

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
Evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act**

Alabama Industrial Development Training (AIDT)

RFP Number: 2023-3

Issue Date: April 27, 2023

Deadline for Questions: June 1, 2023

Deadline for Answers: June 9, 2023

Due Date: June 30, 2023

1. Purpose

The Alabama Industrial Development Training (“AIDT”) solicits proposals from qualified professional firms (“Firm” or “Responder”) interested in **Evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act**. This Request for Proposals (“RFP”) is issued in accordance with the requirements of Section 41-16-72(4), Code of Alabama (1975). This RFP is not an offer to contract but seeks the submission of proposals from qualified, professional firms that may form the basis for negotiation of marketing and administrative support functions.

2. Background of the Evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act.

In April 2022, Governor Kay Ivey signed Act 2022-249, the Alabama Numeracy Act, into law. (The final, enrolled version of the act is available here: <https://legiscan.com/AL/text/SB171/id/2560016>.) The Numeracy Act, sponsored by Sen. Arthur Orr and Rep. Alan Baker, is a strategic statewide approach to improving mathematics achievement within Alabama. Amongst other things, the bill establishes an Elementary Mathematics Task Force, a Postsecondary Mathematics Task Force and an Office of Mathematics Improvement within the State Department of Education. The bill requires the hiring of mathematics coaches initially in the lowest-performing schools but scaling to all elementary schools, the involvement of regional coordinators from the Office of Mathematics Improvement to support reform efforts; intensive support provided to teachers and students in the lowest-performing schools, additional summer programs in mathematics for students in the lowest performing schools, the development of an instructional leadership framework, creating a School Turnaround Academy, interventions for low-performing schools that fail to make adequate progress, annual reporting requirements of progress from schools and the State Department of Education, and the hiring of an external consultant to conduct an annual external evaluation.

3. Minimum Qualifications

In order for an RFP to be considered, the Responder must include documented proof that the following minimum qualifications are met. In addition, the Responder has a continuing obligation to disclose information throughout the RFP process should any qualifications or situations change that might render the Responder an unqualified candidate.

- If selected, the Responder will comply with all state regulations to conduct business in the State of Alabama and will register with the Secretary of State, if applicable.
- The Responder and its personnel have all authorizations, permits, licenses, and certifications as may be required under federal, state, or local law to perform the services specified in this RFP at the time it submits a response to this RFP.

- The Firm has been in operation for at least five years.
- Must have at least 3 years of experience in training.
- The Firm is familiar with the operations of the Evaluation Required for Alabama Numeracy Act and is experienced in working with state workforce agencies.
- The Firm is committed to complying with established time-lines and working closely and cooperatively with the Executive Director of the Alabama STEM Council to implement and enhance the project.
- The Firm has a company policy and practice of equal employment opportunity and non-discrimination based on age, race, creed, and gender.
- If selected, the Firm will maintain commercially reasonable insurance policies to cover the Firm's negligent acts or omissions that may arise in its performance of the services discussed in this RFP.
- If selected, the Firm will be in compliance with Section 9(b) of Act 2011-535, *The Beason-Hammon Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act*.

4. Scope of Services

I. OVERVIEW

1. Statement of the Purpose of the Request for Proposals

The Alabama Industrial Development Training Institute (AIDT), a division of the Alabama Department of Commerce ("Department") solicits proposals from qualified professional responders ("respondent") interested in conducting the evaluation of implementation and impact of the Alabama Numeracy Act ("ANA") consistent with the guidelines provided within this Request for Proposals ("RFP"). Anticipated activities include collecting and analyzing data regarding the implementation of key activities required by the ANA, collecting and analyzing data regarding the extent to which school-level performance outcomes were achieved, designing and overseeing a quasi-experimental study to discern whether the availability of mathematics coaches improves student mathematics performance in low-performing schools, identifying qualitative and quantitative factors associated with differential school-level mathematics outcomes, collaborating with the Alabama Department of Education on data collection and data management, making recommendations for improvements, and providing annual reports. This RFP defines minimum service requirements, details proposal requirements, and outlines the State's process for evaluating proposals and selecting a contractor to provide the needed service.

The RFP is issued in accordance with requirements of Section 41-16-724(4), Code of Alabama (1975). The RFP is not an offer to contract subcontractors. AIDT seeks the submission of proposals from qualified professional responders that may form the basis for negotiation of an agreement to conduct the evaluation.

2. Goal of the Alabama Numeracy Act

The expressed goal of the Alabama Numeracy Act is to implement steps to improve mathematics proficiency of public school K-5 grade students and ensure that those students are proficient in mathematics at or above grade level by the end of fifth grade by monitoring the progression of each student from one grade to another.

3. Operationalization of the Goal of the Alabama Numeracy Act

Progress toward the goal of the Alabama Numeracy Act will be informed by achievement of the following performance expectations:

1. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate improvement over 2021-2022 baseline performance on ACAP mathematics performance in grades 2-5.
2. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate gains each year in the percentage of students scoring at grade level in mathematics on the state summative academic assessment in grades 2-5.
3. During each subsequent administration of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), standard scores and state ranking on NAEP mathematics tests will improve over baseline levels.
4. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate improvement in the percentage of students in grades K and 1 scoring at grade level on approved state formative mathematics assessments during spring assessments.
5. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate improvement in the number and percentage of students who started third grade with a math deficiency and completed 5th grade on grade level based on the state summative math assessment.
6. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate a decline over 2023/24 baseline in the number and percentage of incoming students in grades one and two identified as having a mathematics deficiency.
7. Full and limited support schools will demonstrate a decline over 2023/24 baseline in the number and percentage of incoming students in grades four and five identified as having a fractional reasoning deficiency.
8. The number and percentage of all students retained in grades K-5 based on mathematics deficiencies by grade level within LEA will decline each year.
9. Schools will report a decline in the number and percentage of students retained in grades K-5 based on mathematics deficiency.

