

**Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention (RtI) Strategies**  
**Request for Proposals (RFP) for Training and Support for**  
**Implementation of Tier 2 RtI Models**

**Release date: January 5, 2009**

**Questions due: January 20, 2009**

**Letter of intent deadline: February 3, 2009**

**Proposal submission deadline: March 20, 2009**

---

---

**Table of Contents**

A. General Overview and Background.....	1
A.1. Project Background.....	1
A.2. Overview of the Evaluation .....	2
A.3. Definition of <i>Measurement System</i> and <i>Benchmark Assessments</i> .....	3
A.4. Overview of Products and Services Solicited.....	4
A.5. Required Features of Tier 2 RtI Models .....	4
B. Responsibilities of Selected Providers, Districts and Schools, and Evaluation Study Team .....	7
B.1. Selected Providers .....	7
B.2. Districts and Schools.....	8
B.3. Evaluation Study Team (MDRC, SRI International, and Survey Research Management) .....	9
C. Technical Specifications .....	9
C.1. Statement of Work .....	9
C.1.a. Task Descriptions .....	10
C.2. Schedule of Deliverables.....	12
C.3. Organization of Proposal and Instructions to Offerors .....	13
C.3.a. Overview .....	13
C.3.b. Details and Instructions for Each Proposal Section .....	13
C.4. General Proposal Information .....	17
C.4.a. Proposal Format.....	17
C.4.b. Eligible Providers.....	17
C.4.c. Type of Agreement and Funding Level.....	17
D. Evaluation Factors for Award .....	18
D.1. Evaluation and Selection Process .....	18
D.2. Minimum Qualifications .....	18
D.3. Review Criteria .....	18
E. Key Proposal Dates .....	19
F. Business Proposal Instructions .....	20
Appendix A. Cover Pages for Proposals.....	22

## A. General Overview and Background

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to select Providers<sup>1</sup> (possibly a consortium of organizations) that agree to:

1. Provide all products, training, materials, and other support for 25 or 50 schools to implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) model for grades 1 and 2 reading, with a particular focus on Tier 2, meeting the standards set forth in this RFP
2. Have their Tier 2 RtI model evaluated by the Department of Education's evaluator, a partnership of MDRC, SRI International, and Survey Research Management.

Offerors must provide evidence of previous widespread use and/or empirical evidence of the effectiveness of the complete model or its components. This solicitation is *not* a request for the development of new RtI strategies or reading interventions; however, it allows for the combination of products and services that have previously been marketed separately.

For the purpose of this RFP, *Response to Intervention* is defined as follows:

*A multi-tiered approach to identify and intervene early with struggling students. Student performance is systematically monitored at each intervention tier to ascertain the need for further intervention in general education and, when needed, to determine whether students are eligible for special education.*

### A.1. Project Background

The National Center for Education Evaluation of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education, is conducting the National Assessment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004, P.L. 108-446), part of which is an evaluation of the impact of RtI strategies in early reading. Under IDEA, RtI may qualify as an early intervening service intended to identify and serve students in general education classrooms who may be at risk for academic difficulties and be eligible for special education. IES has contracted with MDRC, SRI International, and Survey Research Management to conduct the *Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention Strategies*.

The focus of IDEA has evolved from securing access to public education for students with disabilities to including them in accountability systems, providing them access to the general education curriculum, and improving their academic performance. Although progress on some of these goals is evident, students with disabilities continue to display a pattern of low academic achievement despite advances in curriculum design; understanding of the components required to develop reading skills; development of assessment approaches, tools, and procedures used in instructional decisions for teaching reading; and application of research-based intervention strategies. This conundrum, along with the hope of avoiding unnecessary referrals for special

---

<sup>1</sup> The term *Provider* should be viewed as broad and includes but is not limited to commercial curriculum and software publishers, training providers, training organizations, and university research teams. In this RFP, the term *Provider* is used to denote either one organization or a consortium of organizations. The term *Offeror* refers to an organization or consortium submitting a proposal to be a *Provider* for this study.

education, has been the impetus for earlier intervening services to improve the achievement of struggling learners and inform evaluations of whether students have specific learning disabilities.

Reflecting research that suggests that low achievement may be due to inappropriate instruction and not necessarily to a disability,<sup>2</sup> several model programs, student assessment methodologies, and instructional advances have been developed and have come to be known as Response to Intervention.<sup>3</sup> Generally, RtI strategies emphasize high-quality instruction in general education classes, frequent monitoring of student performance, decision rules to identify nonresponders, and delivery of increasingly intensive interventions to nonresponders in a tiered manner. Since the inclusion of RtI in IDEA 2004, the number of RtI initiatives across the nation has grown. As more states and local education agencies seek to adopt RtI initiatives, they need scientific evidence to make sound decisions about appropriate instructional interventions. Thus, the *Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention Strategies* is timely.

## A.2. Overview of the Evaluation

All of the schools included in this study will implement versions of RtI including the following three levels of instructional intensity for Grade 1 and 2 reading:

- **Tier 1** is the core general education curriculum as defined by each school district, combined with some differentiation of instruction and a process for measuring the performance of each student using benchmark assessments. The benchmark assessments, also defined by each district, are directly connected to the general education curriculum to assist schools in identifying students at risk of performing below an age- or grade-appropriate level.
- **Tier 2** consists of supplemental interventions for students not performing adequately in Tier 1. These interventions are more intensive than the instruction provided in Tier 1. Failure to make satisfactory progress in Tier 2 leads to progression to Tier 3 and may lead to the determination of a student's eligibility for special education, whereas satisfactory progress may lead to the student continuing in Tier 2 or being returned to Tier 1.
- **Tier 3** includes more intensive, *individualized* interventions to address each struggling student's unique needs and may lead to the determination of a student's eligibility for special education, if this has not already occurred at the end of Tier 2.

The purpose of the evaluation is to compare the relative effectiveness of different models of Tier 2 RtI strategies: one or two models that include the essential features of the RtI approach (*Essential RtI model*), and one model that has additional features (*Enhanced RtI model*) (see discussion of features beginning on page 5). The models will be implemented in 100–150 schools during the 2010–11 and 2011–12 school years. Schools will be supported during a 4- to 6-month

---

<sup>2</sup> Vaughn, S., & Fuchs, L. S. (2003). Redefining learning disabilities as inadequate response to instruction: The promise and potential problems. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 18, 137–146.

