

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Washington, D.C. 20202-5335**

**APPLICATION FOR GRANTS**  
**UNDER THE**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) Program**

**CFDA # 84.371C**

**PR/Award # S371C240010**

**Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT14193226**

OMB No. , Expiration Date:

Closing Date: Jun 24, 2024

PR/Award # S371C240010

## **\*\*Table of Contents\*\***

<b>Form</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Application for Federal Assistance SF-424</b>	e3
<b>2. Grants.gov Lobbying Form</b>	e6
<b>3. ED Abstract Narrative Form</b>	e7
<i>Attachment - 1 (1235-Abstract)</i>	e8
<b>4. Project Narrative Form</b>	e9
<i>Attachment - 1 (1236-Narrative_)</i>	e10
<i>Attachment - 2 (1237-Citations_)</i>	e60
<b>5. Other Narrative Form</b>	e68
<i>Attachment - 1 (1238-ED_Evidence_2_0-V2.0 - Promising Evidence)</i>	e69
<i>Attachment - 2 (1239-Letters of Support - all)</i>	e74
<i>Attachment - 3 (1240-Resumes (1))</i>	e82
<i>Attachment - 4 (1241-Indirect Cost Rate Agreement)</i>	e86
<b>6. Budget Narrative Form</b>	e89
<i>Attachment - 1 (1234-Budget Narrative 6.5.2024_ V2)</i>	e90
<b>7. Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information</b>	e111
<b>8. Form ED_524_Budget_1_4-V1.4.pdf</b>	e124
<b>9. Form ED_SF424_Supplement_4_0-V4.0.pdf</b>	e127
<b>10. Form ED_GEPA427_2_0-V2.0.pdf</b>	e129
<b>11. Form ED_Evidence_2_0-V2.0.pdf</b>	e132

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).

## Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

\* 1. Type of Submission:

- ☐ Preapplication  
☒ Application  
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

\* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New  
☐ Continuation  
☐ Revision

\* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

\* Other (Specify):

\* 3. Date Received:

06/21/2024

4. Applicant Identifier:

8074808430000

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

### State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

CA

### 8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

\* a. Legal Name:

California Department of Education

\* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):

680258051

\* c. UEI:

HWECY7CDW9Y7

### d. Address:

\* Street1:

1430 N Street

Street2:

\* City:

Sacramento

County/Parish:

CA

\* State:

CA: California

Province:

\* Country:

USA: UNITED STATES

\* Zip / Postal Code:

95814-5901

### e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name:

Instruction Measurement Admin

Division Name:

Professional Learning Support

### f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix:

\* First Name:

Angie

Middle Name:

\* Last Name:

Ford

Suffix:

Title: Education Administrator I

Organizational Affiliation:

California Department of Education

\* Telephone Number:

Fax Number:

\* Email:

PR/Award # S371C240010

Page e3

## Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

### \* 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

### Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

### Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

### \* Other (specify):

### \* 10. Name of Federal Agency:

Department of Education

### 11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.371

### CFDA Title:

Comprehensive Literacy Development

### \* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:

ED-GRANTS-042324-001

### \* Title:

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE): Well Rounded Education: Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) program, Assistance Listing Number 84.371C

### 13. Competition Identification Number:

84-371C2024-1

### Title:

Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) Program

### 14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

### \* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:

California's Literacy Initiative

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments



**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424****16. Congressional Districts Of:**\* a. Applicant \* b. Program/Project 

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**17. Proposed Project:**\* a. Start Date: \* b. End Date: **18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="38,000,000.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* c. State	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="38,000,000.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- ☒ a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on .
- ☐ b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- ☐ c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**☐ Yes ☒ No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 18, Section 1001)**

☒ \*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:

Middle Name:

\* Last Name:

Suffix:

\* Title: \* Telephone Number:  Fax Number: \* Email: \* Signature of Authorized Representative:  \* Date Signed:

## CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

### Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal 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 an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal 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 contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

### Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any 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 commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

#### \* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION

California Department of Education

#### \* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Prefix:  \* First Name: Cheryl Middle Name:   
\* Last Name: Cotton Suffix:   
\* Title: Deputy Superintendent

#### \* SIGNATURE:



#### \* DATE:

06/21/2024

## Abstract

An abstract is to be submitted in accordance with the following:

### 1. Abstract Requirements

- Abstracts must not exceed one page and should use language that will be understood by a range of audiences.
- Abstracts must include the project title, goals, and expected outcomes and contributions related to research, policy, and practice.
- Abstracts must include the population(s) to be served.
- Abstracts must include primary activities to be performed by the recipient.
- Abstracts must include subrecipient activities that are known or specified at the time of application submission.

For research applications, abstracts also include the following:

- Theoretical and conceptual background of the study (i.e., prior research that the investigation builds upon and that provides a compelling rationale for this study).
- Research issues, hypotheses and questions being addressed.
- Study design including a brief description of the sample including sample size, methods, principals, and dependent, independent, and control variables, as well as the approach to data analysis.

[Note: For a non-electronic submission, include the name and address of your organization and the name, phone number and e-mail address of the contact person for this project.]

---

## You may now Close the Form

You have attached 1 file to this page, no more files may be added. To add a different file, you must first delete the existing file.

\* Attachment:

## **Abstract**

The California Department of Education (CDE) is requesting \$38 million over a period of five years to fund California's Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) 2024 project.

The goal for this project is to strengthen coherence across California's educational system, grounded in a thorough understanding of comprehensive literacy and evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention so that educators have the resources necessary to support students and families in becoming successful readers and lifelong learners.

The project has three objectives: 1) Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with Institutions of Higher Education and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, intervention, and assessment; 2) Revise California's Comprehensive State Literacy Plan to include updated evidence-based practices and guidance documents, as well as promising practices and implementation guides from 2019 CLSD subgrantees; 3) Continue to build local capacity through subgrants to county offices of education to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options, ensuring equity in student access and addressing the needs of California's most vulnerable children, particularly related to the impacts of COVID-19 on students and educators. Outcomes include 1) enhanced and strengthened partnerships across California's educational system, 2) strengthened and enhanced pre-service courses aligned to new literacy standards and teaching performance expectations, 3) successful transitions for students in early education and elementary, 4) increased number of students demonstrating proficiency in grade-level literacy skills.

The CDE is requesting consideration for the competitive preference priorities 1 through 4.

## Project Narrative File(s)

---

\* Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename:

[Add Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

[Delete Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

[View Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

---

To add more Project Narrative File attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

[Add Optional Project Narrative File](#)

[Delete Optional Project Narrative File](#)

[View Optional Project Narrative File](#)

## **1) Need for Project**

California's (CA's) public schools serve 5,852,544 students (with 300,407 teachers and 27,631 administrators), and over 450,000 children in early education programs from birth to age five. To serve the largest and most diverse student population in the nation, CA has made significant infrastructure investments specifically targeted to support literacy and biliteracy outcomes. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic shutdown widened existing equity gaps, and the recovery has been uneven. However, as a 2019 recipient of the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) project, the CA Department of Education (CDE), in partnership with subgrantees, demonstrated promising practices and improved literacy outcomes for students in participating counties and districts. The 2024 CLSD Grant award will build upon our model and leverage the developments made over the past five years to bring these practices and improved outcomes to additional counties and districts within CA.

### **California's Context and Assets**

CA's approach to literacy instruction is grounded in a comprehensive understanding of the explicit, systematic, and evidence-based literacy instruction and decades of research applicable to our diverse and multilingual learners. Building on CA's adopted content standards for English language arts (ELA) and English language development (ELD) and the *ELA/ELD Framework for CA Public Schools*, CA's State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) launched the Transforming CA's Schools initiative: Reading by Third Grade, in 2021 aiming to ensure literacy and biliteracy for students through policies, initiatives, evidence-based practices, and resources for educators, parents, and community members. CA's goals are closely aligned with the U.S. Department of Education (ED)'s "Raise the Bar, Lead the World" initiative, in that they

support achieving academic recovery and excellence, improved learning conditions, and increased opportunities for our students to become multilingual.

CA prioritizes educational equity. The state has implemented evidence-based strategies and initiatives consistent with, and specifically designed to, achieve the objectives described in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). CA's education system is founded on the precept that most decisions should be made by local educational agencies (LEAs) and their communities. CA's education funding system, the Local Control Funding Formula<sup>1</sup> (LCFF), supports educational equity by allocating additional funding to LEAs serving high populations of English learners (ELs), socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students, and youth in foster care. Additional funding is provided to LEAs for allocation to school sites with instability rates greater than 25 percent and SED pupil rates greater than 70 percent. LEAs are required to develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which is a tool for LEAs to set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to improve student outcomes in consultation with the school's community, to support continuous improvement. These plans are refined in collaboration with CA's 58 county offices of education (COEs), ensuring that districts receive timely and informed technical assistance (TA). These COEs also ultimately approve LEA LCAPs, ensuring accountability and oversight of this important planning process.

The CA School Dashboard<sup>2</sup> (Dashboard) provides multiple measures demonstrating how LEAs are meeting the needs of students relative to the LCFF priorities, including student achievement, implementation of content standards, EL progress, student engagement, parental involvement, and school climate. LEAs use Dashboard and local data to annually review their progress and set goals, plan actions, and leverage resources to improve student outcomes. While Dashboard data over the past five years shows that CA is making strides (and notably so for CLSD-supported

LEAs), the state overall has much work to do to increase the numbers of students meeting grade-level standards in ELA/ELD.

To assist LEAs in addressing LCFF priorities, CA's Statewide System of Support (SSS) is comprised of the CDE, the CA Collaborative for Educational Excellence<sup>3</sup> (CCEE), and COEs, with the State Board of Education (SBE) playing a policy role. Seven COEs are identified as Geographic Lead Agencies within the SSS. They, and other COEs, have been selected to provide support in Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), equity, community engagement, EL supports, and special education (SpEd) programs.

In addition to the SSS, CA's educational system has organizational structures that can be leveraged and expanded to support literacy initiatives. For example, the Curricular and Improvement Support Committee (CISC) and the CA Subject Matter Projects<sup>4</sup> (CSMP) are critical to CA's professional learning (PL) infrastructure, as explained in the Management Plan. Recently, Senate Bill 488<sup>5</sup> required the CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to update the literacy accreditation standards and teaching performance expectations (TPEs) to include "evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, including tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, ELs, and pupils with exceptional needs." This requires teacher preparation programs (TPPs) to update their coursework to align with these new standards and expectations. These TPPs are located within 252 institutions of higher education (IHEs) and LEAs statewide, and graduate more than 10,000 teacher candidates per year. These TPPs have increased the number of people of color in their graduates, and graduates report feeling well-prepared when they exit their program, particularly in supporting ELs, students with disabilities (SWD), and in assessment practices. The TPPs have strong relationships with LEAs



to support clinical work rooted in research-based practices.<sup>6</sup> Our partnership with the CA State University (CSU) and the University of CA systems through the 2024 CLSD Grant will allow us to work with TPPs to further align our work with the new standards and TPEs.

