



Statewide System of Support (SSoS)
Program Evaluation Grant
Request for Proposals

ANNOUNCED: March 10, 2023

BY: The Michigan Department of Education

CONTACT: Connie McCall

Office of Educational Supports

mcallc@michigan.gov

PROPOSALS DUE: May 12, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. EDST

AT:

USPS:

Michigan Department of Education

Office of Educational Supports

c/o Connie McCall

4th Floor, John Hannah Building

P.O. Box 30008

Lansing, MI 48909

Overnight Express or UPS:

Michigan Department of Education

School Improvement Support

c/o Connie McCall

Pillar H-19

608 W. Allegan Street

Lansing, MI 48933

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is requesting proposals from qualified intermediate school districts (ISD)/regional educational service agencies (RESA) (or consortia thereof), universities, educational research or support organizations, other entities, or partnerships thereof with the capacity to provide the required deliverables and complying with all terms and conditions described in this Request for Proposals (RFP).

Mark all application documents **Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant**.

The following documents must be submitted:

- Original document, seven (7) additional hard copies, and one (1) electronic copy (may be on disc, thumb, or flash drive) of your proposal and accessory documents.

Proposals must be manually signed on the cover page. Please clearly mark the original copy as "ORIGINAL" on the cover.

Mail all documentation to the address listed below:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of Educational Supports
c/o Connie McCall
4th Floor, John Hannah Building
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

If delivering in person or shipping by overnight express or UPS, the following address must be used:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of Educational Supports
c/o Connie McCall
Pillar H-19
608 West Allegan Street
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Cover Page

The cover page of the proposal must include the following information:

- The applicant agency's name and contact information.
- The project director's name and contact information.
- The authorized negotiator's name and contact information. The "authorized negotiator" is the person authorized to negotiate the proposed Grant Agreement with the Michigan Department of Education.
- Joint application member information, if applicable. If the applicant is a consortium, the primary applicant is the applicant agency listed first on the proposal. If a consortium is the successful applicant, subgrant award funds will be paid to the primary applicant agency.
- Project Title and Summary.
- The applicant agency's authorizing official's signature, followed by the typed name and title, and date of signature of the person authorized to execute legally binding Grant Agreements with the State of Michigan.

A cover page template is provided on the next page.

HARD COPY PROPOSAL PREPARATION, FONT SIZE, AND PACKAGING

The proposal should be prepared simply and economically, double-spaced, with one-inch margins, and in a font no smaller than Verdana 11 point. Tables must be developed with a font no smaller than Verdana 11 point, but the text may be single-spaced. Proposal narratives must be **no longer than 75 pages in length, including all attachments and/or appendices**. All application pages must be securely stapled. Special bindings and binders, inserted separators, and heavy paper or cardstock cannot be used. Applications submitted but not in accordance with application preparation instructions **will be returned without review**.

Cover Page Template

Applicant Agency (Name and Address): _____

Project Director (Name, Title, Address, Phone) : _____

Authorized Negotiator (Name, Title, Address, Phone): _____

Joint Application Members (Name and Address): _____

Project Title and Summary: _____

Authorizing Official Signature

I acknowledge that there is no conflict of interest, as defined by Section 5.8, unless otherwise expressly disclosed by attachment to this page.

The undersigned, having become thoroughly familiar with and understanding all the proposed documents attached hereto, agrees to provide the services as specified herein for the total fees as stipulated herein, subject to negotiation.

I hereby state that all the information I have provided is true, accurate, and complete. I hereby state that I have the authority to submit this proposal, which will become a binding agreement if accepted by MDE. I hereby state that I have not communicated with nor accepted anything of value from an employee of MDE that would tend to destroy or hinder free competition. I hereby state that I have read, understand, and agree to be bound by all the terms of Section 5.0, Terms and Conditions of this document.

Application is hereby made for an MDE grant in the amount and for the purposes set forth in this proposal.

Signature of Authorized Official

Title

Date

Table of Contents

1.0 PROPOSAL OVERVIEW.....	7
1.1 Scope of Services Sought.....	7
1.2 Program Goal/Objectives.....	12
1.3 Grant Award.....	13
1.4 Definitions.....	14
1.5 Statutory Authorization.....	14
1.6 Eligible Applicants.....	14
2.0 APPLICANT INSTRUCTIONS.....	15
2.1 RFP Inquiries.....	15
2.2 How to Respond.....	15
2.3 Calendar of Events.....	16
3.0 RFP DELIVERABLES	16
3.1 Applicant Qualifications and Experience.....	16
3.2 Work Plan.....	17
3.3 Key Personnel.....	18
3.4 Reporting	19
3.5 Year 1 Budget.....	20
4.0 PROPOSAL EVALUATION	21
4.1 Proposal Checklist.....	21
4.2 Selection Criteria	21
4.3 MDE Rights in Evaluating Proposal.....	22
5.0 TERMS AND CONDITIONS	22
5.1 Alteration of Application	22
5.2 Rejection of Proposal.....	22
5.3 Incurring Costs.....	22
5.4 Confidentiality of Proposal.....	23
5.5 Applicant Conduct.....	23
5.6 Applicant Responsibilities	23
5.7 Applicant Staff.....	23
5.8 Conflict of Interest.....	23
5.9 Lobbying for Grants and Cooperative Agreements	23
5.10 Insurance.....	24

5.11 Indemnification.....	26
5.12 Tax Exempt.....	26
5.13 Audit Requirements	27
5.14 Audit of Pricing and Billing Procedures	27
5.15 Access to Records and Financial Statements.....	27
5.16 State and Federal Monitoring Visits.....	28
5.17 Cancellation.....	28
5.18 Joint Proposals.....	28
5.19 Designation of Subcontractors.....	29
5.20 Certification Regarding Nondiscrimination	29
5.21 Assurance Concerning Materials Developed and Assets Purchased	29
5.22 Section 511 of the U.S.E.D. Appropriation Act of 1990.....	30
5.23 Contract Award.....	30
5.24 Review Process.....	30
5.25 Compliance with Grant Program Requirement.....	31
5.26 Debarment and Suspension.....	31
5.27 Governing Law.....	31
5.28 Disclosure.....	32
5.29 Grant Payment Schedule.....	32
5.30 Americans with Disabilities Act	32
5.31 Equitable Access.....	33
5.32 Acceptance of Proposal Content.....	33
5.33 Compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA").....	33
5.34 Prohibition of Text Messaging and Emailing While Driving During Official Federal Grant Business	34
5.35 Assurance against Trafficking in Persons	34
5.36 Assurance to Maintain a Drug-Free Workplace.....	35
5.37 Assurance to Supplement not Supplant Federal Funds	35
5.38 Certification Regarding Universal Identifier Requirements	35
APPENDIX A: Selection Criteria Rubric.....	36

STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT PROGRAM EVALUATION GRANT

1.0 PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

1.1 Scope of Services Sought

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is requesting proposals from qualified intermediate school districts (ISD), regional educational service agencies (RESAs), Educational Services Agency (ESA) or consortia thereof, universities, educational research or support organizations, other entities, or partnerships thereof, with the capacity to provide the required deliverables, and complying with all terms and conditions described in the RFP. Mark all application documents **Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant**.