<sup>3</sup> Fuchs, D., & Young, C. (2006). On the irrelevance of intelligence in predicting responsiveness to reading instruction. *Exceptional Children*, 73(1), 8-30.

planning period beginning in early 2010 and will be provided with staff training as well as needed products and materials before the beginning of the 2010–11 school year. Schools, which are to be recruited from approximately 10–15 districts, must serve students in grades K–2, have at least 60 students per grade, and serve students from diverse economic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.

For the evaluation, each study school will be randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups so that there will be 50 schools implementing a particular Tier 2 RtI model. This evaluation will be performed in schools *not* already committed to Tier 2 RtI strategies that are inconsistent with any of the possible models. The evaluators will compare the academic outcomes associated with the different Tier 2 RtI models, such as reading achievement, grade promotion, and special education identification, for students in elementary school.

Two main questions will be addressed:

1. What are the differential impacts of the Tier 2 RtI models on academic outcomes for first- and second-graders after 1 or 2 years of implementation? For example, does an enhanced RtI model produce better academic outcomes than an essential model?
2. Do the impacts of the Tier 2 RtI models vary by subgroup, for example, by students' initial academic performance or by their race/ethnicity?

To describe the implementation of the Tier 2 RtI models in study schools, the evaluation contractor will design implementation surveys to collect data on the student assessment and instructional practices used for grade 1 and 2 reading in each school. These practices might include the decision-making framework for identifying and intervening early with struggling readers; the use of data to differentiate instruction and infrastructures to support such data use; the content of reading instruction; and the processes for determining children's special education eligibility. The evaluation contractor will also administer tests measuring the reading skills of students in the study schools who have been identified, on the basis of district-defined benchmark assessments administered in fall 2010, to be at risk of reading difficulties. The evaluation contractor will administer reading tests in spring 2011 for at-risk first-graders and in spring 2012 for at-risk first- and second-graders.

### **A.3. Definition of *Measurement System* and *Benchmark Assessments***

In this RFP, two terms are used with specific intent: *measurement system* and *benchmark assessments*. *Measurement system* refers to

- Assessments used in identifying children at risk of reading failure
- Assessments used in measuring aspects of students' reading performance (i.e., skills)
- Administration and scoring procedures for those assessments
- Specifications regarding the frequency of the administration of the measures
- Procedures for calculating students' performance (level) and, if appropriate, rate of progress (slope)
- Explicit procedures or rules (i.e., criteria) for using the measurement results to determine a students' need for differentiated intervention/instruction—through

(1) assigning students to tiers, (2) changing tier assignments, or (3) differentiating intervention/instruction within Tier 2

- An infrastructure for supporting teachers and school staff in using the data to make decisions about differentiation of instruction

In this RFP, *benchmark assessment* is used for a component of the measurement system that is: (a) defined, prior to random assignment, by each school district for its schools in the study; and (b) administered to all Grade 1 and 2 students at least three times annually to determine which, if any, are at risk of performing below age- or grade-appropriate reading standards. The RtI literature includes specific measurement approaches and procedures, such as progress monitoring, mastery learning, curriculum-based assessment, curriculum-based measurement, and the like. The meaning of these terms can vary across different audiences. Offerors should propose and define those components of a specific measurement system that are (a) used in connection with Tier 2 instruction, and (b) are consistent with the Offeror's RtI model and the requirements of this RFP.

#### **A.4. Overview of Products and Services Solicited**

The following products and services are to be provided:

- A previously implemented Tier 2 RtI model for grade 1 and 2 reading, including measurement system product(s) to be used for monitoring student performance and progress, and one or more reading interventions to meet the developmental reading needs of the learners
- Training and ongoing support for school staff to implement the Tier 2 RtI model
- Detailed plans for implementation of the model.

Taken together, the processes, products, training, and plans for implementation proposed by the Offeror will constitute its *Tier 2 RtI model* for this study. The evaluation is seeking Providers who can provide their Tier 2 RtI model to either 25 schools or 50 schools. Up to four awards will be made for an *Essential RtI* model, and up to two awards will be made for an *Enhanced RtI* model, depending on whether Providers are able to provide their model to 25 or 50 schools.

#### **A.5. Required Features of Tier 2 RtI Models**

Each Offeror's Tier 2 RtI model must conform to one of two model categories described below: *Essential RtI* or *Enhanced RtI*. The following subsections describe the features that must be included in each type of model. Regardless of whether an *Essential RtI* or *Enhanced RtI* model is proposed, the model must be flexible enough to be used with the schools' core reading program and benchmark student assessments as defined in advance by each participating school district.

The overarching goals of the Tier 2 RtI models for reading are to (1) improve to a satisfactory level the reading achievement of students whose reading difficulties stem from experiential or instructional deficits and (2) distinguish between students whose reading difficulties stem from experiential or instructional deficits and those whose difficulties are due to a learning disability on the basis of nonresponsiveness to scientifically based interventions.

For this study, the focus of the RtI strategies being varied across schools is on improving the reading performance of children in grades 1 and 2 who are identified for Tier 2 instruction. The primary distinction between the *Essential RtI* model and the *Enhanced RtI* model will be the extent and means of differentiation of instruction within Tier 2. *Essential RtI* models will vary the intensity of instruction primarily through the movement of students across the three tiers, although some differentiation of instruction (e.g., variation in content) may occur *within* Tier 2 small groups. In contrast, *Enhanced RtI* models will include a *substantial* amount of differentiated instruction *across* Tier 2 small groups (e.g., by using student data to group students to receive different Tier 2 reading content, length of time in interventions, or size of groups for interventions) and may also include different levels of instruction within Tier 2 to vary instructional intensity for different students.

### ***Essential RtI Models***

*Essential RtI* models must have the following features:

1. **Tier 2 measurement system components including explicit rules for using reading performance data for making tier placement determinations** (e.g., identifying at-risk students, moving students between tiers, and/or having students remain in a tier). The measurement system must include measures with adequate reliability and predictive validity, such as established criteria for adequate performance; be sufficient to make judgments about whether students have reached adequate level of criterion performance; be linked to state standards; be aligned with the skills taught in grades 1 and 2; and provide teachers with timely data to make instructional decisions.<sup>4</sup> These measurement system components are in addition to the benchmark assessments that schools administer to all students.
2. **Explicit instruction in specific reading skills ensuring that students have sufficient learning and practice opportunities in Tier 2 instruction.** At a minimum, the Tier 2 program shall focus on high-priority skills consistent with each student's level of reading development. It may also contain instruction in the other components of reading as defined by the National Reading Panel.
3. **Eighty to 100 minutes of instruction per week to students in Tier 2** (e.g., three 30-minute sessions per week, four 25-minute sessions per week, or two 45-minute sessions per week). Tier 2 instruction is in addition to at least 60 minutes of Tier 1 instruction a day.
4. **Tier 2 instruction delivered in small group formats.** Instruction is delivered in small groups. Group size depends on the number of children in need of Tier 2 instruction and constraints on group size required for effective delivery of the Tier 2 instructional program.
5. **A school-based RtI Leadership Team.** This team includes staff knowledgeable about teaching reading in grades K–2, about using data to make instructional decisions, and

---

<sup>4</sup> Schools selected for the study will either have a benchmark assessment system in place or agree to have one in place no later than January 2010. Benchmark assessments are administered to all students at least three times (i.e., fall, winter, spring) a year to ascertain whether they have reached important performance levels consistent with reading development.

about the eligibility procedures and processes for special education. (See further description in Section C.1.)