The CDE administers early childhood education (ECE) programs in CA through the CA State Preschool Program (CSPP), a mixed-delivery means-tested program serving three to five year old children, including transitional kindergarten (TK), which will ensure universal access for all four-year-old children by 2025–26. The CDE also partners with CA's Head Start program,<sup>7</sup> the largest in the nation, serving almost 90,000 children through 1,917 centers statewide in 2022–23. In the 2021–22 state budget, CA launched a Universal Prekindergarten (UPK) initiative, aiming to provide UPK access to all four-year-old children in CA through expanded age eligibility access to TK and expanded access to three-year-old children through CSPP. As a result of this investment, TK enrollment has doubled over the last two years, from 75,465 in 2021–22 to 151,491 in 2023–24, and CSPP is serving over 100,000 children. This increased access for our earliest learners provides a significant opportunity to provide support for ED's "Raise the Bar: Lead the World" initiative and CA's Reading by Third Grade initiative.

Several state investments have increased support for literacy improvement statewide. Between 2021 and 2022, the CDE allocated \$473 million directly to LEAs to hire literacy coaches or reading specialists in the state's highest-need schools. An additional \$27 million was awarded through a competitive grant to a consortium of COEs to provide PL and certification support to LEAs and new literacy coaches and reading specialists. In 2022, the CDE awarded \$10 million to a lead COE for the Reading Instruction and Intervention Grant, supporting educators of students TK to grade twelve (TK–12) in literacy and executive functioning. The Educator Workforce Investment Grants for Effective Language Acquisition Programs, EL Roadmap

Policy Implementation, and SpEd-Related PL support our ELs and SWD populations. The Dual Language Immersion and Bilingual Teacher Professional Development grant programs are designed to increase student access to Dual Language Immersion programs and qualified bilingual teachers. The CA Dyslexia Initiative builds capacity in the SSS to provide early intervention services and supports for students with or at risk for dyslexia. Through Tools for Teachers, the CDE provides resources to support teachers in their use of formative assessment processes to improve student learning. The SBE and CDE are currently supporting an expert panel (Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel) to identify an approved list of instruments that LEAs will use to screen all CA students in K–2 for reading difficulties, including dyslexia, beginning in 2025–26. In addition, the CA Collaborative for Learning Acceleration (CCLA), funded by the CCEE’s 2022 Learning Acceleration Systems grant, launched a set of online courses that align to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Practice Guides, and will serve as a resource for PL and TA in LEAs across the state.

CA has also developed guidance documents to support literacy achievement. The 2014 ELA/ELD Framework describes evidence-based strategies for high-quality literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention for all classrooms. Five themes: meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills, integrate standards for ELA, literacy, and ELD, emphasizing that teachers in all content areas are expected to integrate literacy and ELD. All recently updated content-area frameworks highlight disciplinary literacy, and ELD. Other key guidance documents include the Comprehensive State Literacy Plan (SLP); the CA Preschool/TK Learning Foundations<sup>8</sup> (PTKLF) describes the learning and development of most children ages three to five and a half years in high-quality early education programs; the EL Roadmap<sup>9</sup> guides LEAs on welcoming, understanding, and

educating the diverse population of ELs in CA public schools; the CA Practitioner’s Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities guides LEAs in identifying, assessing, and differentiating instruction for ELs with disabilities; the Family Engagement Framework<sup>10</sup> outlines strategies for integrated family engagement; and the Dyslexia Guidelines<sup>11</sup> assists in identifying, assessing, and supporting students with dyslexia. All these documents, as well as additional resources, are housed in the Literacy Resources Repository (Repository) on the CA Educators Together website.<sup>12</sup> This Repository was created by the State Literacy Team (SLT) as part of the 2019 CLSD project and includes evidence-based resources supporting educators of students birth through grade twelve and the Local Literacy Planning Toolkit, a foundational resource for the 2019 CLSD project as Literacy Lead Agencies (LLAs) assisted their partner districts in developing and implementing their local literacy plans. The Repository links to each LLA’s project and their resources, and includes resources on assessments, asset-based pedagogy, best first instruction, family and community engagement, PL and coaching, supporting ELs, supporting SWD and students struggling to read, and disciplinary literacy. Finally, a Literacy Roadmap (LR), currently in development and set to be published in 2025–26, will serve as an umbrella guiding implementation of all literacy initiatives, including subgrantee projects. Developed by the CDE in consultation with the SBE, it will help educators apply the ELA/ELD Framework to classroom instruction, navigate resources and PL opportunities, and improve literacy outcomes for all pupils with a focus on equity. The LR will provide practical guidance for classroom teachers and leaders with literacy content blocks, sample daily and weekly schedules, literacy system implementation supports, parent and family resources, and more.

### **California’s Needs and Solutions**

CA will address four needs through this project:

**Need 1:** Continue to improve birth through grade twelve literacy development, including collaboration with IHEs and other partners, to strengthen TPPs and high-quality PL.

**Evidence of Need 1:** We will strengthen state and local PL infrastructure to support full implementation of adopted standards and frameworks and evidence-based strategies for literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention. In 2023, the SSPI named two Statewide Literacy Co-Directors, charged with coordinating and creating coherence in CA’s education system around literacy. They have promoted the SSPI’s Reading by Third Grade campaign and launched a nine-part webinar series to highlight CA's literacy policies and practices. The series explored how the ELA/ELD Framework is organized, what it offers, how it can be used, and more. In the past five years, 2019 CLSD subgrantees provided PL to administrators, coaches, teachers, paraprofessionals, and families in their seven respective LLA projects which focused on the evidenced based practices outlined in CA's SLP, the ELA/ELD Framework, and other CA guidance documents. Given CA’s size, with over 1,000 school districts, the CDE opted to fund small-scale projects that provided PL to partner LEAs as a “proof of concept.” In the 2024 CLSD Grant, the CDE seeks to significantly expand this successful model. Responses from a May 2024 statewide needs assessment (NA), representing over 70 percent of COEs, confirmed LEAs would benefit from additional support to implement literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention:

- Only 4.88 percent felt that few or no schools (0–20 percent) successfully implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for ELA/Literacy, indicating success in CA's rollout of the standards.
- Only 19.51 percent felt that few or no schools successfully implement literacy elements across content areas, an improvement of 4 percent since 2019.

- 26.83 percent felt that few or no schools successfully implement the ELD standards, up 5 percent from 2019, indicating continued need in this area.
- 34.15 percent felt that few or no schools successfully implement the ELA/ELD Framework, as compared with 12.7 percent in 2019, indicating a need to continue to center the framework in PL.
- 53.66 percent answered “some” or “very few” when asked if teachers have PL in the CCSS for ELA/Literacy and the ELD standards, virtually unchanged since 2019.
- 46.34 percent believe that “many” additional state-level supports are needed, up from 38.10 percent in 2019, indicating the expansion and enhancement of supports is needed.
- 60.98 percent believe that state-level activities supporting local efforts (such as an updated SLP, communities of practice [CoPs], etc.) would be very helpful, down from 79.37 percent in 2019, indicating that support of local efforts has improved significantly.
- 60.98 percent are interested in implementing projects like those of the 2019 CLSD in their areas, indicating the success of 2019 CLSD projects and their perceived promise by other COEs.

One respondent stated that “State level activities can provide guidance to LEAs that have limited resources and personnel,” and another stated, “State-level activities that support local efforts to improve student literacy would greatly continue to benefit our region,” demonstrating that the model for the 2019 CLSD Grant aligned with local needs and should be expanded in the 2024 CLSD Grant. Another stated the upcoming LR “is on the right track. Guidance on implementation of the recommendations is necessary for improving student outcomes and increasing teacher efficacy.”

CA's education system relies on more than 328,000 teachers and administrators. Each LEA provides PL designed to address local needs using available resources, and access to high-quality PL for teachers and administrators is variable across the state. This illustrates the importance of partnering with TPPs and IHEs to develop PL on evidence-based literacy practices needed to meet the needs of LEAs. The variability in PL delivery, exacerbated by CA's ongoing teacher shortage, contributes to the following challenges in providing equitable, high-quality, literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention:

- 1) **Disproportionate Access to Effective Teachers and Teacher Shortage:** According to the most recent CA state report on Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes by Full-Time Equivalency<sup>13</sup> 16 percent of teachers were misassigned in the 2021–22 school year. Misassignments vary greatly by county and district, with some having misassignment rates as high as 35 percent. In 2020–21, the CTC<sup>14</sup> reported CA had 30,958 misassigned educators and 5,142 vacancies. In addition, in fiscal year 2022–23 the number of new teaching credentials decreased for the second year in a row, following a seven-year increase, exacerbating the teacher shortage.
- 2) **Highly Variable Teacher Preparation:** The CTC ensures that pre-service teacher candidates are prepared to provide reading instruction and literacy development. In 2021, SB 488 was enacted, making critical changes to the teacher preparation standards related to literacy for prospective educators. All preliminary TPPs must align their literacy coursework and clinical practices with the standards and TPEs by July 2024. A new literacy performance assessment will replace the current Reading Instruction Competence Assessment, on July 1. These programs are generally strong; however, there are a total of 252 CTC-approved educator preparation institutions,<sup>15</sup> 23 at CSUs, nine at UCs, 52 at

private or independent colleges and universities, and 167 at LEAs, which can lead to inconsistent learning outcomes for teacher candidates.

- 3) **Highly Variable PL for Educators:** According to the Learning Policy Institute’s paper “Effective Teacher Professional Development”, “most teachers receive PL of short duration (less than eight hours on a topic, usually in after school workshops).” Inadequate resources or countervailing school and district mandates also pose challenges. Rural LEAs and under-resourced communities struggle to retain teachers and provide resources, impacting the capacity to address PL needs. <sup>16</sup>

**Need 1 Proposed Solution:** The 2024 CLSD project will address these challenges by building on the successes of the 2019 CLSD project, which promoted a coherent statewide vision, resources, guidance for high-quality PL, and improved literacy outcomes for participating LEAs. The CLSD Grant ensures all participating teachers have appropriate training on evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention. In the 2024 CLSD Grant, the CDE will expand and enhance this work through partnerships with IHEs. In addition, the LR will serve as an evidence-based implementation guide for COEs and LEAs.

**Need 2:** Address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic by strengthening state and local PL infrastructure to support full implementation of adopted standards, frameworks, and evidence-based instructional approaches.

