literacy instruction includes both knowledge and skill-based procedures, but may not focus on both adequately | Balance of knowledge and skill-based procedures is based on program requirements and student needs based on data | Knowledge and skill-based procedures are directly instructed based on data and integrated and reinforced consistently throughout the literacy block | | | | | |
| 6 | Literacy is taught daily in both differentiated whole group and small group formats based on students' needs. | Both whole group and small group instruction take place | Whole group instruction focuses on grade-level skills and small group instruction is taught at the level of student need | Whole group instruction is taught with fidelity to the core program small group instruction is regularly adjusted (both concept and materials) | There are indicators that MTSS occurs during both whole group and small group instruction | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | based on student growth | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Small group instruction is targeted and based on student need (including acceleration) and is of long enough duration for students to demonstrate mastery of the targeted skills/concepts. | A schedule is in place for small group instruction and takes place routinely for all students | Skills and concepts taught in small groups are appropriately differentiated based on data | Teachers are routinely checking for mastery (both formally and informally) | Small group instruction is consistently adjusted based on student data and is of sufficient pace that allows for multiple repetition for student attainment. | | | | | | |
| 8 | Lesson objectives are clear, transferable, and communicated to students in a manner that is understandable. | Instruction aligns to the lesson objectives | Objectives are posted and referenced throughout lesson | Students can repeat the lesson objective | The student understands and is able to reflect upon lesson objectives and demonstrate understanding or mastery | | | | | | |
| 9 | Instructional conversations routinely take place among instructional coach/ principal, interventionists, and classroom teachers after each interim assessment. | A system is created to routinely discuss reading data amongst all educators | A protocol is used and consistently planned | Conversations occur at least after each interim assessment and previous goals are revisited at each meeting | Conversations occur more frequently to discuss progress monitoring and program data. Conversations are data driven and stick to the protocol | | | | | | |
| 10 | High-quality research based instructional materials for varied learning levels are readily available to teachers and students, and teachers are prepared to use the materials daily. | Enough materials are available and teachers have been trained on how to use the materials | Materials are organized efficiently in order to maximize instructional time | Materials are selected based on data and student need | Entrance and Exit criteria is determined for different materials used | | | | | | |
| 11 | Technology is used to support and/or accelerate student learning and is aligned with the instructional focus. | Technology is aligned with instructional focus and learners are given the placement assessment if applicable | Technology is used with fidelity | Diagnostic data is used to adjust technology focus | Technology data is used monthly to help track the effectiveness of the program and there is evidence that supports technology is accelerating student learning | | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Interventions: Additional instruction provided to students that is designed to meet their specific needs while at the same time accelerating their growth toward grade-level benchmarks. Students needing acceleration also receive appropriate interventions to accelerate grade level proficiency. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date | |
| 1 | Students who are below benchmark receive an additional 20-40 minutes of literacy | A schedule is set so students who are below benchmark can receive | Intervention time is protected and priority is placed on students | Instruction is targeted and specific to the needs of the students in the group | A sense of urgency is evident in instruction and little intervention | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | instruction per day that is based on the identified need of the student. | 20-40 minutes of literacy instruction per day | receiving instruction each day | | time is lost transitions, etc. | | | | | | |
| 2 | Focus of intervention changes based on information gleaned from most recent progress monitoring assessment. | Students below benchmark are progress monitored regularly | Progress monitoring data is reviewed regularly by all teachers interacting with the student | All staff fully understand and value progress monitoring data and can fluently align their instruction based on it | Time, intensity and focus of intervention is regularly adapted based on the most recent progress monitoring data | | | | | | |
| 3 | Students who are above grade level should receive daily extended learning opportunities or acceleration as needed. | Students needing acceleration have been identified | There is a structure in place to provide acceleration to students above grade level | Materials/strategies are available for staff to accelerate learning for students above grade level | Differentiation takes place during both whole group and small instruction that allows students performing above grade level to continue to accelerate | | | | | | |
| 4 | Interventions are focused, with no more than one targeted skill/concept, and delivered with an intensity to ensure student mastery of the skill/concept. | Specific need of each intervention student has been identified | Appropriate intervention materials have been selected based on the students' needs | Mastery is routinely assessed both formally and informally | Time, intensity and focus of intervention is easily adapted/differentiated for each student in the group based on data | | | | | | |
| 5 | Interventions are delivered in a small-group format with the appropriate level of intensity based on the needs of students. | Small group instruction is offered for intervention | Students have been placed in appropriate small group based on data | A sense of urgency for student growth is felt and the intensity of instruction reflects this | Instruction is continuously refined/adapted based on the needs of students | | | | | | |