4. Scope of the Alabama Numeracy Act

The Alabama Numeracy Act outlines activities to be completed by the following groups:

- A. The Alabama Department of Education
- B. Elementary Mathematics Task Force
- C. Postsecondary Mathematics Task Force
- D. Office of Mathematics Improvement
- E. Office of School Improvement
- F. Regional Coordinators of the Office of Mathematics Improvement
- G. All schools designated as full-support schools (lowest-performing schools) based on their percentile rank in mathematics during a given year of implementation of the ANA
- H. All schools designated as limited-support schools (low performing schools) based on their percentile rank in mathematics during a given year of implementation of the ANA
- I. All Alabama schools serving students in grades K-5
- J. Postsecondary programs preparing elementary mathematics teachers or mathematics coaches
- K. School Turnaround Academy

5. Goals of the Evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act:

In light of the scope of activities and targeted outcomes, the evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act is tasked with addressing the following general questions:

- A. *Were all processes and activities required by the Alabama Numeracy Act implemented by stakeholders? What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation? How were barriers overcome?*
- B. *To what extent did the implementation of the ANA improve mathematics proficiency of students in grades K-5? To what extent was the improvement consistent for all subgroups? What are the characteristics of full- and limited-support schools that make the greatest progress improving proficiency scores?*
- C. *To what extent do Full and Limited Support Schools that are assigned a Mathematics Coach yield better performance than such schools that do not have a coach? (Quasi-experimental study)*
- D. *To what extent is the Alabama Coaching Framework being implemented with fidelity in each full-support and limited-support school?*
- E. *To what extent do performance evaluations of mathematics coaches by principals and regional coordinators in full and limited support schools relate to differences in mathematics achievement?*
- F. *To what extent is the Alabama Framework for MTSS (Multi-tiered Systems of Support) being implemented in Grades K-5?*
- G. *To what extent do ratings of implementation of MTSS (reported in item F above) within schools relate to the distribution of students within tiered placements?*
- H. *What is the status and gains in mathematics knowledge and skills of K-5 teachers (e.g., as perceived by the mathematics coach and or principal) within full and limited support schools?*
- I. *To what extent do principals and regional coordinators ratings of coaches explain variance in principal and coach evaluations of teachers?*
- J. *To what extent do ratings of the mathematics knowledge and skills of K-5 teachers within full- and limited-support schools (e.g., as made by coaches or principals) account for differences in student performance on formative and summative assessments in mathematics?*
- K. *To what extent do required screening and diagnostic assessments identify students who are subsequently identified as needing tiered services and/or receive a diagnosis relating to mathematics (e.g., specific learning disability or dyscalculia)?*
- L. *What positive and negative outcomes emerged within schools, LEAs, ALSDE, and other stakeholder groups that were not anticipated as a result of the implementation of any component of the ANA?*
- M. *What were the impacts of the School Turnaround Academy?*
- N. *What were the impacts of the Instructional Leadership Framework?*
- O. *To what extent were the relationships between process and outcomes achieved as expected based on logic models? What external factors impacted the anticipated accomplishments and relationships?*
- P. *To what extent are stakeholders aware of, and satisfied with the implementation of the Alabama Numeracy Act?*
- Q. *What are the overall costs and actual or anticipated financial benefits of the Alabama Numeracy Act?*

To answer these questions, this RFP specifies evaluation tasks that are to be included in the proposal, completed, and reported annually and at the end of the contract.

II. AWARD INFORMATION

1. Scope of External Evaluation Services

The ANA requires the hiring of an external contractor to conduct an external evaluation of the ANA. The contractor will be responsible for accomplishing the goals of the evaluation clarified within this RFP. The contractor will work with designated representatives from the Alabama STEM Council and the Alabama Department of Education to develop, refine, and conduct the evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act.

A. The State of Alabama (STEM Council, Alabama Department of Education, Governor's office) participation will include:

1. Collaboration in the development of measures needed to assess coaching, teacher mathematics knowledge and pedagogy, fidelity of implementation of MTSS and Alabama Coaching framework
2. Sharing of quantitative student and school-level data required for process and outcome evaluation.
3. Facilitating cooperation between the external evaluator and the Alabama State Department of Education, LEAs, and schools.
4. Participating in planning and development of ANA evaluation activities
5. Collaborating with the evaluator to determine whether the current capacities and processes to share data between schools, LEAs and the Alabama State Department of Education are adequate to support program evaluation and program improvement

B. The Evaluator participation will include:

1. Designing and implementing the project's evaluation methodology,
2. Collaborating with stakeholders during Year One to develop, clarify and/or revise project outcomes, criteria for project outcomes, and implementation expectations to be measured
3. Designing and monitoring implementation of the randomized or quasi-experimental comparison component of the evaluation system,
4. Collaboration during Year One in the development of measures needed to assess coaching, teacher mathematics knowledge and pedagogy, fidelity of implementation of MTSS, implementation of the Alabama Teacher Growth Program, and the Alabama Coaching framework
5. Providing formative and summative evaluation reports on progress as required by the ANA,
6. Conducting surveys, interviews, or focus group meetings with key personnel as needed to address program evaluation questions relating to awareness and perceptions of the ANA, unintended consequences, and factors associated with differential levels of implementation and success of the ANA across schools
7. Collaborating with Alabama State Department of Education data management personnel to support and improve adequate data sharing capacity needed to support program evaluation (a significant amount of this effort will occur during Year One)
8. Providing periodic analysis of results relative to the logic models provided in this RFP,
9. Collaborating with representatives of the legislature, the Governor's Office, the STEM Council, and the Alabama Department of Education, and
10. Providing the State with all data and analyses required by the ANA and this RFP annually

III. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants include domestic public or private, non-profit or for-profit organizations. Institutions of higher education, faith- and community-based organizations, tribes, and tribal organizations are eligible to apply. Applicants may be a single entity or a consortium.

IV. Evaluation Design Methodology

The project evaluation model must combine rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental comparison design with traditional process and outcome evaluation and cost-effectiveness analysis. A comparison design will be required as part of the proposal to determine the differential effectiveness of mathematics coaches in terms of teacher and student performance outcomes. Process evaluation is used to determine the extent to which required elements of the ANA were conducted as expected within and across schools, LEAs, postsecondary programs, the Elementary Mathematics Taskforce, and the Alabama Office of Mathematics Improvement. The outcome evaluation is used to document the achievement of outcomes associated with schools, LEAs, math coaches, teachers, and students and to judge such achievement in comparison to established criteria.