**Evidence of Need 2:** The pandemic forced CA schools to close, necessitating the rapid development of distance and virtual learning. Variance in access to stable internet and technology exacerbated existing gaps in access and opportunity for students. Despite the assets and investments described above, 2023 Smarter Balanced summative assessment data for ELA/Literacy indicated that CA Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)

scores have decreased across the board (grades three through eight and eleven), with persistent and significant gaps between both EL students and SWD and the overall student population:

Spring 2019 CAASPP ELA/Literacy	Spring 2023 CAASPP ELA/Literacy
Overall: 51% Met or Exceeded Standard	Overall: 46.66% Met or Exceeded Standard
EL: 12.81% Met or Exceeded Standard	EL: 10.87 Met or Exceeded Standard
SWD: 16.35% Met or Exceeded Standard	SWD: 15.75% Met or Exceeded Standard
SED: 39.19% Met or Exceeded Standard	SED: 35.27% Met or Exceeded Standard

**Need 2 Proposed Solution:** In the 2024 CLSD Grant, CDE aims to expand state and local PL through subgrants targeting COEs that have not yet received literacy support, including larger consortia covering diverse geographic areas and population densities, and building on the success (detailed below) of the 2019 CLSD Grant participating LEAs:

Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Measures	2019 CLSD LLA Student Literacy Outcome Increases 2021–23
GPRA Measure 1	59% increase in oral language scores on the Desired Results Developmental Profile.
GPRA Measure 2	Over 10% growth in fifth grade ELA scores on the CAASPP at several participating schools.
GPRA Measure 3	2.25% increase in ELA scores on the CAASPP across all participating schools, with some schools posting 7%, 14% and 26% growth.



GPRA Measure 4	1.32% increase in ELA scores on the CAASPP across all participating schools, with some schools posting 10% and 20% growth in scores.
----------------	--

Subgrantees will promote effective, evidence-based instruction with a MTSS framework that addresses the continuum of support (universal, supplemental, intensified), by providing intensive PL to partner LEAs implementing the ELA/ELD Framework, including integrated and designated ELD, as well as services for SWD. This PL will be informed by guidance from the soon-to-be published LR, including literacy content blocks. Subgrantees will also provide support to partner LEAs for using the approved screening instruments for risk of reading difficulties, including dyslexia, as well as for the meaningful use of formative, interim, and summative assessments, supported by CDE-generated resources. We will use the experience and expertise of the 2019 CLSD subgrantees as mentors for new grantees to accelerate literacy learning through evidence-based PL. For example, in one Los Angeles County district, three schools in the 2019 CLSD Grant saw significant literacy gains, with one school increasing the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard from 9 percent to 23 percent after two years of PL. Similar gains in other 2019 CLSD schools highlight the effectiveness of systematic PL, literacy coaching, and educator CoPs, which will be expanded and enhanced in the 2024 CLSD Grant.

**Need 3:** Promote educational equity and resource adequacy for underserved students by enhancing system coherence, building on the alignment and integration of literacy assets and the SSS through systematic communication and collaboration.

**Evidence of Need 3:** In the past five years, CA has made historic investments in literacy instruction. However, given the size and scope of CA's student body, these funds have reached

only one tenth of the students, teachers, schools, and districts that need support to make gains in literacy achievement.

**Need 3 Proposed Solution:** CA has extensive networks and resources to improve student outcomes and is building toward a more coordinated system of communication and collaboration specific to literacy. With more robust state literacy leadership, including the Co-Directors of Statewide Literacy, CA is poised to support more organizations and professionals in growing their literacy expertise so students can access highly effective instruction, regardless of their geographical location or socioeconomic status. We are eager for the publication of the LR, which will provide implementation and improvement supports; we will use the LR to guide 2024 CLSD subgrantees and their partner LEAs in systems improvement. We are also eager to partner with IHEs and TPPs to improve student outcomes through aligned PL for educators.

**Need 4:** Support students and families at key transitional stages through high-quality PL by requiring subgrantees to include “transition teams” as part of the supports they provide.

**Evidence of Need 4:** Students who enter TK/kindergarten with the language skills and developmental milestones necessary to fully engage in classroom instruction have better academic outcomes throughout their educational careers. Though CA is investing tremendous resources into PL and infrastructure to meet the early education needs, there are large percentages of our youngest learners that are underrepresented in those programs.

**Need Proposed Solution:** In birth to age five, early education leaders in the awarded LLAs will partner with LEAs to ensure effective transitions for students moving from preschool settings into elementary settings, focusing on oral language development and other kindergarten readiness skills, including PL for parents and families. In kindergarten to grade five, elementary education leaders in the awarded LLA will partner with secondary education leaders to ensure

effective transitions for students moving from elementary to middle and high school, with a focus on learning acceleration for secondary students who are reading one or more years below grade level. In the 2024 CLSD Grant, the CDE will explicitly promote these transition practices for consistent support and instruction for students' educational paths. The LR will also have literacy content blocks for kindergarten to grade twelve (K–12), which will provide guidance and supports for school leaders to ensure effective transitions. Additionally, CA has a new PreK through Grade Three ECE Specialist Instruction credential,<sup>17</sup> which will help meet the need for ECE teachers. Our partnerships with IHEs can help promote and support this new credential, with some 2024 CLSD subgrantees potentially offering financial support for candidates to earn this credential.

## **2) Project Design**

The CDE's goal for the 2024 CLSD project is to strengthen coherence across CA's educational system, grounded in a thorough understanding of comprehensive literacy<sup>18</sup> and evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention so that educators have the resources necessary to support students and families in becoming successful readers and lifelong learners.

**Objective 1:** Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to enact evidence-based literacy instruction, intervention, and assessment.

### **Relationships and Alignment**

The 2024 CLSD project will continue to fund dedicated CDE staff, including the Education Programs Consultant (EPC) who has led the 2019 CLSD project. Throughout the implementation of the 2019 CLSD Grant, CDE staff developed relationships with internal and external partners and the seven LLAs. These relationships allowed for systemic changes in literacy PL and

instruction to positively impact the students, teachers and staff, and families in our small-scale pilot projects. Survey results collected by our evaluators at WestEd indicate that participants appreciated the opportunities for collaboration and found it inspiring to learn from other subgrantees, enabling them to bridge and scale the work across the projects. We will use the 2024 CLSD Grant to expand on and enhance these relationships by bringing in additional partners and COEs as well as new partnerships with IHEs to connect the entire system together. Additionally, since the beginning of the 2019 CLSD Grant, the CDE has held and will continue to hold monthly internal Literacy Roundtables to establish relationships among literacy staff across the CDE, including the following divisions: Early Education, Multilingual Support, Special Education, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources, Assessment Development and Administration, and the Statewide Literacy Office. This structure helped to break down silos by establishing ongoing communication and providing a consistent outlet for sharing resources and support. CDE staff find the Literacy Roundtables helpful to their work, stating that there is “great collaboration” and there are “opportunities for discussion and high-quality presentations.”

Moreover, this 2024 CLSD Grant introduces a project component. As described in our Needs section, CA is at a critical point in our work in supporting teacher TPPs as they implement new requirements for evidence-based instructional practices. The CTC, the Center for Advancement of Reading and Writing (CAR/W), and the UC/CSU Collaborative for Neurodiversity and Learning will partner with the CDE to support the alignment of CA’s TPPs with CTC standards and TPEs and all state-adopted frameworks and guidance. The CDE, the CTC, CAR/W, and the UC/CSU Collaborative will jointly create and refine tools, resources and learning opportunities that will be mutually beneficial for teacher preparation faculty and PK to twelve (PK–12)

educators across the state and bolster the alignment of TPPs with new literacy standards and TPEs. The CDE does not oversee the CA's credentialing system; the CTC accredits IHE preparation programs. This grant aims to build a mutually beneficial relationship between all four entities so that the capital and expertise at each of these institutions can support the common goal of PK–12 literacy success in the state. This grant will give the CDE an opportunity to create the same level of relationship and communication that it established with other parts of the system for the 2019 CLSD Grant.

Our other partner agencies, First 5 CA, CSMP, WestEd, and California County Superintendents Association (CSA), have signed on to continue the work. We will include CTC, CAR/W, and the UC/CSU Collaborative at monthly meetings, to ensure alignment and resource sharing. We will also continue to represent the CDE and the CLSD at regular CCEE meetings within the SSS. The CDE will address challenges through a data-informed Policy-Practice Communication Loop. This involves quarterly meetings with organizational and regional leads, monthly meetings with CDE staff, and monthly SSS meetings.

### **Outcomes for Objective 1**

Outcomes include sustainable partnerships with defined roles among COEs, LEAs, IHEs, external partners, and the CDE. Established structures will ensure ongoing collaborations with state and regional literacy leads in the SSS and IHEs. Success will be measured through ongoing formative evaluations and documentation of collaborative and PL systems.

**Objective 1:** Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

Activities	Measurement/Evaluation	Outcomes
Continue to fund dedicated staff to lead a coordinated, statewide effort to build local capacity.	Duty statements outlining the staffing of three EPC staff, with expertise in literacy and PL.	Dedicated staff assigned to lead the project over five years.  Fostering alignment, directing resources, and monitoring progress.
Continue to facilitate CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs.	Agendas, participant lists, and feedback surveys from monthly roundtable meetings and quarterly team meetings.	Collaboration on literacy projects and shared understanding across divisions in the CDE to support literacy achievement for all students.  Collaboratively develop a process map as an educational visual for literacy initiatives and partnerships across CDE.
Establish coordination and partnership with IHEs on TPEs and courses to support faculty learning related to	Agendas and participant lists showing establishment of partnership with clearly defined roles and responsibilities, structures to	Sustained formalized partnerships that continue through the life of the project and beyond.

the alignment of the literacy standards in TPPs.	ensure ongoing collaboration, and inclusion of organizations with the capacity to influence teacher preparation standards and courses. Pre- and post-surveys on knowledge/use of CDE's guidance, including the LR and universal screeners.	Collaboratively developed resources that align with CA's literacy initiatives, guidance, standards, and Frameworks to support effective teacher preparation in literacy.  Collaboratively developed Request for Applications (RFA) for subgrantees to encourage partnering with IHEs.
Continuation of statewide partnerships, including the SLT, with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	Agendas, participant lists, and feedback surveys showing sustainable partnerships with clearly defined roles and responsibilities, structures to ensure ongoing collaborations, and inclusion of organizations with the capacity and expertise to	Sustained formalized partnerships between external partners for the life of the project and beyond.  Collaboration and shared understanding to support literacy achievement.



	provide evidence-based, statewide PL support.	
--	--	--

**Objective 2:** Revise CA’s Comprehensive SLP to include the LR and updated evidence-based practices and guidance documents, as well as promising practices and implementation guides from 2019 CLSD subgrantees.