| 6 | READ Plans are written in a manner that targets students' identified needs based on the interim and diagnostic assessment data for each student. | READ Plans are written for all students identified with a Significant Reading Deficiency | Both interim and diagnostic data is used to develop goals and objectives | Goals are appropriately aligned to the interim and diagnostic data | Instruction during interventions aligns to READ Plan goals and objectives | | | | | | |
| 7 | Intervention materials are readily accessible to teachers and students and are appropriate, purposeful, targeted to students' needs, and aligned with core/universal programming. | SBRR materials are available for intervention | Intervention materials have been carefully selected and are able to meet the needs of all identified students | Intervention and core/universal programming are aligned and work together to strengthen student growth | Teachers/interventionists are fluent with materials and can make appropriate decisions regarding selection and use of materials that leads to student growth | | | | | | |
| 8 | Students who are below grade level but not eligible for READ plans are considered through the RtI process. | Students below grade level, but not eligible for READ Plans have been identified | A plan has been developed to assist these students in reaching grade level expectations | Consistent progress monitoring occurs to track progress toward goals | A fluid process is in place of identifying, monitoring and either moving students off RTI plans or onto READ Plans according to data | | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | | |

Assessment: Valid and reliable instruments for screening and progress monitoring reading achievement are clearly specified and are used to guide instruction. Procedures for using assessments are clearly specified. For students in grades K-3, approved interim assessments from the READ Act State Board Approved List are used at a minimum of 3 times a year and more often for students reading below grade level.

| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 | A school-wide assessment calendar is shared with staff and adhered to consistently, including screening, progress monitoring, and summative assessment testing dates. | A School-wide assessment calendar has been created | All staff know where to access the calendar and how to use it | All staff regularly use the calendar and rarely need to be reminded to progress monitor and bring data to meetings. | Progress monitoring and data usage is a regular part of the school routine | | | | | |
| 2 | Assessors receive on-going, job-embedded professional development related to assessment administration to ensure data is valid and reliable, and fidelity of assessment administration is routinely verified (e.g., checklists, observations). | Assessors have been trained on administering designated assessment | Observation of assessment administration occurs and a method of training new staff has been established | Assessment observations rarely find lapses in fidelity | Inter-rater reliability occurs on a consistent basis | | | | | |
| 3 | Within the first 30 days of enrollment, an interim assessment is used as a screener to identify students who are reading above and below expectations based on established goals for the interim assessment. Upon determination of an SRD, READ plans are immediately developed in collaboration with parents. | Interim assessment is administered to all K-3 students in a 2 week window within 30 calendar days of the start of the year | Students are identified with an SRD within 30 days of the start of the year | READ Plans are developed/updated for all students with an SRD immediately upon identification | READ Plan goals and objectives correctly align to interim and diagnostic results | | | | | |
| 4 | Students identified as needing targeted and intensive interventions are progress monitored at a minimum every two weeks on a consistent basis. | All staff have a progress monitoring schedule and assess routinely | Staff are aware of progress monitoring data, but do not routinely examine it or understand its value | Data is regularly examined and used to inform and align instruction | Instructors know what students need based on data, have the materials to provide it and it happens in both whole and small group instructions | | | | | |
| 5 | Students identified as having an SRD have been given a valid and reliable diagnostic assessment chosen from the State Board Approved List to identify specific areas of instructional need. | All staff can identify the diagnostic assessment selected by the school | Appropriate staff have been trained on administration of the assessment | The diagnostic assessment is used thoughtfully and with the correct students | Use of diagnostic data is routine and all staff understand how to read the data and apply it to instruction | | | | | |
| 6 | Students identified as reading above expected goals are progress monitored to ensure expected growth is taking place to maintain or exceed grade level proficiency. | A progress monitoring schedule is set for students above grade level | Data is examined regularly to ensure students are maintaining growth | Appropriate instruction is aligned to data to ensure continued growth | Staff can easily adapt instruction to provide additional learning opportunities for students above grade | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | level within regular classroom instruction | | | | | |
| 7 | Students reading below level who do not qualify for a READ plan are further assessed to determine an instructional plan for meeting grade level proficiency. | Students below grade level, but not on a READ Plan have been identified | Additional assessments are available to assist in determining instructional needs | Appropriate assessments are selected and routinely used to measure needs and growth | Whole group, small group and intervention instruction reflects the data and leads to continuous student growth | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | |

| Professional Development: Professional development (PD) is an integral part of the school-wide system for increased literacy achievement. Professional development includes the skills and knowledge gained in an effort to improve teaching and is aligned to research based principles and instructional practices. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | On-going, job-embedded professional learning is provided in many ways to meet varying staff needs. | PD that aligns to data and classroom instruction is provided | Job embedded PD is provided in an ongoing manner with consistent follow-up | Various PD options are provided to meet the needs of staff based on their data and need. (i.e., book study, learning communities, coaching, etc.) | Learning is continuously analyzed and follow-up is provided to determine next steps and future PD needs. | | | | | |