1. Data Availability

Data that is currently available and part of the state assessment/accountability data base system will be shared with the evaluator, given appropriate clearances, includes:

- A. Student scale scores and performance categories on the annual state summative assessment (currently the ACAP) and its alternate for each student in grades 2-5 within all schools, available at student, teacher and/or class, school, and LEA level from spring 2021 forward
- B. Alabama Teacher Observation Tool and the Alabama Teacher Growth Program data
- C. Formative assessment data in math and reading in grades K-5 provided by multiple vendors to the schools and state (status and gains during academic year)
- D. Percentile ranking of schools used to assign the school to full and limited support status and to conduct the comparative system (using the formula provided by the Alabama State Department of Education).
- E. Full-support or limited-support status annually of each school as assigned by the Alabama Department of Education
- F. Student demographic, student attendance and school characteristic data regarding all schools
- G. When available, all required LEA reporting components from ANA 8(d)
 1. Number and percentage of K-5 students identified with a math deficiency by grade based on approved assessment
 2. Number and percentage of students screened for dyscalculia, number identified, number receiving dyscalculia-specific intervention, name of the specific intervention for each grade
 3. Number and percentage of all K-5 students performing at or above grade level on the ACAP (or other adopted summative assessment) by grade level
 4. Number and percentage of students starting 5th grade with a math score below grade level on the ACAP (or other adopted summative assessment),

5. Number and percentage of students starting 5th grade who started third grade with a math deficiency and completed 5th grade on grade level based on the ACAP (or other adopted summative assessment).
6. Number and percentage of eligible students in grades four and five who attended the Alabama Summer Mathematics Achievement Program in full support schools, reported by grade level
7. Number and percentage of all students retained in grades K-5 based on mathematics deficiencies by grade level
8. By school, the number of teachers who have earned the K-5 mathematics coach endorsement
9. By school, the number and percentage of incoming students in grades one and two identified as having a mathematics deficiency
10. By school, the number and percentage of incoming students in grades four and five identified as having a fractional reasoning deficiency

While process and outcome data will be gathered during each year of the project beginning in August 2023, some components of data collection will be delayed allowing for the development or adoption of systems needed to support the full evaluation of the ANA in a manner that can support school improvement. Systems for gathering, reporting, and aggregating data on the following components will be developed and trained on during 2023/24. As a result, evaluation tasks requiring such measures will not be required for the evaluation until the 2024/25 school year.

- A. measures for evaluating perceptions of quality of math and reading coaching behaviors
- B. measures for determining fidelity of coaching behaviors within the Alabama Coaching Framework
- C. measures associated with the Alabama Teacher Growth Program
- D. measures of mathematics knowledge and pedagogical performance of K-5 mathematics teachers
- E. systems for monitoring fidelity of implementation of MTSS with the state's approved framework
- F. systems for monitoring the status of student assignments in the multi-tiered systems of support (e.g., as evidenced by the percentage of students per school served exclusively in Tier 1, primarily in Tier 1 (more than 50% of the academic year), primarily in Tier 2, primarily in Tier 3, or primarily in Tier 2 or Tier 3)
- G. The sensitivity and specificity of screening measures used at the beginning of each grade

2. Evaluator collaboration in the development or adoption of measures and systems to support the evaluation of the ANA:

While much of the policy evaluation of the ANA can begin in August 2023, certain evaluation measures, data systems and training will need to be developed, piloted, and implemented before being integrated into the evaluation. During a period not to exceed the first year of the evaluation (June 2023-May 2024), in addition to other evaluation duties, the evaluator will provide guidance and assistance to AIDT and the Alabama Department of Education to determine and pilot additional data collection and data systems beyond what is currently systematically collected by the Alabama Department

of Education needed to evaluate the implementation and efficacy of the ANA. Areas of collaboration during this period may involve:

- A. Developing or adopting measures for evaluating coaching behavior of math and reading coaches
- B. Developing or adopting measures of mathematics knowledge and desired pedagogical performance of K-5 math teachers
- C. Developing or adopting systems for monitoring fidelity of implementation of coaching with the Alabama Coaching Framework
- D. Developing or adopting systems for monitoring fidelity of implementation of MTSS with the state's approved model
- E. Collaborating with the Alabama State Department of Education to determine data and protocols needed to monitor: (a) the fidelity of screening and diagnostic assessments, (b) assigned diagnoses, (c) the status of student assignments in the multi-tiered systems of support [e.g., as evidenced by the percentage of students per school served exclusively in Tier 1, primarily in Tier 1 (more than 50% of the academic year), primarily in Tier 2, primarily in Tier 3, primarily in Tier 2 or Tier 3].
- F. Determining the adequacy of current data sharing capacities and processes between schools, LEAs and the Alabama State Department of Education needed to support program evaluation and program improvement of the ANA and providing consultation to the ALSDE to facilitate necessary improvements.
- G. Developing measures required for monitoring implementation of all other required processes of the Alabama Literacy Act
- H. Determining annual improvement criteria for process and outcome metrics
- I. Identifying additional process and outcome metrics needed for evaluating the ANA
- J. Providing assistance regarding the training on measures used for the evaluation of the ANA
- K. Determining the role of the Alabama Teacher Observational Tool and the Alabama Teacher Growth Program in the evaluation
- L. Determining mechanisms for evaluating the implementation and impact of the School Turnaround Academy (e.g. on school report cards)
- M. Determining mechanisms for evaluating the implementation and impact of the Alabama Instructional Leadership Framework (e.g., on principal leadership and teacher performance).

3. Overall Process Evaluation:

The primary functions of the process evaluation are to determine: (a) whether all processes and activities required by the Alabama Numeracy Act are implemented to fidelity, (b) determine factors that facilitate or impede implementation, and (c) determine effective strategies to overcome barriers to implementation. Process evaluation expectations are delimited in Appendices A, B and C. The primary focus of the process evaluation will be on activities within, and support provided to, full and limited support schools. As there may be as many as 300 schools across these categories, the process evaluation may propose approaches to sample schools in order to estimate the quality of implementation of ANA processes across the state each year.