6. **A school-based RtI Delivery Team.** This team will provide Tier 2 reading instruction to students in grades 1 and 2. Some members of the RtI Delivery Team are also likely to belong to the RtI Leadership Team.

### ***Enhanced RtI Models***

*Enhanced RtI* models include all the features of *Essential RtI* models and expand on them by providing substantially more differentiated instruction across small groups within Tier 2. Here we present seven possible expansions, although such expansions may be accomplished in other ways, and a proposed model need not include all these possible expansions.<sup>5</sup>

1. **Differentiate instruction across small groups within Tier 2 on the basis of frequent measurement of student performance with** explicit rules using data on *performance level and slope* for making group placement determinations and monitoring student progress (i.e., screening, regrouping within the tier to create more homogenous small groups, moving students between tiers, and/or having students remain in a tier).
2. **Distinguish levels within Tier 2.** The multi-level RtI system is set up with two levels or phases of instruction in Tier 2 instead of only one. Decisions about student progress could be made twice in Tier 2, for example, after 6 weeks and again after 12 weeks. After 6 weeks of instruction, the student's performance would determine whether the student should return to Tier 1 or move on to a more intensive version of Tier 2.
3. **Differentiate the reading content in Tier 2.** Depending on their reading development, students may require instruction in different aspects of reading (e.g., phonemic segmentation, letter-sound relations, decoding unfamiliar words, acquiring sight word vocabulary, reading connected text, or acquiring word meanings). Differentiating instructional content can occur by forming groups that differ in instructional focus (e.g. phonological, decoding skills, and spelling versus word identification and reading connected text) and that receive distinct instructional interventions or different components of the same intervention.
4. **Differentiate the amount of time in Tier 2.** Depending on their reading development, students may require more or less instructional time on different aspects of reading (e.g., phonemic segmentation, letter-sound relations, decoding unfamiliar words, acquiring sight word vocabulary, reading connected text, or acquiring word meanings). Differentiating instructional time can occur by forming groups that differ in the time allocated to specific skill, by allocating different amounts of time and practice on specific skills *within instructional groups for individuals*, providing some students with either additional lessons or longer lessons, and/or increasing the amount of time for Tier 2 instruction (e.g., four or five 30-minute lessons per week instead of the 80-100 minutes of time).

---

<sup>5</sup> Offerors with an alternative approach to delivering an *Enhanced RtI* model that contrasts with the *Essential RtI* model and meets the RFP evaluation criteria are encouraged to submit their models for consideration.

5. **Differentiate the size of the instructional groups in Tier 2.** Instruction might be delivered in smaller groups to allow for more learning opportunities for students needing more intensive intervention. Decisions about group composition might be revisited regularly using student performance data.
6. **Differentiate instruction for students within Tier 2 on the basis of frequent curriculum-embedded assessments and/or otherwise broader forms of assessment.** Curriculum-embedded assessments, end-of-unit assessments, or teacher's informal assessments within lessons (e.g., assessing students' knowledge of letter-sound relations, word meanings) may be used to assess student's ongoing progress. Measurement may be on a broader range of reading skills than the "essential reading skills" for that grade. Performance may be measured by both level and rate of growth (slope).
7. **Follow the progress of children in Tier 1 who are on the margins of meeting the criteria for Tier 2 assignment.** For example, teachers informally follow student's progress; wait until the second benchmark assessment; or collect more data points on the child's performance to determine Tier 2 eligibility using tools for measuring student performance.

## **B. Responsibilities of Selected Providers, Districts and Schools, and Evaluation Study Team**

### **B.1. Selected Providers**

The Providers selected shall from the time of award through the end of the 2012-2012 school year::

- Provide products and services for monitoring the performance of Tier 2 students and one or more reading interventions for Tier 2 students, as required by the Provider's Tier 2 RtI model. The Provider's Tier 2 RtI model must accommodate schools using different core reading curricula, benchmark assessments, or universal screening products.
- Work with school RtI leadership teams to develop a set of decision rules for the movement of students into and out of Tier 2, as well as plans for implementing the Tier 2 RtI model.
- Either work with schools' preexisting supplementary reading products or be prepared to provide additional supplementary reading products that address each of the essential reading skills in grades 1 and 2 for students receiving Tier 2 instruction.
- Work within the schools' existing benchmark assessment system (that is, not supplant benchmark assessments being used in study schools per district policy).
- In response to comments from the evaluation team and IES, update the plan for training the staff of the schools' Tier 2 RtI Leadership Team and Delivery Team in the implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model set forth in the proposal, arrange for the logistics of training, and provide school staff with on-site training as described in the approved training plan. The training will include activities during a planning period

from early 2010 through the summer of 2010, training sessions before the start of the 2010–11 school year, and additional support for implementation during the school year.

- Be responsible for ensuring that the Tier 2 RtI model is implemented with fidelity and responding to implementation problems as they arise.

The Providers have no responsibility for recruiting sites or collecting data for the impact study, although Providers will be invited to nominate eligible districts with which they have relationships but to which they are not currently providing services. These tasks will be handled by the Evaluation Study Team.

## **B.2. Districts and Schools**

Schools recruited for the study will:

- Either have in place or agree to put in place no later than January 2010 a set of procedures and a district-defined reading measure for screening all students in grades 1 and 2 three times a year (fall, winter, and spring) to accurately identify those at risk of failure to learn to read. Schools in each district should be assumed to use the same benchmark assessment system, program, or tool for all students in the grade, but benchmark assessments will likely differ across districts. The study schools will also be required to continue administering benchmark assessments at least three times per year (fall, winter, spring) in both the first and second grades during the study years.
- Have in place a basal reading curriculum, a comprehensive core reading program most often produced by major educational publishers. Core elements of the basal reading program include phonemic awareness, systematic explicit phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension instruction. Schools in each district are likely to use the same basal reading program, while using different supplementary reading products for teaching the core five components of reading.
- Identify a core set of staff members as leaders to work with the Provider(s) on implementation of the RtI model in the school (the RtI Leadership Team), as well as staff members to provide Tier 2 instruction to students (the RtI Delivery Team).