Proposal applications will articulate the design, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system. This process will create a system to measure the effectiveness of the Statewide Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) and Regional Assistance Grant (RAG) in supporting districts with schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Additional Targeted Support (ATS). The evaluation will consider circumstances that impact positively or negatively the fidelity of implementation and the degree to which the supports correlate with schools' ability to increase student achievement significantly. The goals of the Statewide System of Support are:

- Provide the support needed to implement Michigan Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP) plans so that schools and districts make improvements in student outcomes.
- Create the conditions in which schools and districts address systemic barriers that impede the ability to increase student outcomes.
- Increase system coherence among MDE, ISDs/RESAs, and organizations to increase student outcomes in schools identified for CSI, TSI, and ATS supports.

The Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP)

The Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process ([MICIP](#)) is a pathway for districts to improve student outcomes by assessing whole child needs to develop plans and coordinate funds.

MICIP consists of three elements: *Mindset, Process, and Platform*.

Mindset is thinking about continuous improvement as constant with the whole child, systems, and equity at the forefront.

Process is the Michigan Continuous Improvement Cycle which is comprehensive and iterative. Needs and Assets are assessed by analyzing whole child and systems data. Plans are developed to address challenges identified through root cause analysis and include evidence or research-based strategies as well as blending or braiding of funds. Implementation occurs with Monitoring and Evaluation to ensure implementation achieves the intended impact.

Platform is a streamlined web-based application with integrated tools and resources that facilitates dialog around continuous improvement and provides a place for districts to record their thinking, which will lead to continuous improvement plans.

MICIP provides the following benefits to local schools and districts:

- Consolidates the comprehensive needs assessment process.
- Facilitates the completion of the consolidated application for Federal Title funds.
- Prepopulates data into the platform to facilitate the process of assessing needs.
- Aligns across compliance requirements, resulting in a greater focus on improved student outcomes.
- Reduces time and duplication of effort in building plans with the integration of embedded tools and resources.
- Reduces reporting by engaging in multi-year cycles of continuous improvement.
- Focuses on the whole child, including on areas that influence (or impact) academic achievement.

Federal Accountability Designation and Supports

The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires states to identify a statewide category of schools to receive additional resources and more intensive support. Michigan's ESSA plan identifies schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Additional Targeted Support (ATS) using the [Michigan School Index System](#). The Michigan School Index System measures performance in seven areas: student growth, student proficiency, school quality, student success¹, graduation rates, English Language Learner (ELL) progress, general assessment participation, and English Language Learner participation. Each school receives an overall index value (0-100)

determined by the percentage of targets met in the seven areas. School designations are based on the following:

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI): Schools identified for CSI have overall index values in the bottom five percent statewide or are high schools with graduation rates at or below 67 percent, or were in a previous CSI or ATS cohort but did not meet exit criteria. Schools are identified for CSI every three years.

Once schools are identified for CSI supports, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will assign a staff member who serves as a primary point of contact (PPoC) to work with the school's district and facilitate the following:

- Completing the assessment needs and process and performing a root cause analysis.
- Development of a continuous improvement plan that addresses the root cause(s) and includes federal requirements associated with CSI identification.
- MDE approval of the continuous improvement plan.
- Implementation of the MICIP continuous improvement plan.
- Monitoring of the MICIP continuous improvement plan.

- ***CSI Continuous Improvement Plan Requirements***

The ESSA requires schools identified for CSI supports to develop and implement a plan in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents) that meets the following:

- The plan is informed by the components of the Michigan School Index.
- The plan is based on a school-level needs assessment.
- The plan includes evidence-based interventions.
- The plan identifies resource inequities.
- The plan is approved by the school, district, and MDE.
- Upon approval and implementation, it is monitored by MDE.

To minimize the reporting burden, school districts will integrate the ESSA CSI requirements into the continuous improvement plan created via the Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP).

- ***Supports provided to districts with schools identified for CSI include:***

- Supports and services at no cost from their local Intermediate School District (ISD) or Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) at no cost to the local district funded through the federal Title I Regional Assistance Grant (RAG).
- Supports and services at no cost through the Statewide Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) on implementation science, continuous improvement science, and systems.

Some districts with schools identified for CSI supports, including charter districts, will also be able to develop and implement a Partnership Agreement with the Michigan Department of Education, which will allow them to:

- Access to Partnership Agreement Liaisons (PALs), content experts, and diverse resources (including additional state funding).
- Combine state and community-level support systems to drive continuous improvement.
- Have an explicit and detailed understanding between all partners while continuing under the leadership of the local superintendent and the local board of education.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI): Schools identified for TSI have one or more subgroups performing in the bottom 25 percent within each applicable component. Schools are identified for TSI annually.

- ***TSI Continuous Improvement Plan Requirements***

The ESSA requires schools identified for TSI, in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents), to locally develop and implement an improvement plan for the school to improve student outcomes for each subgroup of students that was the subject of the TSI identification, that:

- Is informed by the components of the School Index.
- Includes evidence-based interventions.
- Is approved by the school's district.
- Upon approval and implementation, it is monitored by the school's district.

The district determines exit criteria for TSI status.

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATS): Schools identified for ATS have one or more student subgroups consistently underperforming across components (bottom 25% for each component applicable to that student subgroup in Michigan's School Index system) AND one or more student subgroups overall performing like a bottom 5% school (CSI). Schools are identified for ATS every six (6) years.

- ***ATS Continuous Improvement Plan Requirements***

The ESSA requires that schools identified for ATS shall, in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents), locally develop and implement an improvement plan for the school to improve student outcomes for each subgroup of students that was the subject of the ATS identification, that:

- Is informed by the components of the School Index.
- Includes evidence-based interventions.

- Identifies resource inequities.
- Is approved by the school's district.
- Upon approval and implementation, it is monitored by the school's district.

If schools identified for ATS do not meet state-established exit criteria after six (6) years, they become identified for CSI.

Grants Supporting Schools Identified for CSI, ATS, and TSI

Regional Assistance Grant (RAG): The RAG provides formula funding to Intermediate School Districts (ISDs)/Education Service Agencies (ESAs) to support districts with schools identified for CSI in creating, implementing, and monitoring a RAG District Service Plan. RAG service plans are developed in collaboration with the local district and focus on the root cause(s) identified in the MICIP plan. Allocated funding is based on the number of schools identified for CSI that each ISD/ESA supports.

Statewide Technical Assistance Grant (TAG): The TAG is a competitive grant awarded to a Local Educational Agency (LEA), which may include intermediate school districts (ISDs) or educational service agencies (ESAs), or a consortium thereof. The TAG Subgrantee provides statewide training and technical assistance to all ISDs/ESAs and local school districts supporting schools identified for CSI, TSI, or ATS in the areas of continuous improvement and implementation science within a systems context. Supports are provided at no cost to local ISDs/ESAs and districts. The Subgrantee awarded the TAG is responsible for providing all services associated with that grant.

The TAG Subgrantee provides eligible schools and districts with ongoing support and technical assistance to the superintendent, central office, building leadership, and other school/district staff to facilitate equitable continuous improvement and implementation in a system that pays explicit attention to the culture, history, values, and needs of the district, school, and community.