CA will reconvene the SLT that developed the SLP for a revision that includes the LR and other updated state guidance; the resources, entities, and networks developed in the 2019 CLSD Grant, the new requirements for screening K–2 students for risk of reading difficulties; current state literacy data, and information gathered from a new comprehensive literacy NA that will be disseminated to the field in the fall of 2024. The revision will include “bright spots” with positive literacy outcomes in the 2019 CLSD Grant, links to the implementation guides created by the seven 2019 CLSD LLAs, and links to relevant IES Practice Guides.

### **Development Process for the State Literacy Plan**

The SLP strengthens and aligns literacy initiatives, highlighting evidence-based strategies for literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention from CA policies, standards and frameworks.

The SLT includes representatives from the CDE, the CCEE, the SBE, the CTC, CAR/W, the UC/CSU Collaborative and others selected for their literacy expertise. With the CDE’s guidance, the SLT developed the SLP and will lead the work of revising the SLP. The SLT includes representatives with expertise in literacy, PL, ECE, SpEd programs, ELD, expanded learning, and parent and community engagement; represents urban, suburban, and rural areas; and includes members from IHEs, COEs, school/district staff, community members, and parents.

In 2019, the CDE disseminated a statewide NA, which served as a foundation for the SLP, the seven statewide priorities, and the RFA. The NA was developed by the CDE, in consultation



with the American Institutes for Research and the Region 15 Comprehensive Center (R15) from WestEd, ensuring it was a tool that collected relevant and accurate data from schools and districts across CA to inform the development of its SLP. For 2024, we will update the statewide NA with support from that team of experts, the Statewide Literacy Office, and the R15.

### **Current State Literacy Plan and Necessary Updates**

The SLP, grounded in the ELA/ELD Framework, describes a vision and strategies for supporting literacy development for children from birth to grade twelve during the school day, in expanded learning programs, and at home. It integrates and aligns the existing infrastructure and resources as described in the Needs section, providing recommendations and a plan for state and regional literacy leads, with support of the SSS, to create a coherent literacy vision for CA. The Comprehensive and Integrated Literacy Model presented in the SLP sets the direction for literacy programs statewide by aligning and integrating state literacy initiatives. In particular, the upcoming LR will provide further alignment through practical implementation guidance. The SLP also ensures high-quality literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention will occur within the context of inclusive and equitable systems of schooling featuring high levels of engagement, a focus on continuous improvement, and application of the CA MTSS Framework. The SLP includes comprehensive information regarding evidence-based literacy development strategies that have proven to improve student outcomes, including, but not limited to, structured literacy and coaching models.<sup>19</sup> For example, new screening instruments will allow for assessment of risk of reading difficulties. The SLP will also include guidance regarding evidence-based practices for PL including CA's Quality PL Standards<sup>20</sup> (QPLS), instructional coaching, the IES Practice Guides, and other resources available from the What Works Clearinghouse.

In 2020, the SLT identified seven statewide literacy priorities based on the data gathered. The priorities were:

<b>Birth through Age Five</b>
<b>Priority 1:</b> Support ECE programs in creating literacy-rich environments and experiences and support the quality of ECE programs and their capacity to support early language and literacy skills and increase parenting support by increasing parental knowledge, skills, and confidence through parenting curriculum and literacy activities with special attention to access and equity for all.
<b>Transitional Kindergarten to Grade Five</b>
<b>Priority 2:</b> Build teacher capacity for Tier 1 foundational skills and reading comprehension, including best first reading and writing instruction.
<b>Priority 3:</b> Build school capacity for effective literacy and comprehensive ELD for ELs, including opportunities to develop biliteracy and primary language instruction whenever possible.
<b>Priority 4:</b> Build school capacity to support students struggling with reading, including, but not limited to, SWD and students with dyslexia.
<b>Grades Six to Twelve</b>
<b>Priority 5:</b> Build teacher capacity across disciplines for literacy instruction.
<b>Priority 6:</b> Build school capacity for effective literacy and comprehensive ELD for ELs, including opportunities to develop biliteracy and primary language instruction whenever possible.
<b>Priority 7:</b> Build school capacity for effective literacy instruction for SWD and students with dyslexia.

The educational landscape of CA has changed significantly since 2020. School closures due to COVID-19 and natural disasters, virtual and remote learning options, state literacy grants and initiatives, and a recognition that CA's students are still not achieving proficiency in the literacy skills needed to be fully engaged, successful citizens of our state, make this the time to revise the SLP to accurately reflect our current needs. In revising the SLP in 2024, we anticipate the priorities may shift, but maintain their focus on key literacy concerns. As with the 2020 SLP, these priorities will inform the work of the subgrantees, which will be elaborated in Objective 3 below.

The SLP also guides LEAs in writing local literacy plans, informing their approaches so that they can choose the evidence-based practices or strategies that work best within their local context, with state-level support and alignment to the priorities within the SLP to ensure consistent implementation. LEAs can align their literacy goals with the SLP, promoting coherence across the system and helping LEAs create clearly articulated goals and action steps to support their most vulnerable students. We will also update the Literacy Planning Toolkit, a guide for developing local literacy plans based on NA data, to include additional supports. To guide all of this, the Continuous Improvement Cycle modeled in the SLP provides LEAs with the final step in ensuring that their plans are iterative, based on their local context, and aligned to their needs.

### **Outcomes for Objective 2**

Outcomes include a comprehensive analysis of locally determined literacy needs, an SBE-adopted and widely disseminated SLP, and sustainable collaborative networks to support implementation. Success will be measured through surveys capturing information on the dissemination and use of the updated SLP, including knowledge and implementation of the SLP, staff interviews of its effect, etc. Additionally, we will collect data from the updated statewide

comprehensive NA to inform the revision of the SLP and ongoing implementation support for LEAs to develop local literacy plans. Data for these outcomes will be collected through surveys, both quantitative and qualitative. The second objective meets needs as described by aligning updated guidance documents to evidence-based strategies LEAs can use to develop literacy plans that meet the needs of their local context.

<b>Objective 2: Revise CA's Comprehensive SLP to include promising practices and implementation guides from 2019 CLSD subgrantees.</b>		
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Measurement/Evaluation</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
Reconvene the NA team to update the literacy NA.	Agendas and participant lists showing a wide representation of expertise.	A revised NA, reflective of CA's current context.
Disseminate updated comprehensive literacy NA.	NA disseminated to approximately 977 districts, 1,334 charters statewide and results gathered and analyzed.	Data that is generated locally and identifies persistent literacy gaps to inform revisions to the SLP.
Reconvene the SLT to analyze the comprehensive literacy NA data.	Identification of any necessary new members and convening of the SLT to analyze data and define objectives.	Analysis of locally determined literacy needs through root cause analyses and well-defined objectives for the SLP.
Collaborate with the SLT to inform revisions to and participation in	Convening of a meeting of the SLT.  SBE approval of revised SLP.	SBE-adopted and widely disseminated revised SLP and sustainable collaborative

dissemination of the SLP.	Dissemination of the SLP, in collaboration with the SLT, through online communications, meetings, conferences, etc.	networks to support implementation.
---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

**Objective 3:** Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options, ensuring equity in student access and addressing the needs of CA’s most vulnerable children, particularly related to the impacts of COVID-19 on students and educators.

### **Subgrantee Process and Requirements**

The most important element of the CLSD project is continuing to build local capacity to improve literacy achievement for high-need schools and students. Through a competitive grant process, the CDE will award subgrants to consortia of COEs that represent the geographic and demographic range of CA, ensuring equitable participation of rural schools and communities. A particularly promising practice from the 2019 award that will be incentivized is larger, more heavily resourced COEs entering consortia with smaller, less resourced, and rural COEs to ensure a wide and diverse reach.

The CDE will conduct a TA webinar and post TA documents on its website to support all application requirements. Successful applications will include a summary and analysis of a local literacy NA for K–12 students, which must align with the comprehensive state NA and the SLP. Applicants will be required to build on previous CLSD projects and to address one or more of the identified statewide literacy priorities in the SLP. Each applicant must also describe a plan for providing high-quality PL in evidence-based practices for literacy instruction, assessment,

and intervention that is grounded in the content of the newly revised Infant and Toddler and PTKLF, the ELA/ELD Framework, the LR, and other CA guidance documents mentioned in the Needs section. Grant activities must be aligned with evidence-based practices including those detailed in the IES Practice Guides, to address the identified needs of early learning providers, K–12 educators, and regional partners. This includes support with implementing universal screening instruments according to the guidance of the Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel, as well as incorporating formative and interim assessments. Applicants must describe how the QPLS will be applied to the design and evaluation of all PL. Grant activities must build the capacity of the local system to engage families and communities to increase educational options for students, especially children living in poverty, ELs, SWD, students impacted by COVID-19, and other student groups identified through Dashboard data. Selection criteria for subgrantees will reference all required and suggested aspects in the Federal Register. The RFA will reflect program priorities by requiring applicants to demonstrate a strong plan to:

- 1) target services for student groups with the widest literacy gaps, especially those residing in rural areas, living in poverty, and/or have been impacted by COVID-19; 2) collaborate with the CSMPs or other IHEs to ensure a solid research base for PL over the life of the grant, including, but not limited to, IES Practice Guides; and 3) collaborate with early childhood and nonprofit community organizations to support family and community engagement and ease transitions from early education to the K–12 system. Applicants will receive priority points for partnering with IHEs, serving children from birth through age five, serving LEAs with a high number or percentage of high-need schools, and including consortium partners that have not previously benefited from state or federal literacy grant funding.



Subgrantees will comply with all relevant federal laws as required by this grant program, submit quarterly and annual progress reports, and participate in CDE-hosted grant activities, as well as monthly monitoring calls with the CDE. The subgrantees will participate in the SSS to ensure a coherent approach to literacy support. They will commit to participating in regional assessments and to contributing PL materials, best practices, and other resources to the Repository. The CDE will disseminate these resources statewide through the CDE website and the Repository developed in the 2019 CLSD Grant, as well as through SSS and CISC events, presenting at conferences, and sharing through other grant partners, thereby expanding the reach of the project.

#### **Successes and Lessons Learned for 2024**

The CDE will design the 2024 RFA to reflect our learning in the 2019 CLSD Grant. We will focus on the expansion and enhancement of the LLA structure to positively impact more LEAs, educators, students, and families. The table below shows the best practices we intend to continue.