Districts and schools recruited for the study will:

- Have processes and procedures in place for determining whether children are eligible for special education and related services.
- Provide up to 5 days of professional development time per teacher to train school staff in implementing the Tier 2 RtI models. (MDRC may compensate schools with payments for substitute teachers if professional development time beyond the 5 days is required for successful implementation of a Tier 2 RtI model.)
- Cooperate with research procedures and data collection.

### **B.3. Evaluation Study Team (MDRC, SRI International, and Survey Research Management)**

The evaluation study team (EST) will:

- Recruit the districts and schools for the study (up to 10–15 school districts, at least six schools in each district).
- Randomly assign schools in a district to one of three treatment groups of 50 schools each. Monitor the Providers' implementation of the Tier 2 RtI models.
- Collect all student data, administrative records as appropriate, and surveys of school staff.

## **C. Technical Specifications**

This section of the RFP provides information on the tasks to be undertaken and their anticipated timeline. It also provides direction on what each proposal must provide in terms of content, how it must be organized, and what the formatting requirements are. Note that the technical proposal will be limited to 40 pages (see section C.4 for more details).

### **C.1. Statement of Work**

For planning purposes, bidders should assume that the implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model will be tested in 10 to 15 districts with at least six schools in each district and that each school will have three first- and three second-grade classrooms with approximately 20 children in each. Providers shall be responsible for supporting the implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model in 25 or 50 schools, depending on their capacity. Although the precise distribution of districts across states will not be known until site recruitment has concluded, for budgeting purposes Offerors should assume that the districts will be distributed across five or six states in different regions of the country. Additional information about the sites is summarized below:

- Fifty schools will be randomly assigned to each of the three treatment groups corresponding with different Tier 2 RtI models.
- If not currently configured, each school will form for this study an RtI Delivery Team consisting of 8 staff members on average (first- and second-grade teachers or other staff), and an RtI Leadership Team consisting of 4 staff members on average, two of whom are also on the Delivery Team, for a total an average of 10 key staff involved in Tier 2 RtI implementation. The RtI Delivery Team will deliver Tier 2 interventions and maintain an infrastructure to support use of data to make tiered decisions and instructional decisions within Tier 2. The RtI Leadership Team will be trained to lead the implementation of RtI in the school, oversee the analysis and interpretation of student data in the implementation of interventions, assist in instructional decisions, and communicate with parents and staff about the implementation of RtI in the school.
- In the 2010–11 school year, the Tier 2 RtI model will be implemented with first-grade students (Cohort 1). In the 2011–12 school year, the Tier 2 RtI model will be implemented with Cohort 1 (most of whom are likely to be enrolled in second grade) and with new first grade students (Cohort 2);

- Pooling across the cohorts, schools will have at least 15 first-graders enrolled who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and ideally a similar number of students in other possible subgroups such as race/ethnicity and English Language Learner status.

Providers are expected to integrate the school's benchmarking system for all first- and second-graders into the structure of the Tier 2 RtI model.

### **C.1.a. Task Descriptions**

#### **Task 1. Refine the plan of work, Tier 2 RtI model, approach to training, and materials.**

The EST will assemble an expert panel to review the Provider's Tier 2 RtI model, approach to training, and materials as set forth in their proposal. The EST will collect the expert panel's feedback and provide guidance for revisions. The Provider shall then submit a document describing its RtI model, approach to training, and all materials as refined on the basis of the feedback. In the summer after the first year of implementation, the Provider shall submit a memo summarizing lessons learned and implications for the second year of implementation.

##### **Deliverables**

- Refined description of Provider's Tier 2 RtI model and approach, with accompanying materials (August 2009)
- Memo documenting lessons learned in first year of implementation and implications for second year of implementation (July 2011)

#### **Task 2: Prepare brief written description of the Tier 2 RtI model appropriate for district and school administrators**

The Provider shall prepare a brief description of the Tier 2 RtI model in a user-friendly format for distribution to district and school administrators as part of the site recruitment process. The Provider shall submit a draft of the document to the EST and revise it on the basis of the EST's feedback.

If the EST requests, the Provider will collaborate with the EST to conduct a presentation for district and school administrators; the cost of this presentation would be covered by the EST and is outside the scope of services under this RFP.

##### **Deliverables**

- Draft user-friendly document describing Provider's Tier 2 RtI model (July 2009)
- Final user-friendly document describing Provider's Tier 2 RtI model. (August 2009)

#### **Task 3: Conduct professional development and provide ongoing support during the school years for the RtI Leadership Teams**

During January through June 2010, the Provider shall train and work on an ongoing basis with the RtI Leadership Team of each of its assigned schools to ensure that the RtI Delivery Teams can be trained no later than August 2010 and that implementation begins in September 2010. The Provider shall determine the location and duration of training in collaboration with the schools. When

conducting the professional development, the Provider shall consider team members' understanding of their roles and the team's skills in analyzing student performance data, communicating clearly, resolving problems, and any other relevant issues.

The Provider shall also provide the Leadership Teams with follow-up training and support during each year of the study. Professional development and ongoing support may include assisting schools with their data collection, analysis and interpretation of student data, and data management so that data are readily available and timely enough to inform instruction. Each Provider shall determine the appropriate follow-up training and support activities for the Leadership Team at its assigned schools.

EST staff will observe the professional development sessions. Should observers report deficiencies in the training, the Provider shall promptly correct them.

**Deliverables**

- Conduct initial training and support for the RtI Leadership Team of each of the Provider's assigned schools (January–June 2010)
- Provide follow-up training and support throughout the school year. (2010–11 and 2011–12 school years)

**Task 4: Conduct professional development and provide ongoing support for the RtI Delivery Teams**

Before the 2010–11 school year, the Provider shall train approximately 250 or 500 school staff (i.e., an average of 10 teachers or other staff at each of the 25 or 50 schools assigned to the Provider who will be involved with implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model). This training shall address one or more of the five reading essentials (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary). Training staff to use the relevant components of the measurement system will also be critically important and may include such topics as frequency of progress monitoring, test administration, maintaining records, scoring, and analysis. The Provider shall determine the location and duration of the training in collaboration with the schools.