A. Process Evaluation Criteria:

It is the state's expectation that all required components of the ANA will be implemented consistent with the expectations and timelines provided within the Act. Currently, specific guidelines for implementation of some components of the Act (e.g., coaching duties, approaches for training coaches and principals on data collection requirements, guidelines for placement and monitoring of students in MTSS, processes for monitoring screening and diagnostic assessments) are not fully developed. Furthermore, the state anticipates that some schools may struggle with full implementation of all required activities of the Act early in its roll-out. Therefore, during Year One of the evaluation, evaluation personnel will collaborate with state-level stakeholders to determine: (a) whether all major activities of the ANA will be rigorously monitored, (b) guidelines for implementation of key activities that will allow the state to judge the fidelity of implementation, (c) development of data collection methods for monitoring the scope and fidelity of implementation of key processes, (d) the annual criterion expectations (e.g. implementation rates) for all major components, and (e) the role of the Alabama Teacher Observational Tool (ATOT) and the Alabama Teacher Growth Program within the evaluation. It is expected that process evaluation efforts will focus on full-support and limited-support schools. Possible components to be monitored are listed in the Process Evaluation Table. All quantitative data will be provided by the ALSDE. Any qualitative data (interviews, focus groups) required to inform the process evaluation will be gathered by the evaluator.

B. Process Evaluation Design Requirements:

- 1. The evaluation plan must provide assurances that the evaluation will monitor the extent to which required processes were delivered across the state each year and when relevant, the quality of delivery of such services (e.g., fidelity of implementation with guidelines).*
- 2. During Year One, process evaluation plans must focus on monitoring whether required processes (screenings and diagnostic assessments; coaches hired, trained, and supporting teachers; summer programs being offered, MTSS occurring) were implemented across the state consistent with the expectations of the ANA for the period of August 2023 through July 2024 in full-support and limited-support schools. During subsequent years, after necessary systems for measuring and reporting the quality of implementation of key processes and criteria have been developed, process evaluation plans must address the extent and quality of such services.*
- 3. The evaluation design must describe whether the evaluation will involve data collection from all full and limited support schools or whether there will be a sampling approach proposed for estimating the proportion of schools in compliance with process evaluation criteria.*
- 4. During Year One the state and the evaluators will develop annual criteria relating to improvements in the scope and quality of implementation of key processes. The evaluation design must describe the manner in which the applicant will measure progress toward the state-level criteria for process implementation each year (e.g., all full- and limited-support schools being monitored for all components or some type of representative or matrix sampling)*

5. In addition to evaluating the extent and quality of implementation, the evaluator will: (a) determine barriers and facilitators to implementation of required components, and (b) determine whether efforts to reduce barriers to implementation were effective. *The proposal must clarify methods and sampling approaches for gathering data regarding factors that were documented to, or perceived to, impede or facilitate implementation of required components of the ANA. Given appropriate clearance, the evaluator will have access to quantitative school data (demographics, school size, etc) that may be useful for identifying factors that may impact implementation. The evaluation plan should identify any qualitative research strategies that will be used to identify factors impacting the fidelity of implementation and effective strategies for overcoming barriers.*

4. Overall Outcome Evaluation:

The primary purposes of the outcome evaluation are to: (a) determine the extent to which implementation of the ANA achieved the goal of improving mathematics proficiency of students in grades K-5, (b) determine the extent to which the goals achieved consistent for different groupings of schools, and (c) identify the characteristics of full and limited support schools that make the greatest progress and those who make the least progress.

A. Outcome Evaluation Metrics:

The targeted outcomes of the ANA include, but may not be limited to, the following metrics:

1. improvement over 2022-2023 baseline performance on ACAP mathematics performance in grades 2-5
2. improvements in the percentage of students in full- and limited-support schools scoring at or above grade level in mathematics on the ACAP (or other summative assessment adopted by the ALSDE) in grades 2-5 by grade level and by cohort (e.g., third graders in spring of 2024 who are fourth graders in spring of 2025 and fifth graders in the spring of 2026)
3. standard scores and state ranking on NAEP mathematics tests
4. the percentage of students in grades K and 5 in all schools scoring at or above grade level on approved state formative mathematics and reading assessments during spring assessment
5. the number and percentage of students in all schools who started third grade with a math deficiency and completed 5th grade on grade level based on the ACAP (or other adopted summative state assessment)
6. within full- and limited-support schools: the number and percentage of incoming students in grades one and two identified as having a mathematics deficiency
7. within full- and limited-support schools: the number and percentage of incoming students in grades four and five identified as having a fractional reasoning deficiency
8. the number and percentage of all students retained in grades K-5 based on mathematics deficiencies by grade level within LEA

9. the number of schools reporting a decline from the previous year in the number and percentage of students retained in grades K-5 based on mathematics deficiency by grade level

During Year One of the evaluation contract the evaluators will work with state-level stakeholders to determine the annual criteria for each of the nine outcome metrics above and identify any additional outcome metrics and their associated criteria. The evaluator will implement these criteria beginning in Year Two of the evaluation.

B. Proposal Outcome Evaluation Requirements:

The evaluator will have access to data systems needed to provide external evaluation judgments regarding the expectations above. *The evaluation design must include plans for addressing each of the nine aforementioned outcomes on an annual basis, and as a summative judgment during the fifth year of the evaluation.*

The evaluation plan must also describe plans for determining the quantitative and qualitative characteristics that differentiate schools that are most and least successful in moving out of Full Support to Limited Support status and out of Limited Support status (Years 2-5). The evaluator will have access to:

1. Formative assessment data for three measurement periods per year from all approved vendors with school identifying codes
2. ACAP summative assessment data in mathematics for grades 2 through 5 for each year with school identifying code
3. Electronic data describing school characteristics and demographics associated with each school identifying code

The evaluator will be provided with all available quantitative data regarding targeted outcomes at school and LEA levels for full- and limited-support schools beginning in the 2023/24 school year (Year One of the implementation and evaluation) along with baseline data on the ACAP. The evaluator will provide annual reports regarding outcomes and achievement of criteria. It is expected that the report will be provided to the state before November 1 of each year. That is, the first report for the 2023/24 year (August 1, 2023- July 31, 2024) will be due before November 1, 2024.

5. Comparison Study Regarding Effectiveness of Math Coaches:

The primary purpose of the quasi-experimental study is to determine the extent to which Full and Limited Support Schools that are assigned a Mathematics Coach yield better mathematics performance than the same or similar schools without a coach.