<b>Best Practice</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Coaching	Research review for literacy coaching in high school, <sup>21</sup> Coaching for Impact, <sup>22</sup> Instructional Coaching for English Language Arts <sup>23</sup>
PL	<b>IES Practice Guides:</b> Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9, <sup>24</sup> Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively, <sup>25</sup> Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, <sup>26</sup> Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, <sup>27</sup> Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers, <sup>28</sup> Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, <sup>29</sup> Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and

	Intervention Practices, <sup>30</sup> Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades <sup>31</sup>
Instructional Rounds	Learning from Instructional Rounds, <sup>32</sup> Instructional Rounds in Education <sup>33</sup>
Universal Design for Learning	Universal Design for Learning Guidelines, <sup>34</sup> The Effectiveness of Universal Design for Learning <sup>35</sup>
Culturally Sustaining Literacy	Emphasize Authentic, Culturally Responsive Learning, <sup>36</sup> Culturally Responsive Instruction Best Practices and Support <sup>37</sup>
Book Access	Book Deserts, <sup>38</sup> Global Desert Book Map <sup>39</sup>
Family and Community Engagement	Effective, Research-based Family Engagement Strategies, <sup>40</sup> Successful Strategies for Family Engagement in Rural Schools <sup>41</sup>
COE consortia	WestEd Evaluation on Effectiveness of Consortia <sup>42</sup>
Professional Learning Communities, including administrators, classroom teachers, and paraeducators	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making <sup>43</sup> Effective Teacher Professional Development <sup>44</sup>



## **Alignment with State Guidance**

As with the 2019 CLSD Grant cohort, our 2024 CLSD subgrantees will align their work with CA guidance. The SLP will tie each of these documents together and show how subgrantees and LEAs can use them to develop and implement comprehensive, evidence-based literacy programs at their sites.

As mentioned above, we will ask applicants to partner with IHEs and/or the CSMPs to ensure alignment with evidence-based research. We will also leverage our partnership with IHEs and the CTC, through Objective 1, to support evidence-based PL. Additionally, we will ask applicants to partner with two statewide structures for early learning, the CA Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN) and the Program for Infant Toddler Care<sup>45</sup> (PITC), to coordinate and deliver regional PL, coaching support, and TA, aligned to CA's new PTKLF and to support early learning and transition to the K–12 system. The CDE, our early education partners, and IHEs offering the new P–3 ECE credential will be able to share knowledge and resources to ensure successful preparation. The CDE developed the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)<sup>46</sup> child assessment to improve quality in early education programs. Subgrantees will use data from the DRDP to inform their literacy plans, ensuring that children, particularly those at or below the federal poverty line, are well prepared to enter kindergarten, and will work with the CDE to review and analyze this data to help provide PL to early childhood educators. Promising practices for early literacy identified in the 2019 CLSD Grant will be highlighted for applicants, such as literacy coaching, PL and educator CoPs, and coordination between early education and elementary LEAs.

Applicants will also be required to align their support for partner districts with CA's guidance documents and literacy initiatives on ELs and SWD as noted in the Needs section. The resources

developed by these initiatives will be used by the subgrantees to ensure statewide alignment.

Best practices to support ELs and SWD identified in the 2019 CLSD Grant will be highlighted for applicants, including coaching, PL and educator CoPs, culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogy, and direct, explicit, and systematic instruction. Subgrantees will elevate student assets, including home language.

Based on lessons learned from the 2019 CLSD Grant, the 2024 RFA will require applicants to devote a portion of their budget to aligning data systems to ensure accurate data collection, analysis, and reporting, including robust student outcome data.

The subgrants are a principal vehicle for supporting local literacy needs with the SLP.

Subgrantees will support LEAs in their regions to develop and implement local literacy plans to improve student literacy outcomes, informed by Dashboard data, as part of the LCAP process.

These plans will be aligned to and supported by regional literacy plans and, therefore, the SLP, promoting coherence across the system. Local literacy plans will be aligned to the LR, and the ELA/ELD Framework and will provide practical resources for implementation of evidence-based literacy practices, including literacy blocks for instructional planning and universal screening.

### **Outcomes for Objective 3**

Outcomes include selection of grantees through a competitive process; established partnerships for state, family, and community collaborations; and resource sharing through an online platform. Success will be measured through a thorough grant application process; evidence of state, family, and community partnerships; formative evaluations; and documentation of improved academic outcomes. COEs will be resourced to lead literacy PL, literacy coaching networks and support, and educator collaboratives to ensure equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities.

**Objective 3:** Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options, ensuring equity in student access and addressing the needs of CA's most vulnerable children, particularly as it relates to the impacts of COVID-19 on students and educators.

Activities	Measurement/ Evaluation	Outcomes
Conduct a competitive process that identifies subgrantees across regions based on local NAs, to serve high-need schools and students.	RFA disseminated. Ongoing TA for applicants. Grant awards distributed to COEs or consortia of COEs representing all regions and high-need student populations.	A consortium of geographically diverse regional subgrantees to collaborate and lead local literacy efforts over the life of the project and beyond.
Reengage formalized educational and community partnerships for statewide collaborations.	Evidence of state, community, and family partnerships and events. Increased access to high-quality literature for all children.	A statewide network of educational and community partnerships working together to address the literacy needs of children.
Strengthen relationships among regional literacy leads, First 5 CA, the CPIN and PITC.	Evidence of regional and early education partnerships. Increase in PL for childcare managers and infant/toddler and TK teachers.	A stronger statewide network of early education and K–12 partnerships that work together to build children's literacy skills.

	Increase in successful transition from early education to K–12.	
Provide ongoing implementation for LEAs to develop their own local literacy plans.	<p>Facilitate collaborative learning for regional teams.</p> <p>Ongoing feedback and formative evaluations.</p> <p>Resource sharing through the Repository.</p> <p>Documentation of improved academic outcomes per local and state level assessments for subgroups identified as underserved or facing barriers to equity and access.</p> <p>Documentation of impact on students in SpEd, such as students identified as SWD, students who receive successful interventions and students who receive referrals for SpEd.</p>	<p>Statewide collaborations, resource sharing, and increased capacity of regions to disseminate literacy best practices and TA.</p> <p>Improved academic outcomes for students.</p> <p>Minimized misidentification of students with reading difficulties, including dyslexia.</p>

### **3) Management Plan**

The CLSD team, situated within the existing Professional Learning Support Division (PLSD) will oversee all grant activities. The PLSD currently administers two ESEA programs: Title II, Part A and the 2019 CLSD Grant, demonstrating proficiency in administering federal funds and conducting statewide grant competitions. This expertise will support completion of all grant-related tasks, on time and within budget.

PLSD staff will maintain collaboration with partners within and beyond the CDE to achieve project objectives. External partners, many of whom are partnering with CDE for the second time, have committed to prioritizing the state's teacher preparation standards, evidence-based literacy practices, addressing the impacts of COVID-19 on vulnerable students and educators, engaging families and communities, and promoting educational equity and opportunity.

**CDE:** The CDE will assign PLSD staff to this work. This includes working in collaboration with IHEs and the CTC to develop tools and resources for supporting the implementation of teacher preparation standards using evidence-based literacy methods. We will also coordinate with the SSS for statewide alignment. We will align literacy projects across CDE divisions committed to participating in this work, including, but not limited to, PLSD, the Statewide Literacy Office, Early Education, Expanded Learning, Multilingual Support, Special Education, Education Data Management, and Curriculum Frameworks. PLSD staff will lead the SLP revision, starting with input from the SLT to update the document and online resources.

The CDE will support subgrantees with ongoing TA, ensuring commitment and alignment to grant goals, and that assessments, reports, and evaluations associated with the project are conducted in a timely manner. Project leads in the PLSD are:

- Division Director: Monique McWayne, PLSD

- Project Director: Erika St. André, EPC
- Project Coordinator: Julia Agostinelli, Education Administrator
- Fiscal Lead: Victoria Kielborn, Staff Services Manager I
- Lead Literacy Consultants: Eve Fabiaschi, EPC, Jennifer Howerter, EPC

**The CA County Superintendents:** The CA County Superintendents<sup>47</sup> organizes the 58 COEs into 11 regions to foster collaboration and serve district and charter schools' needs. The CA County Superintendents provide the organizational mechanism for the COEs to design and implement statewide programs to identify and promote quality cost-effective educational practices and services and provide support to school districts in the areas of student services, curriculum and instructional services, fiscal accountability and business services, personnel services, and technology and telecommunications. The CA County Superintendents' CISC<sup>48</sup> identifies curriculum and staff development needs and provides a statewide implementation network. The CISC initiates collaborative leadership with school districts, the CDE, and other partners to ensure programs, practices, and services that support success for all students. The committee identifies statewide curriculum and PL needs, provides a communication and implementation network for curriculum and PL activities, and assists the CDE in adopting and implementing instructional materials and developing publications such as curriculum frameworks. Within CISC, the CISC ELA/ELD Subcommittee supports teams for ELA/ELD and PL that promote collaborative leadership to ensure high-quality programs, practices, and services for sustainable and improved outcomes for all students. The CISC Early Learning Subcommittee leads statewide efforts to promote early learning and collaborates with the ELA/ELD Subcommittee to support the continuum of literacy development from birth through grade twelve. Each of the seven LLAs has presented their projects to the CISC ELA/ELD

Subcommittee as part of that committee’s work to align literacy initiatives across the state and ensure equal opportunities for COEs to gain knowledge and expertise around promising practices in student literacy. The CA County Superintendents and CISC will continue to provide ongoing support to create, deliver, and promote high-quality PL and systems support. Activities include providing subgrantees with PL opportunities and technical support as they conduct and analyze local literacy NAs and develop local literacy plans.

**CSMP:** The CSMP is a network of nine statewide projects that provide content-specific PL at regional sites statewide. Each CSMP is housed at an IHE, provides a solid base in instructional pedagogy, and maintains a critical feedback loop between IHEs and TK–12. The National Writing Project has been studied in randomized control trials and found to be one of the most effective PL programs in the country for literacy.<sup>49</sup> The CA Reading and Literature Project supports PL for teachers on the successful implementation of CA’s ELA and ELD standards and ELA/ELD framework. They provide evidence-based PL programs for Foundational Skills, Reading Comprehension, Learning How English Works, Content Area Language and Literacy, and Spanish-English Biliteracy Transfer. 2019 CLSD subgrantees have partnered with the CA Reading and Literature Project to provide PL to teachers and literacy coaches. The CDE will maintain these partnerships in a 2024 CLSD Grant award. The CSMP and its discipline-specific regional projects will continue to support leads in providing content-specific, evidence-based PL to teachers, administrators, and literacy coaches, and will continue to support implementation of family literacy events.

**First 5 CA:** As a state agency, First 5 works closely with the CDE on improvements for early learning and care settings, including projects focused on early math, social emotional development, positive adult-child interactions, and early literacy, all aimed at improving school

readiness. First 5 will continue to support the provision of services to all CA children and improve student outcomes through effective literacy instruction and intervention. They will be part of the SLT to provide input on revisions and will advise the CDE CLSD team on the subgrant competition RFA.