Equitable continuous improvement and implementation supports provided by the Subgrantee serve as a guide for asking questions, analyzing data, developing, monitoring, and evaluating programs and plans, and utilizing implementation strategies in ways that support culturally responsive implementation.

Michigan's Top Ten Strategic Education Plan

[Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan](#) was updated and approved by Michigan's State Board of Education in August 2020. Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan provides focused direction to Michigan's education community in support of all learners. It is designed to concentrate energy and resources, strengthen operations, and set success measures to ensure that all stakeholders are working together toward common education goals. Michigan's Top 10 Strategic

Education Plan has a mission, vision, guiding principles, focused goals, and metrics for each goal area to help monitor Michigan's educational progress. Collaboration among the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), education partners and stakeholders, business and industry, and communities is needed for the plan's successful implementation. The evaluation will measure, to the extent possible, the impact of RAG- and TAG-funded services on the following Top Ten Strategic Plan goals, utilizing the state-provided metrics for impact:

Goal 2: Improve early literacy achievement.

Goal 3: Improve the health, safety, and wellness of all learners.

Goal 4: Expand secondary learning opportunities for all students.

Goal 5: Increase the percentage of all students who graduate from high school.

1.2 Program Goal/Objectives

MDE is seeking a Subgrantee to measure and evaluate the implementation and impact of RAG- and TAG-funded supports. MDE seeks to better understand the following:

- The extent to which local districts and schools utilize RAG and TAG supports.
- The extent to which local schools and districts are satisfied with support providers.
- The extent to which local leadership and instructional staff implement what they have learned at the district and building levels.
- The extent to which RAG and TAG supports impact instructional practice and improves district engagement to bring about effective changes in schools identified for CSI, ATS, and TSI supports.
- The extent to which RAG and TAG supports are positively impacting student outcomes.
- The extent to which the RAG- and TAG-funded services are positively impacting student outcomes as evidenced by the metrics for Goals 2,3,4 and 5 of [Michigan's Top Ten Strategic Education Plan](#).

Key Evaluation Questions

In creating the evaluation, MDE seeks to be able to answer these key questions:

1. How do the academic outcomes of schools and districts receiving RAG and TAG supports compare to statewide trends and results of demographically similar schools and districts not receiving these supports?
2. What strategies are identified in RAG District Service Plans to improve local district performance?
3. Of the strategies identified in RAG District Service Plans, which are associated with improvement in students' academic outcomes and social/emotional health?

4. What evidence is available to indicate if RAG District Service Plans were implemented with fidelity? To what extent are strategies implemented as planned?
5. What is the type of technical support needed to generate improvement in local district performance? What is the appropriate dosage of technical support? Where is that support best utilized – district, building, or program - to generate improved district performance?
6. What support(s) received from the Regional Assistance Grant (RAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable?
7. What support(s) received from the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable?
8. To what extent has MICIP impacted the continuous improvement process?
9. To what extent have RAG and TAG funded supports affected the metrics for Goals 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Michigan's Top Ten Strategic Education Plan?

The evaluation must be able to present findings that directly address all the questions above using appropriate indicators of effectiveness and proper data analysis/synthesis.

1.3 Grant Award

This subgrant award will be 100% federally funded as a part of the Title I, Part A funds received from the US Department of Education to the Michigan Department of Education. A subgrant award by MDE will be based upon criteria, standards, and weighting identified in this RFP. Each applicant proposal will be considered as a whole solution, without limitation, including all services proposed, qualifications of the applicant and any subcontractor, and cost. The proposal will be awarded with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) mandated activities funds; the anticipated total amount of this grant is up to \$250,000 in the first year. The award is subject to change based on MDE need and funding availability. Funding will be effective following the approval of the Grant Award by the State Superintendent. The initial award for the implementation of the program and activities begins October 1, 2023, and ends September 30, 2024. Based on satisfactory performance and availability of funds from the US Department of Education and assessed needs of eligible schools and districts, MDE has the option to extend the grant award for three additional years (for a total of up to 48 months).

Funding carryover to a subsequent year is subject to approval and should be budgeted in accordance with subsequent year activities.

1.4 Definitions

State:	State of Michigan
SEA:	State Education Agency
ISD:	Intermediate School District
ESA:	Educational Services Agency
RESA:	Regional Educational Services Agency
MDE:	Michigan Department of Education
OES:	Office of Educational Supports
SSoS:	Statewide System of Support
CSPC:	Coordinated Supports Point of Contact
Applicant:	LEA, ISD/ESA/RESA, or consortium thereof, universities, educational research or support organizations, other entities, or partnerships, submitting a subgrant application
Grantee	MDE is the Grantee and recipient of the Title I grant award from the United States Department of Education.
RFP:	Request for Proposal
Subgrantee:	Successful applicant awarded the subgrant
LEA:	Local Educational Agency
EDST:	Eastern Daylight Savings Time
ESEA:	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
ESSA:	Every Student Succeeds Act
RAG:	Regional Assistance Grant
TAG:	Statewide Technical Assistance Grant
MICIP	Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process

1.5 Statutory Authorization

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part A, Section 1003, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), authorizes the State of Michigan to grant funds for the purpose of providing supports and services to schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Additional Targeted Support, and Targeted Support and Improvement.

1.6 Eligible Applicants

MDE is requesting proposals from qualified intermediate school districts (ISD), regional educational service agencies (RESAs), Educational Services Agency (ESA) or consortia thereof, universities, educational research or support organizations, other entities, or partnerships thereof, with the capacity to provide the required deliverables, and complying with all terms and conditions described in the RFP.

2.0 APPLICANT INSTRUCTIONS

2.1 RFP Inquiries

All inquiries concerning this RFP, including, but not limited to, requests for clarification and questions, **shall be emailed with the subject line reading “Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant,”** citing the RFP title, Page, Section, and Paragraph, and submitted to the following Point of Contact:

Connie McCall

mccallc@michigan.gov

Michigan Department of Education

Office of Educational Support

Continuous Improvement Unit

Subject: **“Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant”**

Applicants may submit questions via email only; however, MDE assumes no liability for ensuring accurate/complete email transmission/receipt and is not responsible for acknowledging receipt.

Inquiries must be received by MDE’s Point of Contact (see above) no later than the conclusion of the Applicant Inquiry period (see 2.3 Calendar of Events). Inquiries received later than the conclusion of the Applicant Inquiry Period shall not be considered properly submitted and will not be considered.

MDE intends to issue official responses to properly submitted inquiries on or before the date specified in the Calendar of Events; however, this date may be subject to change at MDE’s discretion. MDE may also consolidate and/or paraphrase questions for sufficiency and clarity. MDE may, at its discretion, amend this RFP on its own initiative or in response to issues raised by inquiries as it deems appropriate. Oral statements, representations, clarifications, or modifications concerning the RFP shall not be binding upon MDE. MDE will make publicly available all inquiries and responses upon request.

In the event that it becomes necessary for MDE to revise any Grant Deliverables in Section 3.0 or revision to any other portion of the RFP, an addendum will be posted on MDE’s web page at [Educational Supports \(michigan.gov\)](http://EducationalSupports.michigan.gov)

2.2 How to Respond

The cover page of this RFP document contains specific instructions as to where and to whom your response should be addressed, the number of copies needed, the due date, and the cut-off time, along with other important instructions.