A. Proposal Requirement:

The proposal must describe a plan to conduct a comparison study that approximates an experimental design (randomized control) to evaluate the value-added benefit of math coaches across three or more years using the state approved summative assessment (ACAP, or other adopted summative state assessment) and formative assessment measures as outcomes.

6. Evaluation of Mathematics Coaches and the Relationship of Such Evaluations to Student Mathematics Achievement in Full and Limited Support Schools:

The purpose of this component of the evaluation is to determine the extent to which evaluations of the performance of mathematics coaches in full and limited support schools account for differences in student mathematics achievement. Specifically, the goal is to determine the extent to which evaluations of coaching quality (such evaluations can be informed by teachers and self-evaluations by coaches) are associated with mathematics achievement in grades K-5 in full and limited support schools.

During Year One of the implementation and evaluation, the evaluator will work with stakeholders to assure that appropriate methods are available for evaluating the performance of math coaches. While it is currently assumed that principals and regional coordinators will participate in the evaluation of the performance of mathematics coaches, the evaluator will collaborate with state stakeholders to assure that the assessment mechanism is consistent with the established coaching framework adopted by the state.

A. Proposal Requirement:

The evaluator will propose a mechanism for determining the extent to which evaluations of coaching performance (e.g., degree to which the coach completed all requirements of the position, perceptions expressed by teachers) related to formative and/or summative student performance in mathematics in grades K-5.

7. Evaluating the Effects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) on Student Achievement in Mathematics:

One aspect of the Instructional Leadership Framework that is required within the ANA is the provision of Multi-tiered Systems of Support. The primary purposes of this component of the evaluation are to determine the extent to which fidelity in the implementation of MTSS at the school-level in grades K-5 is related to school-level student academic achievement in K-5 grade formative assessments and 2-5 state summative assessments (i.e., ACAP or other adopted state summative assessment) in full-support and limited-support schools, and (b) determine the relationship between the typical tiered placements of students and their state summative assessments (e.g., ACAP) math performance for students in grades 2-5 in full-support and limited-support schools. The evaluator will consult with state-level stakeholders during Year One in the development of mechanisms to monitor consistency of school-level implementation of MTSS with the established state framework.

A. Proposal Requirement:

- 1. Beginning in Year Two, the evaluator will use data collected by the ALSDE regarding fidelity of implementation of MTSS at the school-level to associate ratings of implementation with the percentage of students at each performance level on formative and summative mathematics assessments at each grade level in all full-support and limited support schools.*

2. *The evaluator will propose and implement a plan for determining if there is a relationship between the typical (e.g., modal) tiered placement of students in grades 2-5 and their ACAP(or other state adopted summative assessment) math performance, and will evaluate the extent to which such a relationship is mediated by fidelity of implementation of MTSS*

8. Evaluating Teacher Knowledge and Mathematics Pedagogy and the Relationship of Such Attributes to Student Mathematics Performance in Full and Limited Support Schools:

The primary purposes of this component of the evaluation are to: (a) document the status and improvements in the mathematics knowledge and skills of K-5 teachers (e.g. as perceived by mathematics coaches, or by standardized mathematics content knowledge assessments) within full and limited support schools, and (b) determine the extent to which such ratings of teacher mathematics knowledge and skills account for differences in student mathematics performance in grades K-5 on formative and summative assessments in full-support and limited-support schools. During Year One, the evaluator will consult with state personnel in the development of a system for documenting the status and/or improvement of mathematics knowledge and skills of K-5 teachers. During subsequent years, the evaluator will associate data collected and provided by the state regarding teacher knowledge and pedagogy within full- and limited-support schools that have math coaches with student performance data at classroom or school-levels.

A. Metrics:

The following four metrics will be evaluated beginning in Year Two (after development and training on measures of teacher knowledge and pedagogy). Specific criteria for annual improvements will be determined jointly by the evaluator and state-level stakeholders before the beginning of Year Two.

1. Percentage of all K-5 mathematics teachers in each full-support and limited-support schools rated as having grade appropriate skills and knowledge during spring evaluation
2. Percentage of full- and limited-support schools with all teachers rated as having grade-appropriate knowledge and skills during spring evaluations
3. Ratings of teacher mathematics knowledge and skills (pedagogy) will be positively related to student mathematics achievement at classroom/teacher levels for full-support and limited-support schools.
4. Average ratings (e.g., by coaches or principals) of teacher mathematics knowledge and skills; or other assessments of teacher mathematics knowledge or skills within full- and limited-support schools will be positively related with student performance in mathematics at each grade level K-5. The evaluator will examine the effect that the number of years of coaching received has on the correlation between teacher performance and student performance.

B. Proposal Requirement:

While specific measures and methods of monitoring teacher knowledge and skills will be finalized during Year One, as part of the proposal the evaluator will propose general analytical approaches to evaluate each of the four metrics above.

9. Effectiveness of Screening Assessments:

The purpose of this component is to determine the extent to which required screening assessments refer students who subsequently are identified as needing tiered or diagnostic-based mathematic supports. The evaluator will consult with the state during Year One of the evaluation to assure that mechanisms are available for associating initial screening results with subsequent placements during that academic year. The

A. Metric:

The evaluator will report on the results of screening measures administered at the beginning of each academic year within full- and limited-support schools in terms of various outcomes including referrals for additional testing, tiered placements, dyscalculia diagnoses, and under-identification (e.g., students not identified by screening but for whom tiered services or math-related diagnoses occurred later in the academic year). The goal of the evaluation is to describe levels of true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives (i.e., the sensitivity and specificity of the screening measures).

B. Proposal Requirement:

Schools will report the total number of students screened at each grade level, the total number of students screened as at-risk who subsequently received tiered intervention, and the total number of students who were not referred but who subsequently received tier 2 or tier 3 academic intervention in that grade. *The proposal must describe how the evaluator will evaluate achievement of the expectation (e.g., proportional random sampling of full-support and limited-support schools vs. all eligible schools) after Year One.*

10. Unintended Consequences of Implementation of the Alabama Numeracy Act:

The purpose of this component of the evaluation is to identify positive and negative outcomes that emerged within schools, LEAs, ALSDE, and other stakeholder groups because of implementation of the ANA that were not anticipated.