| 2 | PD is determined to be high quality and is research based. Staff knows the specific effectiveness behind the research. | There is an understanding of what qualifies as research-based professional development | PD is research based and meets the needs of the school according to data | Staff can articulate both the research base of the PD and how it aligns to data and school need | Effects of PD are evident in classroom practice as well as data | | | | | |
| 3 | PD is aligned to the goals outlined in the school's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). | UIP goals do not reflect current literacy data | UIP goals reflect current data and PD decisions are aligned | PD is established based on appropriate UIP goals | PD leads to outcomes that are evidence based and lead to increased student outcomes | | | | | |
| 4 | School PD decisions are based on research and data and are made with a collaborative, representative process through the work of the School Leadership Team. | School Leadership Team has a role in selecting professional development | PD decisions are made using data but do not address the root cause and may not reflect most current research | SLT recommends PD based on feedback from grade level teams and data. Data is used to determine root causes | PD is aligned to provide next steps including job embedded PD and is reflective of grade level goals | | | | | |
| 5 | School leaders regularly encourage teachers to improve instruction regarding literacy after observing frequently and providing specific feedback. | School leaders have a strong understanding of good literacy instruction | School leaders observe regularly and provide timely feedback | Feedback and next steps are aligned to teacher/school goals and teacher effectiveness rubric | Leaders follow-up to ensure that next steps have been implemented | | | | | |
| 6 | Teachers receive on-going, job-embedded professional development on the instructional materials that are used for all three tiers of instruction as relevant to each teacher's usage. | Initial training is provided for all instructional materials to relevant staff | Follow-up support is provided as needed and every year new teachers are trained on materials by a highly qualified teacher | Implementation is strengthened throughout the school year | Teachers are fluent with the use of programming and know how to embed instructional strategies into the program as needed | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | In order to establish trends, multiple sources of school data are used when planning and implementing professional development. | Data is used when planning professional development including the UIP | Multiple data sources are used to determine PD needs | Teachers and school leaders are able to identify the most relevant data sources and determine trends to provide appropriate PD | Changes in trends are consistently analyzed to determine next steps in PD | | | | | | |
| 8 | PD changes classroom practices based on research and best practices with a rich understanding of the contexts in which these practices have been successful. | Classroom practices and data are considered when selecting PD | PD practices are observable in classrooms and teachers are given adequate time to implement before new PD is provided | Teachers are able to select appropriate PD practices into instructional contexts as appropriate based on student need | Teachers are able to use data to reflect upon their implementation of practices and adjust instructional practices as needed. | | | | | | |
| 9 | Structures are in place for providing on-going, job-embedded professional development for new staff members. | New staff members receive initial orientation to school and school structures and follow-up is provided to determine additional supports needed | Support staff are able to identify teachers needing the most support (i.e. new teachers) and allocate their time appropriately based on teacher needs | Consistent coaching and follow-up is provided to ensure fidelity of implementation | A collaborative process is developed where teacher and coach/administrator are consistently able to work together to determine growth and needs | | | | | | |
| 10 | Professional development supports sustainability of school-wide systems for teaching literacy. | Systems and structures for sustainability are in place | Planning is in place for implementation of effective systems and structures and PD plan reflects these | A long term vision is in place and PD is aligned | Systems and structures are vertically aligned and PD effectively reinforces sustainability practices | | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Data-Based Decision Making: Improving literacy achievement is incumbent on discussion about the current state of literacy achievement. Discussions regarding literacy data must become a regular part of the school climate. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date | |
| 1 | A data protocol that teachers readily understand is used consistently. The protocol is used to inform instructional changes/adjustments when the data demonstrates changes are necessary at the student, classroom, and/or school level. | A consistent data protocol is used | Teachers understand the use of the protocol and implementation of instructional changes/adjustments are discussed and analyzed during future meetings | Systems and structures for multiple data protocols are in place for the systems and structure necessary to effectuate change | Outcomes of data team meetings are visible in classroom and reference routinely in conversations | | | | | | |
| 2 | Teams look at data, value the discussions during their team time, and express a sense of urgency for improving student achievement. | Teams come prepared with data | Teams fully understand the data and are able to focus on the most important aspects of the data | A continuous data cycle including pre and post data is used | Teams demonstrate a sense of urgency as they plan for instruction | | | | | | |
| 3 | A data collection system is in place, and technology support is available | A data collection system exists | All staff have been trained on the use of the | Staff are easily able to access their data and | Data management system is interactive and | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| | for continuous access of the data system. | | data management system | understand the various functions available to them within the system | teachers routinely use it to plan instruction | | | | | |