To be considered, proposals must arrive at MDE, Office of Educational Supports (OES), as specified on the cover page of the RFP. Applicants mailing proposals should allow mail delivery time sufficient to ensure timely receipt of their proposals. Proposals which are received after the specified due date and time, regardless of the date of postmark receipt, cannot be considered and will be returned promptly to the bidder. Applicants are solely responsible for the timely arrival of proposals at MDE. Late proposals and proposals submitted electronically or by facsimile will be returned to the applicant **without review**.

2.3 Calendar of Events

The following table provides the Calendar of Events for this RFP:

EVENT	DATE	TIME
RFP announcement	March 10, 2023	
Applicant inquiry begins	March 10, 2023	8:00 a.m. (EDT)
Applicant inquiry period ends.	May 12, 2023	Noon (EDT)
Final date for application submission	May 12, 2023	5:00 p.m. (EDT)
Anticipated Award Announcement	June 2, 2023	

3.0 RFP DELIVERABLES

Implementation of the Statewide System of Support Program Evaluation Grant

The applicant must provide a detailed narrative describing how it proposes implementing the following deliverables. The narrative must include detailed examples of its relevant past work. Proposal applications must articulate the design, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a comprehensive, longitudinal program evaluation. The applicant's **narrative response** is to follow the numerical sequence of the RFP deliverables described in the RFP below.

3.1 Applicant Qualifications and Experience

*A total of **20 points** is possible for Section **3.1**.*

The applicant's response must provide clear and convincing evidence of meeting the following conditions:

- a) A minimum of five years of recent **demonstrated and sustained** success and experience in the development and implementation of customized system-wide evaluation of education programs in three or more states at the national, state, or regional level, including data collection, analysis, and reports required in the evaluation process. **(5 points)**
- b) The applicant has **demonstrated and sustained** success and experience in implementing **system-wide evaluations**, including the design, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a comprehensive, longitudinal program evaluation. **(5 points)**
- c) The applicant's experience includes working with and customizing evaluation services to address diverse programmatic and system capacity issues in Michigan or other states. **(5 points)**
 - i) Demonstrated successful experience working with SEAs to evaluate support in struggling districts and schools.
 - ii) Demonstrated knowledge of continuous improvement.
 - iii) Demonstrated knowledge of implementation science.
 - iv) Demonstrated knowledge in both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies.
- d) The applicant is able to demonstrate their capacity to **self-monitor and self-assess** their efforts, inputs, and outcomes and adjust as necessary. **(5 points)**

3.2 Work Plan

*A total of **30 points** is possible for Section **3.2**.*

Provide a clear description of the evaluation project responsibilities to be carried out in the first year of the evaluation, including all of the following:

- a) A comprehensive description of proposed project processes and methodology/research design, including how the applicant will design and implement an evaluation model that addresses the key evaluation questions detailed in **Section 1.2: (15 points)**
 - 1. How do the academic outcomes of schools and districts receiving RAG and TAG supports compare to statewide trends and results of demographically similar schools and districts not receiving these supports?
 - 2. What strategies are identified in RAG District Service Plans to improve local district performance?
 - 3. Of the strategies identified in RAG District Service Plans, which are associated with improvement in students' academic outcomes and social/emotional health?

4. What evidence is available to indicate if RAG District Service Plans were implemented with fidelity? To what extent are strategies implemented as planned?
 5. What is the type of technical support needed to generate improvement in local district performance? What is the appropriate dosage of technical support? Where is that support best utilized – district, building, or program - to generate improved district performance?
 6. What support(s) received from the Regional Assistance Grant (RAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable?
 7. What support(s) received from the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable?
 8. To what extent has MICIP impacted the continuous improvement process?
 9. To what extent have RAG and TAG funded supports affected the metrics for Goals 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Michigan's Top Ten Strategic Education Plan?
- b) A comprehensive description of the applicant's goals and objectives for project completion and the proposed timeline for completion. **(5 points)**
 - c) A comprehensive description of how the applicant will communicate with and report to MDE and participating organizations, including appropriate timelines. **(5 points)**
 - d) The applicant's plan for compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) applicable, including the management and safeguarding of any personally identifiable information. FERPA includes any amendments or other relevant provisions of federal law, as well as all requirements of 34 CFR Part 99.31 and 20 U.S.C. §1232(g). **(5 points)**

3.3 Key Personnel

*A total of **15 points** is possible for Section **3.3**.*

- a) Key Personnel: Project Leadership and Oversight **(5 points)**
The proposal must provide ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel who will provide oversight and direction and perform in a leadership role for this project. A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate.

b) Key Personnel Qualifications: Evaluation **(5 points)**

The proposal must provide ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel engaged in the data collection and analysis process and compiling the annual evaluation report.

c) Organizational Chart **(5 points)**

The applicant's response must include an organizational chart illustrating the roles and responsibilities of the individuals listed above.

In general, the proposal must provide ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel to carry out the responsibilities of the project and provides the percentage of time each person will commit to these duties. Key personnel will be experienced in the design, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system; state and/or federal grant/program administration and compliance; technical assistance; and monitoring of large evaluation projects.

3.4 Reporting

*A total of **10 points** is possible for Section **3.4**.*

The successful applicant is responsible for the submission of all required reports to MDE. These reports, at a minimum, shall consist of the following:

a) detailed **annual** evaluation report of: **(5 points)**

- i. Total program activities, findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding the impact of the adult implementation of SSoS services on student outcomes.
- ii. Activities and expenditures by participating organization/Subgrantee.

b) **monthly** updates on: **(5 points)**

- i. Total program activities and expenditures.
- ii. Progress toward completion of goals and objectives in the Work Plan/Statement of Work.

The Subgrantee must participate in and/or attend required team meetings and provide updates on grant and evaluation activities and deliverables to MDE and other SSoS partners, as directed by MDE.

The applicant's response must describe and/or provide examples of the format of the annual report and monthly updates.

3.5 Year 1 Budget

*A total of **10 points** is possible for Section **3.5**.*

Applicants must describe their organization's capacity to manage the budget for work described in this section. Applicants must also complete, to the best of their ability, the sections of the budget on the next page. This includes outlining any potential miscellaneous or other expenses, including staff (noting Full Time Employees), indirect and audit costs. Applicants may also want to take an opportunity to outline any possible in-kind contributions that can be made to the project.

The anticipated total amount of this grant is up to \$250,000 in the first year. The award is subject to change based on MDE need and funding availability. Funding will be effective following the approval of the Grant Award by the State Superintendent. The initial award for the implementation of the program and activities begins October 1, 2023, and ends September 30, 2024. Based on satisfactory performance and availability of funds from the US Department of Education and assessed needs of eligible schools and districts, MDE has the option to extend the grant award for three additional years, with a project final end date of September 30, 2027 (for a project total of up to 48 months). Please complete the sample budget below.