The proposal must summarize approaches that will be used to identify and document unintended consequences associated with the implementation of the policy.

11. Awareness and Satisfaction of Stakeholders Regarding Implementation of the Alabama Numeracy Act (Years 3, and 5):

The purposes of this component of the evaluation are to: (a) discern the extent to which parents and community leaders across Alabama are familiar with the implementation of the ANA, and (b) determine the levels of parent, teacher, administrator and school board member satisfaction with the implementation and effectiveness of the Alabama Numeracy Act .

The evaluation proposal will summarize approaches (methods, samples, and timing) for gathering information from stakeholders regarding awareness and perception of the implementation of the ANA.

12. Cost Effectiveness Analysis (Year 5): The purpose of this component of the evaluation is to discern the cost effectiveness or cost-benefit comparison of the Alabama Numeracy Act.

Consistent with the requirements of the ANA, the evaluator must propose a mechanism to evaluate the cost effectiveness of expenditures associated with implementation of the ANA.

V. Application Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria

A. Application Structure:

1. Each submission must adhere to the following structure:
 - 1.1 A Title Page (Exhibit A) should be provided. The Title Page is the preferred method of providing the Bidder's information. If the Bidder does not utilize the Title Page, the bid must provide a cover letter with, at a minimum, the signature of an individual authorized to obligate the company and a date.
 - 1.2 A statement affirming that the applicant and all individuals who will be assigned to this evaluation are free from obligations and interests that might conflict with the State of Alabama.
 - 1.3 A statement disclosing any information about the applicant firm which presently or in the future could impair the firm's ability to provide the level of services outlined in the RFP.
 - 1.4 A statement that indicates agreement to participate in weekly discussions with Alabama stakeholders regarding progress with, and recommendations based upon, the evaluation.
 - 1.5 A statement that indicates agreement with delivering annual evaluation reports all components of the evaluation.
 - 1.6 A technical proposal, limited to forty (40) pages addressing methodology, project management, organizational capabilities to conduct the evaluation, and processes for resolving challenges. Additional material may be presented as exhibits to the main proposal. Required components and evaluation criteria for the technical proposal are provided below.
 - 1.7 A budget proposal, including the budget detail through September 30, 2028, beginning with the period July 1, 2023 through September 30, 2023 and then for each fiscal year of October – September thereafter. A budget justification for each year.

B. Components of the Technical Proposal and Evaluation Criteria

The technical proposal will be comprised of two sections:

1. Methodology and Management
2. Organizational Capabilities and Experience

The section on methodology and management will be worth 60% of the total evaluation and the section on organizational capabilities and experience will be worth 40% of the total evaluation. The technical proposal is comprised of six components, four within the Methodology and Management section and two within the Organizational Capabilities

and Experience section. Evaluation criteria are assigned to each component within each section of the Technical Proposal.

1. Section One: Methodology, Work Plan, and Resolution of Challenges:

This section of the proposal will summarize evaluation methods, management plans, and plans for addressing potential challenges in addressing all evaluation requirements outlined in Section IV. 3 through IV.13.

a. Year One Measurement, Pilot, and Data Systems Support: (5 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the to which the applicant demonstrates understanding of the instrument development and data system processes for which collaboration between the applicant and the Alabama Department of Education is required during the first year.
2. In the Qualifications section the applicant must highlight experience in expertise in the development of qualitative and quantitative measures similar to the ones required for this evaluation.
3. The applicant should identify any potential challenges that may emerge regarding this component and propose mechanisms for addressing such challenges.
- 4.

b. Process Evaluation Methodology (15 points: Year One 5 points, Years 2-5 10 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent to which the document conveys understanding of process evaluation expectations, includes plans for achieving all process evaluation requirements for Year One and subsequent years in accordance with III.3 of this document.
2. The application should clarify any data that will be collected by the applicant rather than being provided by the Alabama Department of Education. Examples of such data may include observations, interviews, surveys, focus groups, examination of position descriptions or meeting minutes. The application must provide a workplan for gathering such data including timelines for the development and implementation of methods and the proposed sampling plans across each year of the project.
3. The application will be judged on the plans for managing the process evaluation to assure that data collection, analysis and reporting are completed consistent with timelines.
4. In the Qualifications section the applicant must highlight experiences with process evaluations similar in scale to this project
5. The applicant should identify any potential challenges that may emerge regarding completing the process evaluation and propose mechanism for addressing such challenges.

c. Outcome Evaluation Methodology (15 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant provides proposed methodology for judging the extent to which all annual outcome expectations were achieved during Year One through Year Five in

accordance with Section III.4 of this RFP. Separate work plans should be provided for Year One and for Years Two through Five.

2. The application should clarify any data that will be collected by the applicant rather than being provided by the Alabama Department of Education that will inform outcome evaluation. Examples of such data may include observations, interviews, focus groups, and surveys. The application must provide a workplan for gathering such data including timelines for the development and implementation of methods and the proposed sampling plans across each year of the project.
3. The applicant will also be judged on the plans for managing the outcome evaluation to assure that analysis and reporting are completed consistent with timelines.
4. In the Qualifications section, the applicant must highlight experiences with outcome evaluations similar in scale to this project.
5. The application should identify any potential challenges that may emerge regarding the outcome evaluation and propose mechanisms for addressing such challenges.

d. Comparative Study Methodology (10 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant provides a methodology that discerns the extent to which inclusion of mathematics coaches in full-support and limited-support schools in Alabama result in improved mathematics achievement for students in grades K-5 during the first five years of implementation of the Act. The methodology should describe: (a) the experimental or quasi-experimental longitudinal design being proposed, (b) the approach to sampling and assignment that would allow for matching of schools or appropriate controls for confounding factors, (c) the number of schools to be involved in the study each year, (d) variables that must be considered in the assignment, matching or covariate analyses associated with the design; and (e) citations of studies that have successfully applied similar designs.
2. In the Qualifications section, the applicant must highlight experience and expertise relating to such studies.
3. The application should identify any potential challenges that may emerge regarding the comparative study design and implementation and propose mechanisms for addressing such challenges.

e. Supplemental Studies (15 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant provides evidence of understanding of the purposes of the supplemental studies and discusses methods and work plans that are appropriate for all studies for IV.5 through IV.12 listed earlier in this proposal.
2. The application should clarify any data that will be collected by the applicant rather than being provided by the Alabama Department of Education. Examples of such data may include observations, interviews, focus groups,

and surveys. The application must provide a workplan for gathering such data including timelines for the development and implementation of methods and the proposed sampling plans across each year of the project.