**WestEd/R15:** WestEd and the R15 will continue to work with the CDE. The R15 will support facilitation of the SLT, analyzing the results of the comprehensive NA, and revision of the SLP. West Ed will continue formative evaluations.

**CTC:** The CTC serves as CA’s standards board for educator preparation and the licensing and credentialing of professional educators. Recently, the CTC updated its educator preparation standards to ensure candidates learn about effective literacy instruction that is “organized, comprehensive, systematic, evidence-based, culturally and linguistically sustaining, and responsive to students’ age and prior literacy development.”<sup>50</sup> The CTC will support the CDE and IHE partners.

**CAR/W:** The CAR/W promotes the preparation of knowledgeable and highly skilled teachers and reading/literacy specialists in the CSU. CAR/W works with CSU faculty and a variety of public agencies, including the CDE and the CTC, to ensure that CA’s students become capable readers and writers. CAR/W works to support CSU TPPs as they align to the new literacy program standards and TPEs (including coursework and clinical field experiences). In the interest of improving coherence across CA’s educational system, CAR/W will work with the CDE to ensure that IHEs and LEAs benefit from their mutual expertise as they ensure high quality literacy TPPs and instruction in PK–12 classrooms.

**UC/CSU Collaborative:** The Collaborative brings together experts in research and practice from the UC and CSU with the goal of dramatically improving literacy for all children, particularly



those with reading challenges such as dyslexia. They partner with teacher educators, PK–12 teachers, parents, policy makers, and researchers in this effort.

Ensuring alignment to evidence-based practices in IHEs and LEAs creates a comprehensive approach that will ensure every CA student has access to literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention that is systematic and produces improved student outcomes.

### **Ongoing Monitoring and Technical Assistance Plan**

In the 2019 CLSD Grant, CDE literacy leads developed an effective evaluation process to assess local literacy plans and the impacts on student outcomes. This included setting up data systems, evaluation processes, and procedures for LEA and state support, and producing annual reports on implementation and outcomes. The PLSD team monitors the subgrantees and provides TA via monthly meetings, quarterly convenings, and site visits. This evaluation and monitoring process will be continued in the 2024 grant.

### **Weekly**

The PLSD team meets weekly to debrief on all subgrantee activities, and calibrate guidance, so all CDE team members can provide consistent TA. CDE staff representing other literacy initiatives are invited for alignment and collaborative purposes.

### **Monthly Meetings**

The PLSD team meets monthly with their subgrantees. Subgrantees provide updates on project deliverables detailed in their Project Timeline, including PL events, number of staff trained, student outcomes, successes and challenges, and budget changes and concerns. Time is also reserved to plan for sustainability and scaling of grant work. The PLSD team will also continue its monthly meetings with external partners to align initiatives across the educational system.

### **Quarterly Convenings**

The PLSD team leads Quarterly Convenings (October, January, April, July), bringing together all subgrantees. During these convenings, the PLSD team provides TA, LLAs present to the group on their projects, and representatives from related statewide initiatives present on relevant topics. To date, the CDE has held six in-person and five virtual Quarterly Convenings.

### **Site Visits**

The PLSD team will continue the site visits. This critical part of project monitoring in the 2019 CLSD Grant led to increased collaboration within and across grantee teams as the CDE team connected LLAs to each other. The PLSD team attends LLA events, including PL, conference presentations, and classroom visits. Site visits are structured to include a debrief between CDE and LEA staff on questions, highlights, and next steps.

### **Quarterly and Annual Reports**

Subgrantees must submit quarterly programmatic narrative reports and budget expenditure reports to the CDE in October, January, April, and July of each year of implementation.

Subgrantees are also required to submit an annual programmatic narrative, budget expenditure, and data reports in October of each year. The reports are reviewed for completeness and alignment with project timelines and approved budgets, and are approved by the assigned EPCs, analysts, and the Project Director. The reports are also reviewed with subgrantees in monthly monitoring meetings to discuss “bright spots,” challenges, and to plan for next steps.

This process will be replicated for the 2024 CLSD Grant, with systematic data collection and evaluation from inception to conclusion to capture the direct impact of SLP implementation.

State and regional student outcomes and teacher survey data will be reviewed as evidence of progress to inform decision-making. To monitor regional implementation and impact, the CDE will require subgrantees to report quarterly and annually on quantitative data and qualitative data.

Quantitative data will include student interim assessment scores, families positively affected by literacy initiatives, students' access to educational choice, and other subgrantee identified measures. The CDE will provide a list of data collection and assessment systems for subgrantees. Data will be collected and reported at the beginning, middle, and end of the year, offering more frequent progress measurements than summative assessments. Qualitative data will include surveys of teachers and administrators, students, family and community members, and IHE faculty. This data will be reviewed quarterly and annually to assess the project's progress as part of a continuous improvement framework.

### **Project Timeline**

The project timeline below contains all major milestones for the five-year grant period.

<b>Year 1 Activities (2024–25)</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>
Disseminate/promote updated comprehensive literacy NA (October 2024).	CDE, CSA, CSMP, CAR/W, UC/CSU Collaborative, R15, First 5	Comprehensive Literacy NA disseminated through COE and other networks to ensure maximum participation
Conduct weekly literacy lead meetings (ongoing).	CDE CLSD staff	Alignment of federal and state literacy initiatives, planning for grant management
Conduct monthly calls with external partners (October 2024 and ongoing).	CDE, CSA, CSMP, CAR/W, UC/CSU Collaborative, R15, First 5	Input gathered on grant activities, NA, SLP revisions, RFA, and subgrant competition

Complete updated comprehensive NA, including recommendations from SLT (November 2024).	LEAs	Literacy needs data gathered from LEAs across CA
Reconvene SLT to analyze NA results and draft revised recommendations (January 2025).	CDE, R15 as leads with support from all partners	Literacy needs analyzed and interpreted to inform updated statewide literacy priorities
Conduct monthly internal CDE roundtable meetings (ongoing since February 2020).	CDE	Build literacy capacity of internal CDE colleagues and alignment across literacy initiatives
Conduct formative evaluation, (December 2024, March, July, September 2025).	WestEd	Formative evaluations of efficacy of grant management and internal and external partnerships
Revise SLP (February–April 2025).	CDE, R15	Updated SLP aligned to current research and guidance documents, including updated statewide literacy priorities
Present final draft of revised SLP to the SBE (July 2025).	CDE	SBE approval and adoption of revised SLP
Disseminate revised SLP statewide (beginning July 2025).	CDE, all partners	LEAs receive digital copies of revised SLP including links to TA webinars on updates,

		revisions, and implementation supports
Develop/disseminate RFA and TA (July 2025).	CDE, all partners	COEs and LEAs informed of subgrant opportunity and supports available to eligible applicants
Review RFAs (August 2025).	CDE	Qualified subgrantees identified
Award subgrantees (September 2025).	CDE	Qualified subgrantees notified of grant award and TA provided on initiating grant work
<b>Year 2 Activities (2025–26)</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>
Conduct weekly literacy lead meetings (ongoing).	CDE	Alignment of federal and state literacy initiatives, planning for grant management
Conduct monthly internal CDE roundtable meetings (ongoing).	CDE	Build literacy capacity of internal CDE colleagues and alignment across literacy initiatives
Conduct monthly conference calls with LLAs/partners and external partners to review data and	CDE, LLAs, external partners	Monitor implementation of grant work, alignment of LLA work across priorities and state literacy

reporting from LLAs (beginning October 2025).		grants, and indicators of students' progress as reported in monthly calls, quarterly, and annual reports
Conduct training, quarterly convenings, COPs, and TA for LLAs (ongoing, beginning November 2025).	CDE	Provide TA to LLAs, development of LLA expertise
Conduct site visits of LLAs.	CDE	Monitor implementation of grant work, provide technical assistance to LLAs and LEA partners
Attend Regional Topical meetings and Project Director meetings.	CDE	Build relationships and collaborate with other CLSD grantee states
Conduct formative evaluation (December, March, June, September).	WestEd	Formative evaluations of efficacy of grant management and partnerships
Populating Repository (ongoing).	CDE, LLAs, all partners	Resources available to LLAs, partner LEAs, and the public and aligned to resources from literacy initiatives.
<b>Year 3 Activities (2026–27)</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>



Conduct all ongoing activities described in Year 2, including LLA and external partner meetings, reviewing of data, roundtables, conference calls, in-person meetings, training, quarterly convenings, site visits, and TA with LLAs.	CDE, CSA, CSMP, CAR/W, UC/CSU Collaborative	Monitoring of implementation of all grant activities, TA provided to LLAs and partners
Continue populating Repository (ongoing).	CDE, LLAs	Resources available to LLAs, partner LEAs and the public
<b>Year 4 Activities (2027–28)</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>
Conduct all ongoing activities described in Year 2, including LLA and external partner meetings, reviewing of data, roundtables, conference calls, in-person meetings, training, site visits, and TA with LLAs.	CDE, CSA, CSMP, CAR/W, UC/CSU Collaborative	Monitoring of implementation of all grant activities, TA provided to subgrantees and partners
Continue Repository (ongoing).	CDE, LLAs	Resources available to LLAs, partner LEAs, and the public
<b>Year 5 Activities (2028–29)</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>

Conduct all ongoing activities described in Year 2, including LLA and external partner meetings, reviewing of data, roundtables, conference calls, in-person meetings, training, site visits, and TA with LLAs.	CDE, CCSESA, CSMP, CAR/W, UC/CSU Collaborative	Monitoring of implementation of all grant activities, TA provided to subgrantees and partners
Scaling and sustainability planning.	CDE, LLAs	Resources and templates developed to assist other COEs and LEAs interested in implementing the projects
Conduct grant close out activities (October–December 2029).	CDE	Grant successfully closed out; expenditures completed

#### 4) Project Services

CA’s SLP identified seven statewide literacy priorities that formed the basis of the 2019 CLSD Grant subgrant competition. LLAs developed partnerships with other COEs spanning the state. Each COE partnered with LEAs who were ready to change their systems and practices to improve literacy outcomes for students. Each LLA focused on one of the seven statewide literacy priorities. Because of the COEs’ knowledge of local educational contexts, their partnerships with LEAs have shown lasting impacts that will reach far beyond the end of the original grant funds. In the final two years of the grant program, the PLSD team provided TA to LLAs on sustainability and scaling of their projects. LLA-developed implementation guides will be posted in the Repository, available for use by COEs and LEAs across CA. The May 2024 Statewide



Literacy NA indicated that 60.98 percent of respondents were interested in implementing one or more of the 2019 CLSD Grant projects.