Budget Category	Budget Detail	Estimated Budget Amount
Project's Estimated Costs:		
Personnel & Benefits (Applicant should list grant personnel and FTE)		
Purchased Services		
Contracted Services		
Travel & Lodging		
Conferences/Meetings/Trainings		
Supplies, Materials		
Other Expenses		
Current Estimated Project Costs:		
Sub-Total:		
Below the line costs:		
Indirect Costs (up to 5%)		
Grand Total (not to exceed \$250,000)		
In-kind Contributions		

Applicants submitting a proposal for this project should complete the above draft budget demonstrating estimated costs for services outlined within the proposal. This includes providing estimated costs for all budget items listed above and any additional line items required. These costs are for services outlined in the proposal for which the potential subgrantee would be responsible.

4.0 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

4.1 Proposal Checklist

The proposal must include a detailed narrative for each of the grant deliverables in Section 3.0. The responses must follow the sequence of the RFP and rubric. Proposals that do not follow the sequence of the RFP and rubric will not be considered for funding.

4.2 Selection Criteria

All proposals will be reviewed using a structured review system. Award selections will be based on merit as determined by points awarded in accordance with the Review Panel Score Sheet using all relevant information provided in the proposal to reflect the level of clarity, detail, and capacity/capability to meet the needs of this project (superior, good, average, limited, poor) in the following areas:

RFP Deliverables	Possible Points
3.1 Applicant Qualifications and Experience	20
3.2 Work Plan	30
3.3 Key Personnel	15
3.4 Reporting	10
3.5 Year 1 Budget	10
Overall Proposal: The overall proposal will be evaluated for completeness, organization, detail, and the likelihood of the applicant's ability to meet the identified deliverables.	15
TOTAL	100

A total of **100 points** is possible; however, **a minimum of 80 points must be obtained for consideration of the proposal**. Refer to Appendix A for the complete Selection Criteria Rubric. The narrative should be written in the sequence of the rubric.

4.3 MDE Rights in Evaluating Proposal

MDE reserves the right to:

- Consider any source of information in evaluating proposals.
- Omit any planned evaluation step if, in MDE's view, the step is not needed.
- At its sole discretion, reject any and all proposals at any time.
- Open discussions with the second highest-scoring applicant if MDE is unable to reach an agreement on award terms with the highest-scoring applicant.
- Require oral presentations of the applicants' proposals to MDE. These presentations may provide an opportunity for bidders to clarify the proposal to ensure thorough mutual understanding. MDE will schedule these presentations if required.

5.0 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

5.1 Alteration of Application

The original submitted application document is on file with MDE. Any alteration to this application or any file associated with the application is prohibited. Any such changes may result in a proposal being rejected.

5.2 Rejection of Proposal

MDE reserves the right to reject any and all proposals in whole or in part or to negotiate separately with any sources whatsoever to serve the best interests of the State. Additionally, past performance on other grants will be considered when recommendations for the Grant Award are made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This RFP is made for information and planning purposes only. The State does not intend to award the Grant solely on the basis of any response made to this request or otherwise pay for the information solicited or obtained.

5.3 Incurring Costs

There is no express or implied obligation of MDE to reimburse any individual or firm for any costs incurred in preparing or submitting responses; for providing additional information when requested by MDE; or for participating in any applicant conference, technical assistance meeting, interview, or negotiation.

5.4 Confidentiality of Proposal

A proposal must remain confidential until the effective date of any resulting award as a result of this RFP. An applicant's disclosure or distribution of proposals other than to MDE will be grounds for disqualification.

5.5 Applicant Conduct

During the application window (the date from the release of the RFP to the final award), applicants are not permitted to contact any MDE employee regarding the RFP unless written permission is given by MDE subgrant contact identified within this document. No gratuities of any kind will be accepted, including meals, gifts, and trips, except as provided as a reference site visitation during finalist evaluations, if needed. Violation of these conditions will constitute immediate disqualification.

5.6 Applicant Responsibilities

The Subgrantee will be required to assume responsibility for all activities offered in this proposal whether or not they perform them. Further, MDE will consider the Subgrantee to be the sole point of contact with regard to matters, including payment of any and all charges resulting from the anticipated Grant Agreement.

5.7 Applicant Staff

MDE may conduct reference and background checks on the applicant, assigned workers, or subcontractors. MDE reserves the right to reject the Applicant, assigned workers, or subcontractor as a result of such reference and background checks.

5.8 Conflict of Interest

All applicants must disclose the name of any officer, director, or agent who is also employed by or represents MDE. All applicants must disclose the name of any employee or representative who owns, directly or indirectly, any interest in the applicant's business or any of its branches. Failure to disclose conflicts of interest may result in suspension of the grant award.

5.9 Lobbying for Grants and Cooperative Agreements

No federally appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the

extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement.

If any funds other than federally appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member Of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal grant, the applicant shall complete and submit form SF-LLL Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying, in accordance with its instructions.

Subgrantees shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-awards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all sub-recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. [34 CFR Part 82, Appendix A to Part 82 - Certification Regarding Lobbying; 31 U.S.C. 1352 - Limitation on use of appropriated funds to influence certain Federal contracting and financial transactions; 2 CFR 200.450 – Lobbying]

5.10 Insurance

The Subgrantee, as a condition of the Grant Agreement that may ensue from their proposal, shall purchase and maintain such insurance as will protect the Subgrantee from claims set forth below which may arise out of or result from the Subgrantee's operations under the Grant Agreement, whether such operations be by the Subgrantee or by any other Subgrantee or vendor, or by anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them, or by anyone for whose acts any of them may be liable.

The Subgrantee must provide proof of the minimum levels of insurance coverage as indicated below. The insurance must protect the State from claims which may arise out of or result from the Subgrantee's performance of services under the terms of the Contract, whether the services are performed by the subgrantee or by any other subgrantee or contracted vendor or by anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them, or by anyone for whose acts they may be liable.

The Subgrantee waives all rights against the State of Michigan, its departments, divisions, agencies, offices, commissions, officers, employees, and agents for recovery of damages to the extent these damages are covered by the insurance policies the Subgrantee is required to maintain under the contract.

All insurance coverages provided relative to the Contract/Purchase Order are PRIMARY and NON-CONTRIBUTING to any comparable liability insurance (including self-insurances) carried by the State.

The insurance must be written for not less than any minimum coverage specified in the RFP or required by law, whichever is greater.

The insurers selected by the Subgrantee must have an A.M. Best rating of A or better. All policies of insurance required in the RFP must be issued by companies that have been approved to do business in the State. See www.michigan.gov/deleg. Insurance companies must be acceptable to MDE.

Where specific limits are shown, they are the minimum acceptable limits. If the Subgrantee's policy contains higher limits, the State must be entitled to coverage to the extent of the higher limits.

The Subgrantee is required to pay for and provide the type and amount of insurance as indicated below:

A. Commercial General Liability with the following minimum coverage:

\$1,000,000 General Aggregate Limit other than Products/Completed Operations.

\$1,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate Limit.

\$1,000,000 Personal & Advertising Injury Limit.

\$1,000,000 Each Occurrence Limit.

The Subgrantee must list the State of Michigan, Michigan Department of Education, its employees, and agents as ADDITIONAL INSURED on the Commercial General Liability certificate. The Subgrantee also agrees to provide evidence that insurance policies contain a waiver of subrogation by the insurance company.