3. The proposal should differentiate what aspects of the studies will begin in fall of 2023 (Year One) and which will begin in 2024 (Year Two) and subsequently.
4. The proposal should include timelines for all major activities associated with the various studies.
5. In the Qualifications section, the applicant must highlight experience and expertise relating to the various supplemental studies.
6. The proposal should identify any potential challenges that may emerge regarding the supplemental studies and propose mechanisms for addressing such challenges.

2. Section Two: Organizational Capabilities and Experience

a. Organizational Capabilities (20 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the quality of: (a) the applicant's organization in terms of management, resources, leadership, and accomplishments; (b) the management structure and plans for accomplishing the requirements of the project, and (c) properly manage budgets from external projects. Such information should clearly demonstrate the organization's ability to accomplish and manage the evaluation.
2. The application should describe the organization's current mission and structure, scope of current activities, organizational chart, and describe how these elements contribute to the organization's ability to conduct the proposed program evaluation and reporting requirements and meet program expectations.
3. The application should describe the organization's current resources, skills, and staff that will be used to meet the requirements of the project. The proposal should include a staffing plan with sufficient detail about the role and responsibilities of each staff position supported by this funding. Biographical sketches and resumes should be provided for key personnel that will be working on the evaluation.
4. If other organizations are to be involved in the evaluation, the proposal must include the rationale and specific roles, responsibilities, and program management for each of the proposed entities or partners. The proposal must include a clear letter of commitment from each organizational partner.
5. The application should detail how daily operations, communications, fiscal management, and reporting will be managed.
6. The proposal should describe the performance management systems and processes that will be used to effectively track performance.

b. Organizational Experience (20 points)

1. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent of successful prior experiences of the applicant with program evaluations of similar scope and management. Specific attention will be given to the qualifications and experience of the lead evaluator(s) assigned to the project.
2. The proposal should describe previous experience, skills, and knowledge of the organization and personnel assigned to the project on previous evaluation work of a similar nature.
3. If possible, the proposal should demonstrate knowledge and experience of working on state-level evaluations.
4. The proposal should provide links to summative reports of similar evaluations conducted by the organization.
5. The proposal should highlight the experience of the organization and staff assigned to this evaluation with the specific types of evaluation approaches required for this project including: (a) the design and implementation of cohort longitudinal studies, quasi-experimental studies, and state-level process (implementation) evaluations; (b) the development of measures of coaching, teacher knowledge/skills, multi-tiered systems of support; and (c) collaborating with states regarding data collection and management systems.
6. The applicant should identify at least two references for recent large-scale evaluation projects

C. Budget Proposal

The application must contain a 6-year fee proposal with annual budget and budget narratives to address and justify costs such as, but not limited to:

1. Salary/wages
2. Employee benefits
3. Travel
4. Materials/supplies
5. Communication
6. Consultants/contracts
7. Administrative and other costs directly related to the Alabama Numeracy Act. (May not exceed 8% of the direct costs).

Total annual budget costs must not exceed \$700,000.

TITLE PAGE

The undersigned declares that he/she has read the RFP and that the following BID is submitted as a good faith response.

The undersigned declares that he/she has the authority to obligate the company.

(Signature of Signee)

(Name of Signee)

(Title)

(Company Name)

(Street Address)

(City, State, Zip)

(Telephone Number)

(E-mail)

5. Proposal Required Information

Proposals should be as thorough and detailed as possible so that the Responder's capabilities to provide the required services can be properly evaluated.

To be considered, proposal responses to this RFP must include:

1. Brief transmittal letter;
2. Proposal; (Application structure Ref. Section V. Subsection A) PG. 15
3. Exhibit A: Minimum Qualifications (Reference Item #3 of this document);
4. Exhibit B: Vendor Disclosure Statement;
5. Exhibit C: Beason-Hammon Affidavit (must be submitted prior to award of contract);
and
6. Other required documentation, as requested by AIDT during the course of the solicitation process.

6. Submission of Proposals

Issuing Office:

AIDT
One Technology Court
Montgomery, AL 36116

Submission of Proposals: Format and layout should follow the proposal format as listed in Section V on Page 15 of this document.

Submission Deadline: It is the responsibility of the Responder to ensure that one printed copy of its proposal is delivered to and received by AIDT at the above address in a sealed envelope on or before **4:00 p.m. on June 16, 2023**. Responders should additionally provide two (2) electronic versions of their response on a USB jump or flash drive. The electronic data must be an exact duplicate of the written version. AIDT will not consider proposals received after the date and time specified herein. AIDT assumes no responsibility for late delivery by the U.S. Mail, the State's Central Mail Facility, a commercial courier service, or any other method of delivery selected by the Responder. RFPs will be opened beginning at 4:01 p.m. CST and prepared for distribution to the committee; however, no opinions, decisions or judgments will be rendered at that time regarding response content. Other than questions and answers (see next item), **vendors should not contact the AIDT Purchasing Agent for updates on the review process.**

Questions and Inquiries: The sole point of contact for purposes of this RFP is Chris Brown, AIDT Purchasing Agent. **Any questions or inquiries should be in writing and emailed to cbrown@aidt.edu.** All written questions should be submitted by **4:00 p.m. June 1, 2023**. Written responses to written questions and inquiries will be posted on AIDT's website by May 18, 2023. Any oral communications will be considered unofficial and nonbinding.

Rejection of All Proposals: AIDT reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and/or to solicit additional proposals if that is determined to be fiscally advantageous to AIDT or is otherwise determined to be in the best interests of AIDT.

7. Evaluation and Selection

AIDT will post the RFP on the Alabama Department of Finance Comptroller's website at <http://www.comptroller.alabama.gov>. And AIDT website AIDT.edu.com. Interested parties may monitor the progress and status of this RFP process on such database.