The Provider shall perform follow-up training and support activities consistent with the Provider's Tier 2 RtI model and determine the amount, timing, and location.

EST staff will observe the professional development sessions. Should observers report deficiencies in the training, the Provider shall promptly correct them.

**Deliverables**

- Conduct professional development for the RtI Delivery Team who will be delivering Tier 2 instruction and using the corresponding components of the measurement system in each of the Provider's assigned schools. (no later than the month preceding the 2010 and 2011 school years)
- Provide follow-up training and support for the RtI Delivery Team throughout the school year, including training new staff as needed by the schools. (2010–11 and 2011–12 school years)

**Task 5. Monitor fidelity of implementation**

The Provider shall use cost-effective direct and indirect methods for monitoring the fidelity of implementation of its model. The Provider shall conduct a minimum of two direct observations a year. The EST will provide feedback on the measures and methods presented in the Provider’s proposal, and the Provider shall refine its approach on the basis of the feedback. The Provider and the EST will jointly develop a template for reporting on fidelity of implementation in the schools, and the Provider shall use it to report on fidelity in every quarterly report as described in Task 6.

**Deliverables**

- Refined approach for monitoring fidelity of implementation, incorporating the EST’s feedback (July 2010)
- Monitor fidelity of implementation (2010–11 and 2011–12 school years)

**Task 6: Management**

For the duration of the award, the Provider shall submit quarterly reports to EST. These reports must detail all activities conducted during the quarter as well as any problems that have arisen and their resolution. In these reports, the Provider shall also document fidelity of implementation using the template developed in Task 5.

In addition, the Provider shall allocate 2 hours of time per quarter for conference calls with the EST.

**Deliverables**

- Quarterly reports to the EST (by the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the month after the end of the quarter)
- Two hours of conference calls per quarter with the EST (each quarter of the study)

**C.2. Schedule of Deliverables**

<b>Task 1. : Refine the plan of work, Tier 2 Rtl model, approach to training, and materials</b>	
Refined description of Provider’s Tier 2 Rtl model and approach, with all accompanying materials	August, 2009
Memo documenting lessons learned in first year of implementation and implications for second year of implementation	July, 2011
<b>Task 2: Prepare brief written description of the Tier 2 Rtl model appropriate for district and school administrators</b>	
Draft user-friendly document describing Provider’s Tier 2 Rtl model	July 2009
Final user-friendly document describing Provider’s Tier 2 Rtl model	August 2009
<b>Task 3: Conduct professional development and provide ongoing support during the school years for the Rtl Leadership Teams</b>	
Conduct initial training and support for the Rtl Leadership Team of each of the Provider’s assigned schools	January–June 2010
Provide follow-up training and support throughout the school year	2010–11 and 2011–12 school years

<b>Task 4: Conduct professional development and provide ongoing support for the RtI Delivery Team</b>	
Conduct professional development for the RtI Delivery Team	No later than the month preceding the 2010 and 2011 school years
Provide follow-up training and support to the RtI Delivery Team throughout the school year, including training new staff as needed by the schools	2010–11 and 2011–12 school years
<b>Task 5: Monitor fidelity of implementation</b>	
Refined approach for monitoring fidelity of implementation, incorporating the EST's feedback	July 2010
Monitor fidelity of implementation	2010–11 and 2011–12 school years
<b>Task 6: Management</b>	
Quarterly reports to EST	By the 10th day of the month after the end of the quarter
Two hours of conference calls per quarter with the EST	Each quarter of the study

### **C.3. Organization of Proposal and Instructions to Offerors**

#### **C.3.a. Overview**

Offerors shall organize the technical proposal into the following sections:

- Cover Pages
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Introduction:
  - A. Description of the Tier 2 RtI Model
  - B. Empirical Support for or Evidence of Widespread Use of the Tier 2 RtI Model or Components of the Model
- Statement of Work
- Management and Staff Qualifications
- Corporate Capabilities (capacity to train 25 or 50 schools; prior experience)
- Appendix A: Resumes of Key Staff
- Appendix B: RtI Materials
- Appendix C: Professional Development Materials for Training RtI Leadership Team
- Appendix D: Professional Development Materials for Training RtI Delivery Team
- Appendix E: Fidelity of Implementation Instruments
- Appendix F: Districts and Schools That Have Used the Proposed Tier 2 RtI Model
- Appendix G: Empirical Studies Conducted on the Proposed Tier 2 RtI Model

#### **C.3.b. Details and Instructions for Each Proposal Section**

**Cover Pages.** Complete the cover page in Appendix A to this RFP.

**Abstract.** In no more than one page, summarize the features of the Tier 2 RtI model, including the appropriateness for the target audience, and the name(s) of the bidder or consortium.

**Table of Contents.** List each required section of the proposal and the page range for the section. List the materials included in each of the appendices with appropriate page numbers. Prepare a crosswalk between the proposal materials and the materials in the appendices.

**Introduction: Description of the Tier 2 RtI Model and Empirical Support for or Evidence of Widespread Use of the Tier 2 RtI Model or Components of the Model.** Provide a thorough description of the Tier 2 RtI model, including the corresponding interventions and measurement system components for grades 1 and 2 reading, as it fits the conditions described earlier in this RFP for the *Essential* or *Enhanced RtI* model. Include information about the reading content of the intervention materials (see further guidance for Appendix B on page 14) and the measurement product(s) used to identify at-risk students and to gauge student performance (see also guidance for Appendix B). It is important to include enough information to give the evaluators a sense of the scope and sequence of skills and the quality of the instructional design of the intervention. Discuss time allocations for the reading interventions, student grouping formats, reading content, and measures and how these components of the Tier 2 RtI model fit together for schools to implement.

In addition, provide the empirical support for the Tier 2 RtI model and/or its demonstrated widespread use in schools. If there is no empirical evidence of the effectiveness or widespread use of the complete model (i.e., all components of the model used together), then provide the evidence for each component of the Tier 2 RtI model (i.e., empirical or through its widespread use).

Also provide information about the technical adequacy of the relevant components of the measurement system (i.e., show evidence of: reliability and predictive validity such as established criteria for adequate performance, sufficient measures to make judgments about whether students have reached adequate level of criterion performance, measures linked to state standards and aligned with the skills taught in first and second grade, and provision of timely data for teachers to make instructional decisions.)<sup>6</sup>.

**Statement of Work.** In the statement of work section, describe in detail how each task outlined in Section C.1.a. of this RFP will be carried out. Expand on each of task, including a discussion of procedural issues related to completing each task. For each task, clearly indicate which materials in the appendix supplement the discussion under the task description. Instructions for selected tasks follow.