B. Workers' compensation coverage must be provided according to applicable laws governing the employee's and employer's work activities in the state of the subgrantee's domicile. If the applicable coverage is provided by a self-insurer, proof must be provided of approved self-insured authority by the jurisdiction of domicile. For employees working outside of the state of qualification, the subgrantee must provide appropriate certificates of insurance proving mandated coverage levels for the jurisdictions where the employees' activities occur.

The Subgrantee also agrees to provide evidence that insurance policies contain a waiver of subrogation by the insurance company. This provision must not be applicable where prohibited or limited by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the work is to be performed.

Documentation of insurance, in the form of Certificates of Insurance, will be required to be submitted prior to the award of the contract. The certificate of insurance or policies of insurance, evidencing all coverage, must include a

statement that MDE will be afforded a thirty (30) day written notice of cancellation, non-renewal, or material change by any of the Applicant's insurers providing the coverage required by MDE for the duration of the contract. Documentation is not required at the time of the RFP response. In your proposal, indicate whether or not you will be able to obtain the required coverage and meet the specified terms and conditions.

5.11 Indemnification

The Subgrantee, as a condition of the Grant Agreement that may ensue from the RFP, shall indemnify and hold harmless the State of Michigan, MDE, and its agents and employees from and against all claims, damages, losses, and expenses, including attorney fees arising out of or resulting from the performance of the work, which includes all labor, materials, and equipment required to produce the commodity, construction, and/or service required by the Grant Agreement, provided that any such claim, damage, loss, or expense (1) is attributable to bodily injury, sickness, disease, or death, or injury to or destruction of tangible property (other than the work itself), including the loss of use resulting therefrom, and (2) is caused in whole or in part by any negligent act or omission of the Subgrantee, and any other Subgrantee or contracted vendor, anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them, or any of whose acts any of them may be liable, regardless of whether or not it is caused in part by a party indemnified hereunder.

In any and all claims against the State of Michigan, MDE, or any of its agents or employees by any employee of the Subgrantee, any other Subgrantee or contracted vendor, anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them, or anyone for whose acts as any of them may be liable, the indemnification obligation under this indemnification agreement shall not be limited in any way by any limitation of the amount or type of damages, compensation or benefits payable by or for the subgrantee, or any other Subgrantee or contracted vendor, under Workers Disability Compensation Acts, disability benefit acts, or other employer benefit acts.

The obligations of the subgrantee under this indemnification agreement shall not extend to the liability of the State of Michigan, MDE, its agents, or employees arising out of (1) the preparation or approval of maps, drawings, opinions, reports, surveys, change orders, designs or specifications, or (2) the giving of or the failure to give directions or instructions by the State of Michigan, MDE, its agents or employees, provided such giving or failure to give is the primary cause of the injury or damage.

5.12 Tax Exempt

MDE is exempt from sales and use tax by state statute.

5.13 Audit Requirements

The applicant will maintain a separate accounting of expenditures for this Grant Award for each fiscal year it is awarded. Funds will only be requested as needed to meet immediate obligations and shall not be drawn for purposes other than those directly related to this subgrant. Generally, acceptable accounting procedures will be used. The Subgrantee's independent auditor will be made aware of the subgrant so that the auditor can review expenditures as required by federal single audit requirements. The auditor must review all contracts over \$25,000.

Expenses charged to this subgrant will not be charged to any other state or federal source and should follow federal guidelines, including the Code of Federal Regulations CFR 200—Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, And Audit Requirements For Federal Awards: <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=ea83ad58bc0fdf2865998076327c85b8&mc=true&node=pt2.1.200&rgn=div5>.

A fiscal agency that expends \$750,000 or more of federal funds during its fiscal year is required to have a Single Audit performed for that year. [2 CFR 200.501] The applicant assures that it will provide the Michigan Department of Education, officials of the federal agency, and auditors with access to records and financial statements as necessary for the Michigan Department of Education to meet the requirements of section 200.331, sections 200.300 Statutory and national policy requirements through 200.309 Period of performance, and Subpart F—Audit Requirements of this Part, of 2 CFR 200. [Section 200.331(a)(5)]

5.14 Audit of Pricing and Billing Procedures

MDE reserves the right to conduct periodic audits of pricing and billing procedures, as well as other terms, conditions, and procedures of the grant award between the subgrantee and MDE.

5.15 Access to Records and Financial Statements

The applicant hereby assures that it will provide the pass-through entity and auditors with access to the records and financial statements as necessary for the pass-through entity to comply with the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 200 Subpart F—Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, And Audit Requirements For Federal Awards: <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=ea83ad58bc0fdf2865998076327c85b8&mc=true&node=pt2.1.200&rgn=div5>.

5.16 State and Federal Monitoring Visits

All contract and subgrant awards are subject to onsite review. Applicant staff must maintain and make available, in the event of a State and/or Federal monitoring visit, evidence to support the complete implementation of the proposed contract.

5.17 Cancellation

Continuation funding for this grant project is subject to the availability of funds and the performance of the grant. MDE can cancel the grant with ten (10) days written notice for:

- Default of the Subgrantee.
- In the event MDE no longer needs the services or product specified in the contract, or in the event program changes, changes in laws, rules, or regulations, or MDE determines that statewide implementation of the Contract is not feasible.
- Reduction in or elimination of funding allocations to MDE under the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA/ESSA, or any sub-part of the ESEA/ESSA.
- Fiscal constraints that may occur as a result of compliance and improvement priorities.

In the event that a Subgrantee shall default in any of the covenants, agreements, commitments, or conditions and any such default shall continue unremedied for a period of ten (10) days after written notice to the Subgrantee, MDE may, at its option and in addition to other rights and remedies which it may have, terminate the agreement and all rights of the vendor under the agreement. Failure to maintain the required certificates of insurance, permits, licenses, and/or bonds will be cause for grant termination.

5.18 Joint Proposals

MDE requires a single application for all RFP items. In the event a group of applicants elect to submit a single response, all participating applicants must be identified in the response, and a "primary applicant" must be assigned who will be responsible for negotiating all RFP matters. If the applicant is a consortium, the primary applicant is the applicant agency. If a consortium is the successful applicant, subgrant award funds will be paid to the primary applicant agency.

MDE reserves the right to accept the primary applicant but reject any secondary applicants. The primary applicant will have the option of withdrawing their application without penalty or replacing the rejected subcontractor or consortium member.

5.19 Designation of Subcontractors

The applicant may employ subcontractors to deliver required services, subject to the terms and conditions of this RFP. The applicant shall remain wholly responsible for the performance of the entire subgrant regardless of whether a subcontractor is used. MDE will consider the applicant to be the sole point of contact with regard to all subgrant and contractual matters, including payment of any and all charges resulting from the award.

5.20 Certification Regarding Nondiscrimination

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all Federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, shall not discriminate against any person on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, height, weight, familial status, or marital status, exclude from participation in, deny the benefits of, or otherwise subject to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from a US Federal Agency or the Michigan Department of Education.