All proposals timely received will be reviewed and evaluated by AIDT in consultation with the Executive Director of the Alabama STEM Council. After the review and evaluation of the proposals, AIDT and the Executive Director of the Alabama STEM Council may conduct interviews. All interviews will be scheduled in Montgomery, AL. Finalists chosen for interviews, if any, will be notified. AIDT reserves the right to request a best and final offer for fees from finalists.

On the advice of the Executive Director of the Alabama STEM Council, AIDT will select the Firm it determines, to be fully qualified and best suited among those submitting proposals to best meet the needs specified in this RFP.

Upon identification of the selected Firm, if any, AIDT may initiate negotiations for contract terms and conditions.

8. Efforts to Influence Selection Process Prohibited

The integrity of the RFP process is of primary importance and will not be compromised. Any written or oral communications beyond the RFP response made by Responders, or others on their behalf, whether paid or unpaid, to influence the selection process, from the time the RFP is issued through its conclusion, made directly or indirectly to AIDT staff (other than the designated contact), will be grounds for immediate elimination from the selection process.

9. Agreement

All duties of the Firm will be set forth in an Agreement to be entered into between the selected Responder and AIDT and its partners. The agreement will be for a period of up to two years with a one-year extension option. The agreement will incorporate the requirements of the RFP and the proposal as negotiated.

AIDT reserves the right to terminate the agreement with thirty days' notice if the terms of the proposal and/or contract are violated.

Termination of the contract by Responder without cause can only occur with at least one hundred and twenty days' notice prior to the termination of the contract.

Responder shall within two months prior to the end of the contract term provide AIDT with copy of any and all materials, in any form including administrator access to websites and social media accounts, produced under the contract.

State law prohibits AIDT from agreeing to (1) indemnify the Responder, (2) waive the right for jury trial, (3) grant a security interest, or (4) agree to binding arbitration. Additionally, it is mandatory that Alabama laws apply to the performance of the contract and that jurisdiction and venue be in Montgomery, Alabama.

10. Public Information

All proposals received and subsequent communications, contracts, reports, and other records developed during the course of the relationship, except as may specifically be exempted, will be subject to the Alabama Open Records Act, Section 36-12-40, Code of Alabama (1975), and may be subject to public disclosure upon request. The Open Records Act is remedial and should therefore be liberally construed in favor of the public. The Alabama Trade Secrets Act is codified in Sections 8-27-1 through 8-27-6, Code of Alabama (1975). Responders are cautioned to be familiar with these statutes. The burden is on the one asserting the trade secret to show that the information sought to be protected meets the definition of a “trade secret” as defined in such act.

Any RFP proposal submitted that contains confidential, trade secrets or proprietary commercial information must be conspicuously marked on the outside as containing confidential information, and each page upon which confidential information appears must be conspicuously marked as such. Identification of the entire bid proposal as confidential is not acceptable unless the Firm enumerates the specific grounds or applicable laws that support treatment of the entire material as protected from disclosure according to the foregoing statutes or other applicable Alabama law.

The owner of the confidential information shall indemnify and hold the State of Alabama, AIDT and their respective staffs harmless from all costs or expenses, including but not limited to attorney fees and expenses related to litigation, concerning disclosure of said information and documents.

11. Tax Exemption

AIDT is exempt by law from payment of state or local sales taxes; do not include such taxes in the Cost Proposal.

Exhibit A

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

In order for your RFP to be considered, the Responder must include documented proof that the following minimum qualifications are met. In addition, the Responder has a continuing obligation to disclose information throughout the RFP process should any qualifications or situations change that might render the Responder an unqualified candidate.

1. If selected, the Responder will comply with all state regulations to conduct business in the State of Alabama and will register with the Secretary of State, if applicable.

Yes No

2. The Responder and its personnel have all authorizations, permits, licenses, and certifications as may be required under federal, state, or local law to perform the services specified in this RFP at the time it submits a response to this RFP.

Yes No

3. The Firm represented by the Responder has been in operation for over five years.

Yes No

4. The Firm is committed to being a neutral party for workforce and education-focused policy support.

Yes No

5. The project manager at the Firm responsible for providing the services described in this RFP has at least three years of experience in communications and administrative support.

Yes No

6. The Firm is committed to work closely and cooperatively with the Executive Director of the Alabama STEM Council to facilitate the implementation of any enhancements or modifications required by the **Evaluation of the Alabama Numeracy Act**.

Yes No

7. The Firm has a company policy and practice of equal employment opportunity and non-discrimination based on age, race, creed, and gender.

Yes No

8. If selected, the Firm will carry errors and omissions insurance or a comparable instrument to cover the Firm's negligent acts or omissions.

Yes No

9. If selected, the Firm will be in compliance with Section 9(b) of Act 2011-535, *The Beason-Hammon Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act*.

Yes No

Exhibit B

VENDOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

All proposals in response to this RFP must include a completed Vendor Disclosure Statement, as required by Section 41-16-80, *et seq.*, Code of Alabama (1975). Copies of the Vendor Disclosure Statement and related information may be downloaded from the Alabama Attorney General's website at <http://www.ago.state.al.us/Page-Vendor-Disclosure-Statement-Information-and-Instructions>.

Exhibit C

BEASON-HAMMON AFFIDAVIT

(To be completed as a condition for the award of any contract, grant, or incentive by the State of Alabama, any political subdivision thereof, or any state-funded entity to a business entity or employer that employs one or more employees.)

State of _____

County of _____

Before me, a notary public, personally appeared _____ (print name) who, being duly sworn, says as follows:

As a condition for the award of any contract, grant, or incentive by the State of Alabama, any political subdivision thereof, or any state-funded entity or employer that employs one or more employees, I hereby attest that in my capacity as _____ (state position) for _____ (state business entity/employer/contractor name) that said business entity/employer/contractor shall not knowingly employ, hire for employment, or continue to employ an unauthorized alien.

I further attest that said business entity/employer/contractor is enrolled in the E-Verify program. (ATTACH DOCUMENTATION ESTABLISHING THAT BUSINESS ENTITY/EMPLOYER/CONTRACTOR IS ENROLLED IN THE E-VERIFY PROGRAM).

Signature of Affiant

Sworn to and subscribed before me this ____ day of _____, 2020.

I certify that the affiant is known (or made known) to me to be the identical party he or she claims to be.

Signature and Seal of Notary Public