| 4 | The school dedicates sufficient time (e.g. 45 minutes each week) for teams to work together as part of the regular daily schedule. | There is some time for some members to meet | All teams have dedicated time to work together on a semi-regular basis | The schedule is thoughtful. All team members can meet on a regular basis | Team meeting time is seen as valuable and leads to next steps in student growth | | | | | |
| 5 | Teams use data, and the data are disaggregated by trends, sub-groups, and individual students. | Team looks at data at school or class level only | Data is disaggregated by sub-groups and trends | Strengths and areas for growth by sub-groups are identified and action steps are made and implemented | Instructional strategies are tied to strengths and areas for growth based on disaggregated data. | | | | | |
| 6 | Team discusses instructional strategies based on an analysis of the data and commit to action steps. | Instructional strategies are talked about at meetings | Instructional strategies are created and implemented based on data | Strategies are related to the data, are implemented in a timely manner, and are re-evaluated for strengths/weaknesses | The instructional strategies implemented lead to student growth | | | | | |
| 7 | Administrators demonstrate an understanding of the importance of data meetings, always attend a portion of the meetings, and regularly participate while in attendance. | Administrator attends meetings as time permits | Administrator prioritizes attendance and rarely allows conflicts to interfere | Administrator understands the data and protocol of meetings and contributes to instructional action steps | Administrator plays a key role in organizing and leading the meeting and can fluently discuss school data at all levels and help to develop action steps that are aligned to data | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | |

School Leadership Team (SLT): An SLT serves the purpose of leading the school’s efforts to embed the essential components of reading instruction into all elements of the school’s structures and developing and updating the PD plan related to literacy assessment and instruction. Representation is comprised of various grade levels, an administrator, and a representative of teachers working with students receiving interventions.

| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date |
|---------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 | Dialogue of team meetings is focused on literacy instruction and is specific, attainable, and results oriented. | Dialogue is focused on literacy instruction, but may not be specific, attainable, and/or results oriented | Dialogue is consistently focused on literacy instruction and is specific attainable, and results oriented | Literacy goals are in place and progress towards those goals is routinely monitored | Resources and instruction have been altered to effectuate change | | | | | |
| 2 | Team’s focus is proactive, concentrating on data and future planning; little time is spent on reacting to current school crisis or needs that do not relate to the team. | Focus is scattered, time is spent during SLT meeting pulling data reports | Data is prepared prior to the meeting and agenda is results oriented | Data is routinely used throughout the all conversations and all members understand its use | SLT is well aware of school data and have a sense of urgency regarding improvement | | | | | |
| 3 | Team dialogue and exchange develops new team | Team members are not comfortable sharing | Team norms are in place to allow for learning | New team understandings about | New understanding are shared out by SLT | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | understandings about literacy for their school environment. | data with other teachers or conversations are dominated by a few | from one another and they have an understanding that dialogue is about improvement | literacy are used to make goals and take action | members to their constituents | | | | | |
| 4 | School data is a regular focus of meetings. Progress monitoring results for both school-wide and each grade-level team are a discussion topic at least 3-4 times a year. | SLT members look at one data set (either school-wide or grade-level) and are working toward analyzing both | A consistent data protocol(s) is used to analyze both grade-level and school-wide data | Data is prepared in advance, members are able to analyze grade-level and school-wide data. The team identifies instructional changes based on that data and shares out with appropriate constituents. | SLT members analyze the effectiveness of the instructional changes that are implemented and seek additional support as needed | | | | | |
| 5 | Members review data regularly to determine that particular sub-groups of students are or are not making expected progress. Further action statements are developed. | Sub groups are broken out | PD is developed that aligns to sub group trends | Next steps are developed based on PD and data and subgroup analysis is routine | Data indicates that achievement gaps are closing based on action steps | | | | | |
| 6 | Members give both positive comments and constructive feedback for improvement. | The team is focused on either positive comments or constructive feedback and is working towards both or it is inconsistent | The team regularly shares positive comments and constructive feedback | Constructive feedback is focused on continuous improvement and is used to take action | SLT members take responsibility for sharing positive comments, constructive feedback, and action steps with constituents | | | | | |
| 7 | Members complete tasks effectively and on schedule. | Data protocols being used have a line item that tracks tasks for follow through | Each SLT meeting begins by reflecting on the tasks flagged for follow through at the previous meeting | Follow through is routine and members understand their responsibility | Members own the follow through steps, feel a sense of urgency and come prepared to every meeting to discuss | | | | | |
| 8 | Members place highest priority on team/school success. | Team members participate in the SLT out of a sense of duty | Team members are eager to participate and take responsibility for school success | Commitment to success is apparent and members consistently show a passion for seeing success | A common vision is shared and owned by all staff (not just SLT members) | | | | | |
| 9 | Members hold each other accountable for their performance and for results. | Members occasionally hold each other accountable for performance or results and are working towards both | Members routinely hold each other accountable for their performance and results. | Accountability results in action steps and leads to a shared vision | Accountability and collaboration lead to a culture of high success | | | | | |