5.21 Assurance Concerning Materials Developed and Assets Purchased

All hard copy and electronic publications, including news releases, reports, films, brochures, CD-ROMs, videos, DVDs, or any project material developed with funding from this Grant, must be approved by MDE before dissemination. All products and materials must include the following statement:

This document was produced through an Every Student Succeeds Act initiative awarded by the Michigan Department of Education. This document is in the public domain and may be copied for further distribution when proper credit is given. For further information or inquiries about this project, contact the Michigan Department of Education at P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

Ownership of intellectual property resulting from this Grant shall remain with the MDE, which reserves the right to copyright or patent them or otherwise protect their integrity or availability for public use. This stipulation covers recipients as well as subcontractors, subgrantees, or vendors receiving funds through this Grant program.

Ownership of assets purchased through this Grant shall revert back to MDE at the cessation of the grant period.

5.22 Section 511 of the U.S.E.D. Appropriation Act of 1990

Subgrantee-initiated publication or news releases of any information pertaining to the Grant Agreement, work performed under the Grant Agreement, products of the work, and materials based upon the products shall occur only with written prior approval of MDE.

When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing this project or program, funded in whole or in part with federal money, all sub-recipients shall clearly state: (1) the percentage of the total costs of the program or project which will be financed with federal money; (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program; and (3) percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by non-governmental sources.

5.23 Contract Award

A subgrant award by MDE will be based upon criteria, standards, and weighting identified in this RFP. Each applicant proposal will be considered as a whole solution, without limitation, including all services proposed, qualifications of the applicant and any subcontractor, and cost. The proposal will be awarded with ESEA funds; the anticipated total amount of this grant is up to \$250,000 in the first year. The award is subject to change based on MDE need. Funding will be effective following the approval of the Grant Award by the State Superintendent. The initial award for the implementation of the program and activities begins October 1, 2023, and ends September 30, 2024. Based on satisfactory performance and availability of funds from the US Department of Education and assessed needs of eligible schools and districts, MDE has the option to extend the grant award for three additional years, with a final project end date of September 30, 2027 (for a total of up to 48 months).

5.24 Review Process

All proposals will be reviewed using a structured review system. Award selections will be based on merit as determined by points awarded in accordance with the Selection Criteria Rubric – Appendix A and all relevant information provided in the proposal. Based on this process, MDE will provide formal funding recommendations to the State Superintendent. The State Superintendent may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as the performance of the applicant on previously funded initiatives.

5.25 Compliance with Grant Program Requirement

The submission of a proposal, signed by an official authorized to bind the agency submitting the proposal contractually, shall constitute assurance that the proposing agency has accepted, unconditionally and without reservation, all conditions, requirements, and specifications of the RFP. In addition, such submission shall constitute assurance that the submitting agency understands that all or any part of their proposal may be included by reference in any Grant Agreement based on the RFP.

If awarded a grant, the Subgrantee agrees to comply with all applicable requirements of all State statutes, Federal laws, Executive Orders, regulations, policies, and award conditions governing this program. The Subgrantee understands and agrees that if it materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, the Michigan Department of Education may withhold funds otherwise due to the Subgrantee from this grant program, any other federal grant programs, or the State School Aid Act of 1979 as amended until the subgrantee complies with the conditions and the amount disallowed has been recaptured (forfeited), or the issue has been adjudicated. The Department may withhold up to 100% of any payment based on a monitoring finding, audit finding, or pending final report. [MDE Requirement]

5.26 Debarment and Suspension

The applicant assures that it is compliant with the provisions of §200.213 and that the applicant, its employees, and sub-contractors are not suspended or debarred, or otherwise excluded from or ineligible for receipt of federal funds. If the applicant is granted the award, it assures that any and all subgrant awards or sub-contracts include language requiring certification that a proposed contractor is not listed on the suspension disbarment or excluded parties' lists.

The applicant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither or any of its principals are presently excluded, disqualified, debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participating in this transaction by any federal department or agency.

5.27 Governing Law

The provisions of any award resulting from this RFP shall be constructed in accordance with the laws in the State of Michigan.

5.28 Disclosure

After MDE awards a Grant under an RFP, all information in a bidder's proposal is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, Public Act 442 of 1976. This Act also provides for the complete disclosure of Grant Agreements and attachments thereto.

The non-Federal entity or applicant for a federal award must disclose, in a timely manner, in writing to the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity all violations of Federal criminal law involving fraud, bribery, or gratuity violations potentially affecting the Federal award. Failure to make required disclosures can result in any of the remedies described in § 200.338 Remedies for noncompliance, including suspension or debarment.

5.29 Grant Payment Schedule

The payment schedule for any Grant Agreement entered as a result of the RFP will be negotiated and reflect the restrictions of the funding source. The schedule should show the payment amount and should reflect the actual work done by the payment dates.

5.30 Americans with Disabilities Act

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title II of the ADA covers programs, activities, and services provided by State and local government entities. Title II requires that "No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity." Title III of the ADA covers public accommodations and places of public accommodation (including commercial facilities). Title III requires that "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation." Title II requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with defined accessibility standards.

In accordance with ADA requirements, the applicant certifies that it is, and will remain, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

5.31 Equitable Access

All required activities, project development, and implementation activities must promote equitable access to support meaningful implementation of the project and to ensure continuity and adherence to stated MDE goals and objectives.

5.32 Acceptance of Proposal Content

The contents of the proposal of the successful bidder may become contractual obligations if a Grant Agreement ensues. Failure of the successful bidder to accept these obligations may result in cancellation of the Award.

5.33 Compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA")

The applicant agrees to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) applicable to them. FERPA includes any amendments or other relevant provisions of federal law, as well as all requirements of 34 CFR Part 99.31 and 20 U.S.C. §1232(g). Nothing may be construed to allow any party to this application and any subsequent subgrant to maintain, use, disclose, or share student information in a manner not allowed by federal law or regulation.

Compliance with FERPA includes the record-keeping requirements described in 34 CFR Part 99.32(b)(2) and the protection and destruction requirements described in 34 CFR Part 99.35(b). For the purposes of compliance with federal requirements, any personally identifiable information (PII) regarding a student re-disclosed by one party to any other party shall be destroyed by the receiving party when no longer needed. (PII is any sensitive or non-sensitive data that, alone or in combination with other information that, could potentially identify a specific individual. Examples include name, address, date, and place of birth.) Information received by a party that pertains to a student that was not the subject of that party's request shall be destroyed immediately. As pursuant of §99.67 of the FERPA regulations, if the US Department of Education issues a final agency decision that the subgrantee has re-disclosed PII from educational records in violation of FERPA or has failed to provide the notification required under §99.31(a)(9)(ii) pursuant to §99.33(b)(2) of the FERPA regulations, the State of Michigan will adhere to the FERPA guidance to not allow the subgrantee, as appropriate, or any of its team members access to PII from educational records for at least five years.

Applicants or Subgrantees needing data housed by MDE (e.g., assessment data) and by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) (e.g., demographics, program participation) are to fill out a Data Sharing Agreement (DSA). Contactors do not get direct access to the data; the necessary data is

supplied to them. Before a DSA is filled out, there must be a contract in place between MDE and the subgrantee. The legal relationship for the intended purpose is only for program evaluation or audit. Once those two requirements are met, a DSA is put into place between the subgrantee, MDE, and CEPI.