For Tasks 1, 3, and 4, describe the approach to be used to train the RtI Leadership Teams and RtI Delivery Teams and provide 10 sets of relevant materials (see Appendices C and D). Include details about the training and support to be provided to the Leadership Team during the January–June 2010 planning period, as well as during the two implementation years, and information about previous successful experiences with the proposed approach.

---

<sup>6</sup> Schools selected for the study will either have in place or agree to have in place a benchmark assessment system before the implementation of the study (by January 2010). Benchmark assessments are administered to all students at least three times a year (i.e., fall, winter, spring) to ascertain whether the child has reached important performance levels consistent with reading development.

Offerors shall clearly state whether they intend to serve 25 or 50 schools. The location of the training will be determined jointly by the Provider and its assigned schools; however, the Provider shall be responsible for costs associated with the training (except for participants' time). For example, the Provider might offer training in each district or hold regional trainings for staff from several districts, in which case the Provider would bear the travel costs of participants. Offerors that have the capacity to serve 50 schools are encouraged to do so, but they must provide evidence of their capacity to serve the number of schools they propose.

For Task 5, describe the approach to monitoring the fidelity of implementation and provide evidence that the approach has been successful in the past. In addition, provide in Appendix E to the proposal 10 sets of the instruments that will be used for monitoring fidelity. Furthermore, Offerors shall clearly demonstrate their team's capabilities to carry out their proposed approach for monitoring fidelity.

**Management Plan and Staffing.** This section must present a plan for the internal management of the contract work (see Schedule of Tasks and Deliverables), showing clear divisions of responsibility as well as lines of responsibility. Offerors shall include the following:

- A staff organizational chart that delineates lines of responsibility; with brief descriptions of each organization and key person's role on the project
- A brief biographical description of each key staff member; including the project director; project manager; staff who will deliver the training to the schools on measurement, reading instruction, and teaming; and other staff required to implement the model. Descriptions should include documentation of experience working with culturally and linguistically diverse individuals, including English-language learners.
- A timeline of scheduled activities and deliverables
- An exhibit that displays the amount of time each person will spend on each task (by hours).

**Institutional Capabilities.** The statement of institutional capability should demonstrate that the bidder has sufficient institutional resources to deliver the training, products, and services described in the proposal to 25 or 50 schools in 10–15 school districts across at least 5–6 states located in different regions of the country. The Provider shall describe experiences providing the proposed Tier 2 RtI model, including the school staff's satisfaction with the training and intervention program. Providers bidding as a consortium should describe any experience the consortium members have had working together in the past.

**Appendix A: Resumes of Key Staff.** Each resume should be no longer than 5 pages.

**Appendix B: RtI Materials.** Submit 10 sample sets of materials clearly labeled to correspond with descriptions in the main body of the proposal.

A thorough review of the components of an RtI model is necessary to determine whether the program is aligned with current reading research and whether it meets the needs of first- and second-grade readers who are performing below grade level. The review will require the examination of relevant Tier 2 intervention materials (e.g., phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) and associated measurement system components used to identify at-risk students and monitor student performance and progress. The following may serve as a guideline to help Offerors determine the materials to submit for review:

1. Teacher's Editions for a specific grade (e.g., first) or span of several grades (e.g., K–first or first-second)
2. A scope and sequence
3. Sample: Student readers (if the material is not included in the Teacher's Edition)
4. Sample: Practice book or student masters
5. Sample: Software (if applicable)
6. Sample: Audiotapes/DVDs
7. Sample: Measures of students' reading performance including documentation of technical adequacy

**Appendix C: Professional Development Materials for Training the RtI Leadership Team.** Submit 10 sample sets of materials clearly labeled to correspond with sections of the main body of the proposal.

A review of the professional development materials for training an RtI Leadership Team requires an in-depth analysis of the content and key features of the training design. A key assumption is that an RtI Leadership Team will oversee the analysis and interpretation of student data and the implementation of interventions. This team will assist in instructional decisions based on systematic use of a measurement system. It will also be responsible for informing parents and staff about the implementation of RtI in their school. To gain an understanding of the processes and procedures used to train the RtI Leadership Team, we recommend the following:

1. Agendas for all professional development sessions
2. Sample handouts
3. Sample presentations (e.g. PowerPoint)
4. Other supplemental materials

**Appendix D: Professional Development Materials for the RtI Delivery Team.** Submit 10 sample sets of materials clearly labeled to correspond with sections of the main body of the proposal.

A key to the success of a Tier 2 RtI model is the training given to the school staff who will be delivering Tier 2 interventions and implementing the corresponding components of the measurement system—the RtI Delivery Team. A review of the proposed professional development requires a thorough analysis of the materials that will be used to train the staff who will be involved in implementing the Tier 2 RtI model. To attain a representative sample of the professional development to train staff, we recommend the following:

1. Agendas for all professional development sessions
2. Sample handouts
3. Sample presentations (e.g., PowerPoint)
4. Other supplemental materials

**Appendix E: Fidelity of Implementation Instruments.** Submit 10 sets of the instruments they propose to use to monitor fidelity of implementation of their Tier 2 RtI model.

**Appendix F: Districts and Schools That Have Used the Tier 2 RtI Model.** List up to three schools or districts, with contact information, where the Provider is currently conducting (or recently conducted) similar work.

**Appendix G: Empirical Studies Conducted on the Tier 2 RtI Model.** Provide references for reports on empirical studies conducted on the proposed Tier 2 RtI model. Submit 10 full-text copies of research reports about the Tier 2 RtI model, if available.

#### **C.4. General Proposal Information**

##### **C.4.a. Proposal Format**

The technical proposal is limited to 40 pages, where a page is 8.5 inches. x 11 inches, single sided, with 1-inch margins at the top, bottom, and both sides. All text must be vertically oriented with space-and-a-half or double spacing. Font size must be 12-point. All pages, except pre-printed technical inserts, must be sequentially numbered. The title page, table of contents, one-page abstract, and appendices are excluded from the page limit. Any materials submitted outside the 40-page proposal (other than the exceptions noted) will not be reviewed.