| 10 | Team has well-defined and attainable literacy goals and expectations connected to the school's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). | The team has set literacy goals but they are not attainable or may not be tied to the UIP | The team is able to articulate the literacy goals and is clear on their connection to the UIP. They can articulate | The team regularly evaluates progress towards goals and continues to set appropriate action steps | Goals and goal attainment are consistently shared out with constituents | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | how they will be measured | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Team follows effective meeting practices (e.g., meetings begin with a check-in of prior meeting's to-do lists, clear objectives, agenda, stays on task, appropriate time management, establishes decisions and dialogue within the agenda, and documentation). | Principal leads the SLT meeting, sets team norms, and established meeting protocol | A good organizational structure is in place that includes an agenda, protocol, time on task, note taking, and decision making process. | SLT meeting follows a specific protocol, has established norms, all members have equal voice and can effectively represent decisions to all staff members with professionalism | Strong 2-way communication is established and followed. Each team member is clear on whom they represent and what information is shared and/or gathered | | | | | |
| 12 | Agenda is communicated, all participants have input and action steps, and due dates and responsibilities are followed through. | Team members receive the agenda when they arrive at the meeting | Team members have input into the agenda items | The entire school has input into agenda items | Outcomes of meeting are shared with entire staff | | | | | |
| 13 | Members review fiscal resources to ensure supports for literacy improvement are targeted and aligned to the school's UIP. | Members have little knowledge of the fiscal resources and/or the school's UIP | Members review fiscal resources and alignment to the UIP annually | Members regularly review fiscal resources and alignment to the UIP and current data | Members regularly review fiscal resources and alignment to the UIP and give input into action steps | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Community and Family Involvement: Community and family involvement contributes to the social, emotional, physical, academic, and occupational growth of children. Successful involvement is dependent on collaboration among youth, families, schools, businesses, and agencies. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | Documentation of Evidence | Date | Date | Date | Date |
| 1 | Parents are regularly informed of literacy expectations and are updated on individual student progress toward meeting those expectations. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Parents of students with READ Plans are updated on progress regularly, and READ Plans are updated at least annually. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Literacy goals of the school are effectively communicated to parents and other stakeholders in the community in a manner that parents and stakeholders are able to comprehend. | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Parents and community members are engaged as partners in ways that are culturally and linguistically responsive. | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Families and community members are welcomed as partners to maximize student literacy learning. | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Local resources that support literacy activities are recognized and encouraged. | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar | | | | | | | | | | |

| Totals by Date : Column D | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Component | | | | | DATE: | Total Earned/Total Possible | Percent of Implementation |
| Universal Instruction | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Interventions | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Assessment | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| School Leadership Team | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Professional Development | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Data-Based Decision Making | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Community and Family Involvement | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Total | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Totals by Date : Column E | | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | DATE: | Total Earned/Total Possible | Percent of Implementation |
| Universal Instruction | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Interventions | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Assessment | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| School Leadership Team | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Professional Development | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Data-Based Decision Making | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Community and Family Involvement | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Total | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Totals by Date : Column F | | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | DATE: | Total Earned/Total Possible | Percent of Implementation |
| Universal Instruction | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Interventions | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Assessment | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| School Leadership Team | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Professional Development | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Data-Based Decision Making | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Community and Family Involvement | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Total | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Totals by Date : Column G | | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | DATE: | Total Earned/Total Possible | Percent of Implementation |
| Universal Instruction | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Interventions | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Assessment | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| School Leadership Team | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Professional Development | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Data-Based Decision Making | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Community and Family Involvement | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Total | | | | | | 0 | 0% |