5.34 Prohibition of Text Messaging and Emailing While Driving During Official Federal Grant Business

The applicant assures that it and its grant personnel are prohibited from text messaging while driving during official grant business. Federal grant recipients, sub-recipients, and their grant personnel are prohibited from text messaging while driving a government-owned vehicle, or while driving their own privately owned vehicle during official grant business, or from using government-supplied electronic equipment to text message or email when driving. "Texting" or "Text Messaging" means reading from or entering data into any handheld or other electronic device, including for the purpose of SMS texting, e-mailing, instant messaging, obtaining navigational information, or engaging in any other form of electronic data retrieval or electronic data communication. Sub recipients must comply with these conditions under Executive Order 13513, "Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving," October 1, 2009.

5.35 Assurance against Trafficking in Persons

The applicant or Subgrantee assures that it adopts the requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations at 2 CFR 175 as a condition for this grant. A subgrantee and its employees may not:

- i. Engage in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect.
- ii. Procure a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect; or
- iii. Use forced labor in the performance of the award or sub-awards under the award.

Under this condition, the Federal awarding agency may unilaterally terminate the grant award, without penalty, if a subgrantee that is a private entity:

- i. Is determined to have violated a prohibition named above; or
- ii. Has an employee who is determined by the agency official authorized to terminate the award to have violated a prohibition named above through conduct that is either
 - a) Associated with performance under this award; or
 - b) Imputed to the subgrantee using the standards and due process for imputing the conduct of an individual to an organization that are provided in 2 CFR part 85, "Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension

(Nonprocurement).”

5.36 Assurance to Maintain a Drug-Free Workplace

The applicant or sub-recipient assures that it maintains a drug-free workplace as a condition of receiving any federally funded award.

5.37 Assurance to Supplement not Supplant Federal Funds

The applicant assures that it will use federal funds received to supplement funds that would, in the absence of an award, be made available for the program and uses specified in an approved application and in no case will supplant such funds.

5.38 Certification Regarding Universal Identifier Requirements

The applicant or Subgrantee certifies it has or will meet the requirement for supplying a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number. As a condition of a subgrantee of a federal grant award, you must supply a DUNS number to MDE. No entity may receive a federal sub-award without a DUNS number. MDE will not make a sub-award to an entity unless that entity has provided its DUNS number. [OMB 2 CFR Subtitle A, Chapter I, and Part 25, Financial Assistance Use of Universal Identifier and Central Contractor Registration, September 14, 2010: Appendix A to Part 25, B. Requirement for Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Numbers]

APPENDIX A: Selection Criteria Rubric

The responses must be written in the sequence of the rubric.

3.1 Applicant Qualifications and Experience	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
3.1.a: The applicant response reflects a minimum of five years of recent demonstrated and sustained success and experience in the development and implementation of customized system-wide evaluation of education programs, in three or more states, at the national, state, or regional level, including data collection, analysis, report, and secure data storage systems required in that evaluation process.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.1.b: The applicant response reflects demonstrated and sustained success and experience in implementing system-wide evaluations, including the design, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a comprehensive, longitudinal program evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.1.c: The applicant's response reflects experience working with and customizing evaluation services to address diverse programmatic and system capacity issues in Michigan or other states, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Demonstrated successful experience working with SEAs to evaluate support in struggling districts and schools ii. Demonstrated knowledge of continuous improvement iii. Demonstrated knowledge of implementation science iv. Demonstrated knowledge in both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies 	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.1.d: The applicant's response demonstrates its capacity to self-monitor and self-assess its efforts, inputs, and outcomes and adjust as necessary.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.1 Total (20 points possible)					

3.2 Work Plan	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
<p>3.2.a: The applicant's response reflects a comprehensive description of proposed project processes and methodology/research design, including how the applicant will design and implement an evaluation model that addresses the key evaluation questions in Section 1.2.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do the academic outcomes of schools and districts receiving RAG and TAG supports compare to statewide trends and results of demographically similar schools and districts not receiving these supports? 2. What strategies are identified in RAG District Service Plans to improve local district performance? 3. Of the strategies identified in RAG District Service Plans, which are associated with improvement in students' academic outcomes and social/emotional health? 4. What evidence is available to indicate if RAG District Service Plans were implemented with fidelity? To what extent are strategies implemented as planned? 5. What is the type of technical support needed to generate improvement in local district performance? What is the appropriate dosage of technical support? Where is that support best utilized – district, building, or program – to generate improved district performance? 6. What support(s) received from the Regional Assistance Grant (RAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable? 7. What support(s) received from the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) do local districts perceive to have the greatest value? What do they value the least? Why do districts perceive these supports as more or less valuable? 8. To what extent has MICIP impacted the continuous improvement process? 9. To what extent have RAG and TAG funded supports affected the metrics for Goals 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Michigan's Top Ten Strategic Education Plan? 	15	14-12	11-8	7-4	3-0

3.2 Work Plan	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
3.2.b: The applicant's response provides a comprehensive description of the goals and objectives for project completion and the proposed timeline for completion	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.2.c: The applicant's response provides a comprehensive description of how the applicant will communicate with and report to the MDE and participating organizations, including appropriate timelines	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.2.d: The applicant's response describes the plan for compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA") applicable, including the management and safeguarding of any personally identifiable information. "FERPA" includes any amendments or other relevant provisions of federal law.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.2 Total (30 points possible)					

3.3 Key Personnel	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
3.3.a: The applicant's response provides ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel who will provide oversight and direction and perform in a leadership role for this project.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.3.b: The applicant's response provides ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel engaged in the data collection and analysis process and compiling the annual evaluation report.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.3.c: The applicant response includes an organizational chart that illustrates the roles and responsibilities of the key personnel.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.3 Total (15 points possible)					

3.4 Reporting	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
3.4.a: The applicant's response describes and/or provides examples of the format of the annual evaluation report, including total program activities, findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding the impact the adult implementation of SSoS services on student outcomes	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.4.b: The applicant's response describes and/or provide examples of the format of the monthly updates on total program activities and expenditures, progress toward completion of goals, and objectives in the Work Plan/Statement of Work.	5	4	3	2	1-0
3.4 Total (10 points possible)					

3.5 Year 1 Budget	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
The applicant has provided a year-one budget that reflects the organization's capacity to manage the budget for work described in this section. The year one budget includes any potential miscellaneous or other expenses, including staff (noting Full Time Employees), indirect and audit costs.	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-0
Total this section: (10 points possible)					

Overall RFP	Superior	Good	Average	Limited	Poor
1. The overall proposal reflects a deep understanding of the project needs. The proposed evaluation model and key personnel are likely to meet those needs. 2. The applicant's proposal followed the organization of the RFP and clearly labeled each section of the response. 3. The applicant's proposal adhered to the 75-page limit, including any appendices.	15	14-12	11-8	7-4	3-0
Overall RFP (15 points possible)					

Final Score		
Possible		Total
20	3.1 Applicant Qualifications and Experience	
30	3.2 Work Plan	
15	3.3 Key Personnel	
10	3.4 Reporting	
10	3.5 Year 1 Budget	
15	Overall RFP	
100	TOTAL SCORE	

NOTE: A total of **100 points** is possible; **however, a minimum of 80 points must be obtained for consideration of proposal.**