##### **C.4.b. Eligible Providers**

Eligible providers include nonprofit and for-profit entities, including but not limited to universities; research institutes; publishers; software developers; and organizations specializing in training and professional development that publish early reading interventions, systems for measuring student performance (including progress monitoring systems), and/or an RtI approach for addressing the reading needs of struggling readers in first and second grades. Providers may be involved in more than one bid if they are associated with more than one RtI model, Tier 2 reading intervention, or system for measuring student performance. However, in the final selection, the same Provider cannot be assigned to train and support schools in more than one treatment group (of 50 schools). Providers may form consortia as an approach to address all the requirements of the Tier 2 RtI models and RFP requirements. If consortia are formed, one organization shall be named as the lead, and the project director for the bid must come from the lead organization.

**Please note: If a consortium or single organization wishes to bid on more than one Tier 2 RtI model (i.e., *Essential* and *Enhanced*), it must submit separate proposals for each model.**

**Providers must agree to have the evaluation study team disseminate information (e.g., through publications) about the results of the RtI evaluation, including the name of the model, its component products, and the name of the Provider.**

##### **C.4.c. Type of Agreement and Funding Level**

The work will be performed under a fixed-price subcontract with MDRC. The subcontract will contain the applicable Federal Acquisition Regulation and U.S. Department of Education Acquisition Regulation provisions. Providers will receive \$22,500 per school for the *Essential RtI* model and \$45,000 per school for the *Enhanced RtI* model, paid in installments over a 3-year period, after delivery and MDRC's acceptance of the Provider's deliverables. The precise allocation of payments across deliverables will be negotiated after review of the budget and work plans for the winning bidders.

Offerors are encouraged to propose cost-effective means to deliver training and support to school staff in order to increase the quality of the implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model. Cost-

sharing arrangements are permitted if needed to cover training and support expenses beyond those supported by the fixed-price payments to be provided by MDRC.

## D. Evaluation Factors for Award

### D.1. Evaluation and Selection Process

A Review Panel consisting of special education and reading experts will be nominated by the study team and approved by IES. The process of selecting Providers for the study will proceed in four phases. First, each application will be screened by the EST for meeting the minimum qualifications. Second, the EST, IES staff, and the Review Panel will evaluate each proposal and select those eligible for final consideration. Then finalists will be invited to present their program to the panel, IES, and the EST. Finally, the EST, in consultation with the Review Panel, will nominate up to four bidders (up to four for *Essential RtI* and up to two for *Enhanced RtI*) to IES for a final decision.

### D.2. Minimum Qualifications

A proposal that does not meet the following minimum qualifications will be eliminated from consideration:

- Submission includes a technical proposal with the review criteria listed below addressed. **Incomplete proposals will be not be reviewed.**
- Submission includes at least a sample of Tier 2 intervention materials as well as materials associated with the system for measuring student performance.
- Submission includes samples of training materials for use by RtI Leadership Teams and Delivery Teams, including materials for training staff to implement the Tier 2 reading interventions and tools for measuring student performance.

### D.3. Review Criteria

The Review Panel, the EST, and IES will review and evaluate each proposal that meets the minimum qualifications and assign each proposal a score based on the criteria listed below.

Criteria	Points
<b>I. Quality of the proposed Tier 2 RtI model and appropriateness for implementation in grades 1 and 2</b>	0–50
a. The instructional design of the intervention(s) (See instructions for Appendix B.)	
b. The scope and sequence of the components of the intervention (i.e., phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency) (See instructions for Appendix B.)	
c. The technical adequacy (e.g., reliability, predictive validity) of the assessments used in the measurement system (See instructions for Appendix B.)	
d. Empirical support for the effectiveness of the Tier 2 RtI model or components of the model and/or evidence of successful widespread use in schools	
e. The intervention's feasibility as a year-long Tier 2 program (including logistical plans and time frames for implementation)	

Criteria	Points
f. The technical characteristics and requirements of the software used for the measurement system and/or Tier 2 reading interventions	
<b>II. Quality of the professional development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The training approach to be used to teach the roles and responsibilities of individuals who serve on the school's Rtl Leadership Team (See instructions for Appendix C.)</li> <li>b. The content presented in the professional development program including teacher knowledge and pedagogical skills necessary for the Rtl Delivery Team (See instructions for Appendix D.)</li> <li>c. The professional development approach to be used to teach the Tier 2 Rtl model to the Delivery Team, including the logistics and time frame for implementation (See instructions for Appendix D.)</li> <li>d. The professional development materials for the Rtl Leadership and Delivery teams (See instructions for Appendices C and D.)</li> <li>e. The management and coordination of training and strategies to maintain the fidelity of implementation</li> </ul>	0–25
<b>III. Capacity of the institution to provide training and follow-up support for 25 or 50 schools and amount of resources consistent with the Tier 2 Rtl model</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Skills and experience of staff delivering the professional development for implementing the Tier 2 Rtl model in the schools and providing the training and ongoing support</li> <li>b. Adequacy and clarity of lines of authority for conducting the project</li> <li>c. Staff qualifications and time commitment of project director and manager for management and coordination</li> <li>d. Appropriateness of the budget for the services and products proposed. (Cost-effective means of delivering training and support are encouraged to increase the value of the professional development provided school staff.)</li> <li>e. Published reports or other documented evidence demonstrating successful use in the past by Offerors of the Tier 2 Rtl model and associated training across a large number of schools or, if the model has not been used as a whole in the past, of components of the model.</li> </ul>	0–25  Up to 10 additional points for serving 50 schools.

### E. Key Proposal Dates

Activity	Dates
Offerors' questions due	January 20, 2009
Responses to Offerors' questions provided	January 27, 2009
Letters of intent due	February 3, 2009
Proposals due	March 20, 2009
Initial screening completed	March 26, 2009
Panel of experts select finalists	April 16, 2009
Interviews with finalists completed	May 7, 2009
Final selection complete	May 26, 2009

## F. Business Proposal Instructions

The compensation for the Providers' services, activities, and materials will be funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, and provided through a subcontract with MDRC. Providers will receive a fixed-price payment of \$22,500 per school for implementing the *Essential RtI model* and \$45,000 per school for implementation of the *Enhanced RtI model*. The contract will be structured as fixed price with payments keyed to deliverables. The Offeror is encouraged to consider cost-effective means of delivering training and support in order to be more competitive. Cost-sharing is encouraged to allow Offerors to propose the most effective strategies.

The Offeror's business proposal should be consistent with the technical proposal with respect to the number of schools proposed to be treated. An Offeror's proposal to serve 50 schools across 10–15 districts in up to six states should assume the professional development will be provided to 600 school staff members who are on the RtI Leadership and Delivery teams.