In the 2024 CLSD Grant, revisions to the SLP may bring adjustments to the established statewide literacy priorities. Fundamental best practices, such as evidence-based literacy PL, literacy coaching, and educator CoPs, will remain. Once the SLP is updated, the 2024 CLSD Grant subgrant competition will award funding to consortia of COEs who demonstrate the ability to address at least one of the statewide literacy priorities using evidence-based practices to meet the needs of students who have been underserved, as evidenced by Dashboard and local data.

A promising practice of the 2019 CLSD Grant that will be replicated and amplified in the 2024 CLSD Grant is providing PL on evidence-based literacy practices to key players in the system to ensure coherence and sustained implementation. This includes PL for administrators who lead the instructional work at district and school sites; PL for literacy coaches on their unique role in supporting evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention through coaching, modeling, and co-planning; PL for teachers on evidence-base literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention, including how to use instructional materials effectively; PL for paraprofessionals supporting small group instruction in classrooms; and PL for families on how to support school-based literacy efforts in the home and community. The delivery models differed based on the needs of partner LEAs and geographic location, but all seven LLAs engaged in deep and targeted PL, which will be a signature practice of the 2024 CLSD Grant. As an example, the 2019 CLSD Early Learning Literacy project brought supports for the teachers of CA's youngest students into alignment with K–12 PL efforts in a small-scale pilot project across three counties that included students ages birth through five in Head Start, CSPP, and family childcare settings, as well as TK and kindergarten. Teachers and paraprofessionals

were trained in evidence-based early literacy practices, including interactive read-alouds. They were provided with on-site literacy coaching and culturally sustaining books for their classroom libraries. Parents and families also received books, including in the student's home language, and supports for fostering literacy and home language development in the home. We will also expand and enhance this work by aligning with 1,835 county homeless and foster youth support services to ensure that our earliest learners experiencing homelessness or in contact with the foster care system have access to high-quality evidence-based preschool programs.

Another promising practice that emerged in the 2019 CLSD Grant was in the Moreno Valley Unified School District (MVUSD) in Riverside County, a district that was eligible for Differentiated Assistance (DA) due to persistently low progress in ELA/Literacy for SWD on the CAASPP. The Riverside COE, a member of the LLA project called Lead to Literacy, provided PL and SpEd literacy coaching to secondary administrators, literacy coaches, classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents in structured literacy. Grant-facilitated changes to the master schedules at school sites allowed for high dosage tutoring and intensive literacy instruction for students in SpEd. Over two years of implementation, there was such growth and progress in student achievement that MVUSD has exited from DA, and students are moving toward graduation requirements and opportunities in college and career that they would not have had access to without the interventions provided. This proven model can be replicated statewide and is an example of ensuring access to high-quality evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention for secondary students in SpEd.

CA's QPLS identifies characteristics of PL that support educators in building individual and collective capacity to meet professional, school, and student performance expectations. Aligned with the descriptors of PL outlined in the Federal Register, these seven interdependent evidence-

based standards support PL that is rooted in student and educator needs demonstrated through data; focused on content and pedagogy; designed to ensure equitable outcomes; structured to be ongoing, intensive, and embedded in practice; collaborative with an emphasis on shared accountability; supported by adequate resources; and coherent and aligned with other standards, policies, and programs. By utilizing the evidence-based QPLS throughout this project, participants will share a common understanding of the features of high-quality PL and how best to support it, ensuring quality, intensity, and duration of PL supports.

Further, the CDE partners with CSA on the CPIN, a statewide PL system focused on increasing administrator and educator knowledge and skills of preschool, migrant, and TK children through regional CoPs, PL, coaching, and on-site support. CPIN PL is based on the CA Preschool Learning Foundations (and is currently being revised to align with new PTKLF), the CA Preschool Curriculum Framework, the Preschool EL Guide, Preschool Program Guidelines, Family Partnerships and Culture, Integrated Nature of Learning, and Inclusion Works, and other resources. These publications promote linkages between preschool learning and K–12 content areas and will be integral to the services delivered through this project, promoting equitable learning opportunities for students across the system.

The increase in geographic spread will allow more LEAs within those counties to partner with COEs benefitting from the PL, literacy coaching, and educator CoPs. Teachers will have the preparation, PL, coaching, and support needed to give students the high-quality, systematic, explicit literacy instruction they need. Early education students will be prepared with the early literacy skills necessary to fully engage in TK or kindergarten.

## 5) Project Evaluation

CDE proposes a two-pronged approach to evaluating the 2024 CLSD Grant to ensure a thorough, feasible, and appropriate assessment of the goals, objectives, and outcomes previously described.

As described in the Project Design, successes and lessons learned from the 2019 CLSD Grant will inform this evaluation plan in both the internal and external layers of evaluation. The data CDE collects from LLAs, and the outputs requested of our external evaluator, will be more specific, and more clearly defined and designed, namely:

- 1) To what extent is the partnership between CDE and IHEs supporting TPPs in strengthening and enhancing pre-service courses for students preparing to teach students from birth to grade twelve in explicit, systematic, and intensive instruction in evidence-based literacy methods?
- 2) To what extent are participating students transitioning from early education settings into TK and kindergarten demonstrating the early literacy skills necessary to fully engage in the program?
  - i) To what extent are there gaps in skills for students overall compared to significant subgroups, i.e. EL students, SWD, and SED students?
  - ii) In what ways are evidence-based practices contributing to improvements? e.g. PL, literacy coaching, teacher collaboration, etc.
- 3) To what extent are participating elementary students (TK/kindergarten through grade five) demonstrating proficiency in grade-level literacy skills as measured by interim literacy assessments and summative ELA/literacy assessments?
  - i) To what extent are there gaps in skills and achievement for students overall compared to significant subgroups, i.e. EL students, SWD, and SED students?

- ii) In what ways are evidence-based practices contributing to improvements? e.g. PL, literacy coaching, teacher collaboration, impact on system improvement practices, etc.
- 4) To what extent are participating secondary students (grades six through twelve) demonstrating proficiency in grade-level literacy skills as measured by interim literacy assessments and summative ELA/literacy assessments?
  - i) To what extent are there gaps in skills and achievement for students overall compared to significant subgroups, i.e. EL students, SWD, and SED students?
  - ii) In what ways are evidence-based practices contributing to improvements? e.g. PL, literacy coaching, teacher collaboration, impact of system improvement practices etc.

To answer these questions, LLAs will use interim assessment systems to measure student literacy progress and outcomes three times per year. These systems will be required to include functions to disaggregate data. Additionally, LLAs will collect survey data from administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents and families about the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices and the impacts of PL on their teaching and learning.

Internally, CDE will evaluate the work of LLAs throughout the five-year project through monthly monitoring meetings; review of quarterly and annual reports, which include local interim assessment data; attendance and participation at quarterly convenings; observations of PL provided; and site visits of partner schools. The CDE will engage with LLAs in evaluating interim assessment data to determine areas of strength to be amplified and replicated, and areas of concern to be studied and reviewed for further action. This data will be analyzed by the

literacy team and reported to CDE leadership to assess progress toward achieving our intended outcomes of students reading on grade level.

The CDE will contract with WestEd, who has served as the external evaluator for the 2019 CLSD grant, to provide quarterly formative and annual summative evaluations to ensure successful implementation of all aspects of this project. WestEd's evaluation will focus on the effectiveness of CDE's implementation of grant funds to meet the goals, objectives, and outcomes stated. They will do this through monthly monitoring meetings with the CDE team, attendance at grant-related events and reviews of grant-related artifacts, surveys and interviews of grant participants at the LLA, district, and school site level, as well as assisting in the review of literacy data reported to CDE by LLAs. They will produce an annual report to CDE on the effectiveness of CDE's implementation of grant funds, including recommendations for areas of growth and areas of particular strength. These reports will assist the CDE team in homing in on the policies and practices having the most positive impacts on student literacy outcomes so they can be shared with the field at regular intervals.

### **Continuous Improvement through Systematic Collaboration, Communication, Assessment, and Evaluation**

The goal of this project is to provide the supports and resources necessary for educators to have a thorough understanding of evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention so that their students and families are successful and engaged readers and lifelong learners.

The SLP Logic Model details the Inputs and Resources, Activities, Outputs, and Outcomes that were planned and executed through the 2019 CLSD Grant. This critical aspect of continuous improvement will be updated in the 2024 CLSD Grant to expand and enhance the reach and scope of the funds to as many CA students as possible.

Assessment and evaluation of program implementation will be ongoing. CDE and LLAs will maintain ongoing communication through quarterly reports and monthly conference calls and quarterly convenings. Through continued internal and external collaboration, the CDE will assess and continuously improve policy, guidance, and TA for LEAs. Continuing support—including high-quality PL in identifying, analyzing, and addressing student literacy needs and in building teacher and administrator capacity—will be aligned with and integrated into the SSS. The Practice-Policy Communication Loop will support the continual analysis of state-level efforts on student and community impact. Feedback loops will allow the CDE to “solicit, receive, and respond to feedback from schools and districts regarding barriers and facilitators to implementation.”<sup>51</sup> Additional formal assessment and evaluation is integral to the project design and will inform continuous improvement efforts.

The CDE and its partners are poised to continue the work we started with the 2019 CLSD Grant, and through this grant funding, an existing state infrastructure, and strong partner collaborations, to ensure CA’s students with the most needs receive the literacy supports required to close the achievement gap.

## Citations

- <sup>1</sup> California Department of Education. 2024. Local Control Funding Formula. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- <sup>2</sup> California Department of Education. California School Dashboard Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>.
- <sup>3</sup> California Collaborative for Educational Excellence. 2024. Home. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ccee-ca.org/>.
- <sup>4</sup> California Subject Matter Project. n.d. Home. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://csmp.online/>.
- <sup>5</sup> California Legislative Information. 2021. Senate Bill 488: Teacher Credentialing: Reading Instruction. Accessed June 19, 2024. [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220SB488](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB488).
- <sup>6</sup> Patrick, Susan Kemper, Linda Darling-Hammond, & Tara Kini. 2023. *Educating Teachers in California: What Matters for Teacher Preparedness?* Learning Policy Institute. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/educating-teachers-in-california-brief>.
- <sup>7</sup> Head Start California. 2024. Home. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://headstartca.org/>.
- <sup>8</sup> California Department of Education. 2024. California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/SP/cd/re/psfoundations.asp>.
- <sup>9</sup> California Department of Education. 2017. English Learner Roadmap. 2024. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ml/roadmap.asp>.