The business proposal must include the following information:

- A statement of the total estimated costs that will be incurred by the Offeror for training, materials, and other support to schools to implement the Tier 2 Response to Intervention (RtI) model in 25 or 50 schools and including the tasks and deliverables described in the Scope of Work.
- A budget organized by task for each year of the project indicating the level of effort by each staff member, preferably expressed as number of personnel hours or percentage of full-time equivalent; cost of materials and products for training and delivery of the Tier 2 RtI model in the schools; other direct costs associated with the delivery of the Tier 2 RtI model and communicating with the EST and schools, as well as ongoing support for the schools (e.g., telephone, computer time, postage, charges for shipping materials to sites, trainers and cost of travel for trainers local travel, and facilities and food for training events). *The budget should not include honoraria for teachers and substitute teacher payments, but the Offeror's technical proposal should specify the extent, if any, to which successful implementation of the Tier 2 RtI model would require staff professional development and training beyond the 5 days per teacher assumed to be provided by the districts.*

Offerors are asked to organize their cost estimates according to the following major cost line items:

- **Direct Labor:** Provide project personnel salaries and wages only. For all personnel, provide title and amount of time, in hours, that each position will devote to the project.
- **Fringe Benefits:** Provide estimated fringe benefit costs according to the most recent audited financial statements of your Negotiated Indirect Costs Rate (NICRA). Leave this line blank if fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are included as part of the indirect costs.
- **Other Direct Costs (ODC):** Indicate all significant direct costs not covered above. Examples are materials, supplies, and products; reproduction; postage and shipping; communications; meetings and conferences, travel; and consultants. These costs

should be broken down in sufficient detail for analysis by event and unit. If consultants are proposed, include in separate lines all consultant fees. Provide names, rates, and level of effort for each proposed consultant.

- **Indirect Costs:** Apply all applicable indirect costs according to your recovery practice. Indicate whether you have an NICRA approved by the federal government. If you do not have an indirect rate agreement approved by a federal agency, provide audited balance sheets and profit and loss statements for the last 2 complete years, and current year-to-date statements.

**Questions.** Offerors may submit questions to [rti-evaluation@sri.com](mailto:rti-evaluation@sri.com) up to 6:00 p.m. PST on January 20, 2009. All questions and answers will be posted on [http://www.sri.com/rti\\_rfp.html](http://www.sri.com/rti_rfp.html) no later than January 27, 2009. A link to the questions and answers will also be available at [http://www.mdrc.org/project\\_28\\_93.html](http://www.mdrc.org/project_28_93.html).

**Letter of Intent.** Offerors are asked to submit a Letter of Intent no later than February 3, 2009 to indicate their interest, but this letter does not obligate the bidder to submit a proposal. Submitting a Letter of Intent will ensure that prospective bidders receive all related communications to assist them in the application process. Please submit Letters of Intent via e-mail to [rti-evaluation@sri.com](mailto:rti-evaluation@sri.com).

**Proposals.** Each Offeror is required to submit a written proposal in response to this RFP. Written proposals are due by 3:00 Pacific Time on March 20, 2009. Written proposals should be submitted via e-mail or hard copy to the following locations:

*E-mail:* Written proposals submitted via e-mail should be attached as a Word document to an e-mail message sent to [rti-evaluation@sri.com](mailto:rti-evaluation@sri.com) and received by 3:00 Pacific Time on March 20, 2009. It is suggested that Offerors request a receipt received via e-mail. In addition to the e-mail proposal, bidders shall submit 10 sample sets of materials, as described in Appendices B–D, to Camille Marder at the mailing address below.

*Hard Copy:* Written proposals submitted as hard copy must be received by 3:00 Pacific Time on March 20, 2009. 1. Bidders shall submit 10 copies of the proposal and 10 sample sets of materials, as described in Appendices B–D to:

Camille Marder, RFP Coordinator  
SRI International  
Center for Education and Human Services  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94040

Bidders are required to send materials by services that require a signature from the recipient.

**Contract award** is anticipated on May 26, 2009.

## **Appendix A. Cover Pages for Proposals**

# PROPOSAL COVER PAGES

Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention (Rtl) Strategies  
Proposal for Training and Support for Implementation of Rtl Model

**Submit to:**

Camille Marder, RFP Coordinator  
SRI International  
Center for Education and Human Services  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94040

**Due Date:**

March 20, 2009

## Part 1. OFFEROR'S INFORMATION

Name _____	Name and title of contact person _____
Address _____	Telephone _____
_____	Fax _____
_____	Email address _____

Names of other organizations, agencies, or individuals in consortium, if applicable:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Names and titles of persons who prepared the proposal:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Part 2. INFORMATION ABOUT PROPOSED MODEL AND PROPOSAL

1. Model proposed is for (*check one*):
  - Essential Rtl*
  - Enhanced Rtl*
2. Proposal is to serve (*check one*):
  - 25 schools
  - 50 schools
3. The proposed Tier 2 Rtl model includes (*check all that apply*):
  - Instruments for monitoring student performance in Tier 2
  - Software for tracking student performance in Tier 2
  - One or more reading interventions for students in Tier 2
  - Decision rules for moving students across tiers
  - Specification of size of groups in Tier 2
  - Specification of number of minutes per session and sessions per week in Tier 2

**Part 2. INFORMATION ABOUT PROPOSED MODEL AND PROPOSAL (Concluded)**

4. Empirical evidence of effectiveness of the proposed Tier 2 Rtl model (*check one*):
- The Tier 2 Rtl model proposed been used in the past as a whole (rather than components of the model separately) (*check all that apply*).
  - The Tier 2 Rtl model proposed been *not* used in the past as a whole, but the components have been used separately (*check all that apply*).
    - a. The proposal presents empirical evidence of effectiveness of:
      - the model as a whole       each component of the model.
    - b. The proposal presents evidence of widespread use of:
      - the model as a whole       each component of the model.
    - c. The proposal includes names and contact information for schools or districts that have used:
      - the model as a whole       each component of the model.
5. Proposal includes 10 sets of the following (*check all that apply*):
- Tier 2 intervention materials, or a sample of such materials
  - Materials pertinent to the system for measuring student performance
  - Sample materials for training Rtl Leadership Teams
  - Sample materials for training Rtl Delivery Teams
  - Sample instruments or monitoring fidelity of implementation
  - Empirical studies conducted on the proposed Tier 2 Rtl model or on components of the model

**I hereby certify that I am a representative of the above Offeror who is authorized to negotiate on behalf of the Offeror and to the best of my knowledge and belief that:**

- The information in this proposal is true and accurate.
- The governing body has duly authorized this document.
- The Offeror will be able to meet all of the requirements as specified in this RFP.

**Authorized representative:**

**Printed Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_