- <sup>10</sup> California Department of Education. 2014. *Family Engagement Framework: A Tool for California School Districts*. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/documents/famengageframeenglish.pdf>.
- <sup>11</sup> California Department of Education. 2017/2018. *California Dyslexia Guidelines*. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/cadyslexiaguidelines.pdf>.
- <sup>12</sup> California Department of Education. Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant Resource Repository. California Educators Together. Accessed June 4, 2024.  
<https://www.caeducatorstogether.org/groups/hmdnyg/comprehensive-literacy-state-development-grant-resource-repository>.
- <sup>13</sup> California Department of Education. n.d. 2021-22 Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes by Full-Time Equivalent (FTE). DataQuest. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/TchAssgnOutcomeLevels.aspx?cds=00&agglevel=State&year=2021-22>.
- <sup>14</sup> California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. n.d. California Educator Assignment Monitoring. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/reports/data/california-educator-assignment-monitoring>.
- <sup>15</sup> California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. n.d. Approved Institutions and Programs. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/reports/data/approved-institutions-and-programs>.
- <sup>16</sup> Mathews, Kai, Hui Huang, Erika Yagi, Cathy Balfe, & Joseph Bishop. 2024. California's Teacher Education Deserts: An Overlooked & Growing Equity Challenge. UCLA Center for the Transformation of Schools. Accessed June 19, 2024.  
<https://transformschoools.ucla.edu/research/californias-teacher-education-deserts/>.

- <sup>17</sup> California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. PK-3 ECE Specialist Instruction Credential. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/pk-3-ece-specialist-instruction-credential>.
- <sup>18</sup> U. S. Department of Education. Definition of Comprehensive Literacy Instruction. *Federal Register*, Vol. 89, No. 79. Accessed May 29, 2024. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2024-04-23/pdf/2024-08578.pdf>.
- <sup>19</sup> California Department of Education. 2021. *California Comprehensive State Literacy Plan*. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/pl/documents/cacompstatelitplan.pdf>.
- <sup>20</sup> California Department of Education. 2014/2015. *Quality Professional Learning Standards*. 2014/2015. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://www.caeducatorstogether.org/resources/113199/quality-professional-learning-standards-qpls>.
- <sup>21</sup> Institute of Education Sciences, Regional Educational Laboratory Program. n.d. What Research Has Been Conducted on the Effect of Literacy and Math Coaches in High School? Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/southeast/Ask-A-REL/80075>.
- <sup>22</sup> The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact. 2016. *Coaching for Impact: Six Pillars to Create Coaching Roles That Achieve Their Potential to Improve Teaching and Learning*. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/coaching-for-impact.pdf>.
- <sup>23</sup> Institute of Educational Sciences, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. n.d. Instructional Coaching for English Language Arts: Practices and Outcomes. Accessed May 24, 2024.

[https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/infographics/pdf/REL NEI Instructional Coaching for ELA.pdf](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/infographics/pdf/REL_NEI_Instructional_Coaching_for_ELA.pdf).

- <sup>24</sup> Vaughn, Sharon, Russel Gersten, Joseph Dimino, M. J. Taylor, Rebecca Newman-Gonchar, Sarah Krowka, Michael J. Kieffer, Margaret McKeown, Deborah Reed, Michele Sanchez, Kim St. Martin, Jade Wexler, Sheila Morgan, A. Yanez, & Madhavi Jayanthi. 2022. *Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9*. Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/29>.
- <sup>25</sup> Graham, Steve, Julie Bruch, Jill Fitzgerald, Linda Friedrich, Joshua Furgeson, Katie Greene, James S. Kim, Julia Lyskawa, Carol Booth Olson, & Claire Smither Wulsin. 2016. *Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively*. (NCEE 2017-4002). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/22>.
- <sup>26</sup> Foorman, Barbara, Nicholas Beyler, Kelley Borradaile, Michael Coyne, Carolyn A Denon, Joseph Dimino, Joshua Furgeson, Lynda Hayes, Juliette Henke, Laura Justice, Betsy Keating, Warnick Lewis, Samina Sattar, Andrei Streke, Richard Wagner, & Sarah Wissel. 2016. *Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/21>.
- <sup>27</sup> Baker, Scott, Nonie Lesaux, Madhavi Jayanthi, Joseph Dimino, C Patrick Proctor, Joan Morris, Russell Gersten, Kelly Haymond, Michael J. Kieffer, Sylvia Linan-Thompson, & Rebecca Newman-Goncher. 2014. *Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English*

*Learners in Elementary and Middle School*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/19>.

- <sup>28</sup> Graham, Steve, Alisah Bollinger, Carol Booth Olson, Catherine D'Aoust, Charles MacArthur, Deborah McCutchen, & Natalie Ollinghouse. 2012. *Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/17>.

- <sup>29</sup> Shanahan, Timothy, K Callison, C Carrier, Nell K. Duke, P. David Pearson, C Schatschneider, Joseph Torgesen. 2010. *Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/14>.

- <sup>30</sup> Kamil, Michael L., Geoffrey D. Borman, Janice Dole, Cathleen C. Kral, Terry Salinger, & Joseph Torgesen. 2008. *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/8>.

- <sup>31</sup> Gersten, Russell, Scott K. Baker, Timothy Shanahan, Sylvia Linan-Thompson, Penny Collins, & Robin Scarcella. 2007. *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/6>.

- <sup>32</sup> City, Elizabeth A. 2011. Learning from Instructional Rounds. *ASCD*. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/learning-from-instructional-rounds>.
- <sup>33</sup> City, Elizabeth A., Richard F. Elmore, Sarah E. Fiarman, & Lee Teitel. 2009. *Instructional Rounds in Education: A Network Approach to Improving Teaching and Learning*. Harvard Education Press.
- <sup>34</sup> CAST. 2018. Universal Design for Learning Guidelines, Version 2.2. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>.
- <sup>35</sup> Capp, Matthew J. 2017. The Effectiveness of Universal Design for Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Literature Between 2013 and 2016. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(8), 791–807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1325074>.
- <sup>36</sup> Darling-Hammond, Linda, A. Schachner, A K. Edgerton. 2020. Emphasize Authentic, Culturally Responsive Learning. *Restarting and Reinventing School: Learning in the Time of COVID and Beyond*. Learning Policy Institute. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://restart-reinvent.learningpolicyinstitute.org/emphasize-authentic-culturally-responsive-learning>.
- <sup>37</sup> Goldston, Cora. 2017. Blog: Culturally Responsive Instruction: Best Practices and Supports. Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/midwest/Blog/10146>.
- <sup>38</sup> Neuman, Susan B., & Naomi Moland. 2019. Book Deserts: The Consequences of Income Segregation on Children’s Access to Print. *Urban Education*, 54(1), 126-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916654525>

- <sup>39</sup> Unite for Literacy. Global Book Desert Map. n.d. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://uniteforliteracy.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=e72d37247eea430cb8d70136ecd4cc54&extent=-133.1511,32.7806,-76.9011,46.2656>.
- <sup>40</sup> Regional Educational Laboratory Program: Ask A REL. [2018. What Are Effective, Research-Based Family Engagement Strategies? Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/central/Ask-A-REL/20002>.
- <sup>41</sup> Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia: Ask A REL. 2018. What Are Successful Strategies for Family Engagement in Rural Schools? Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/appalachia/askarel/aar32.asp>.
- <sup>42</sup> WestEd. Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant: Interim Report. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://wested.box.com/s/49kqjt7yo5on2pmq5dfgwhwxefnw21rp>.
- <sup>43</sup> Hamilton, Laura, Richard Halverson, Sharnell S. Jackson, Ellen Madinach, Johnathan A. Supovitz, & Jeffrey C. Wayman. 2009. *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Accessed May 24, 2024. [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dddm\\_pg\\_092909.pdf](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dddm_pg_092909.pdf)
- <sup>44</sup> Darling-Hammond, Linda, Maria E. Hyler, & Madelyn Gardner. 2017. *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Learning Policy Institute. Accessed June 19, 2024. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>.
- <sup>45</sup> California Preschool Instructional Network. n.d. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://cpin.us/>.
- <sup>46</sup> WestEd. Program for Infant-Toddler Care. Accessed May 24, 2024. <https://www.pitc.org/>.

- <sup>47</sup> California Department of Education. *DRDP (2015): A Developmental Continuum from Early Infancy to Kindergarten Entry*. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/documents/drdp2015preschool.pdf>.
- <sup>48</sup> California County Superintendents. Home. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://cacountysupts.org/>.
- <sup>49</sup> California County Superintendents. Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee (CISC). Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://cacountysupts.org/committees/cisc/>.
- <sup>50</sup> Gallagher, H. Alix, Katrina R. Woodworth, Christina J. Park, & Teresa McCaffrey. 2014. Evaluating the Impact of Professional Development to Meet Challenging Writing Standards in High-Need Elementary Schools. SRI International. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://www.sri.com/publication/evaluating-the-impact-of-professional-development-to-meet-challenging-writing-standards-in-high-need-elementary-schools/>.
- <sup>51</sup> California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. 2023. Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential Evidence Guide, Standard 7: Effective Literacy for All Students. Accessed June 19, 2024. [https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms\\_ss\\_standard-7-literacy-evidence-guide---february-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=152526b1\\_9](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms_ss_standard-7-literacy-evidence-guide---february-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=152526b1_9).
- <sup>52</sup> National Implementation Research Network. 2015. Handout 14: Improvement Cycles. Accessed May 24, 2024.  
<https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/Handout%2014%20Improvement%20Cycles.docx.pdf>.

## Other Attachment File(s)

---

\* Mandatory Other Attachment Filename: 1238-ED\_Evidence\_2\_0-V2.0 - Promising Evidence.pdf

Add Mandatory Other Attachment

Delete Mandatory Other Attachment

View Mandatory Other Attachment

---

To add more "Other Attachment" attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

Add Optional Other Attachment

Delete Optional Other Attachment

View Optional Other Attachment





U.S. Department of Education  
Evidence Form

OMB Number: 1894-0001  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2025

1. Level of Evidence

Select the level of evidence of effectiveness for which you are applying. See the Notice Inviting Applications for the relevant definitions and requirements.

☐ Demonstrates a Rationale ☒ Promising Evidence ☐ Moderate Evidence ☐ Strong Evidence

2. Citation and Relevance

Fill in the chart below with the appropriate information about the studies that support your application.

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/14">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/14</a>	(Table 2, p. 9) Recommendation 1 ("Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies.") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix D, Table D.1, pp. 54-55) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts on comprehension strategies such as activating prior knowledge and predicting, questioning, visualization, monitoring or clarifying, inference, and retelling.	(Appendix D, Table D.1, pp. 54-55) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 1 were conducted on students in grades Kindergarten through 3rd grade in urban and suburban schools throughout the U.S. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.

PR/Award # S371C240010  
Page e69

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
<p>Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A Practice Guide (NCEE #2008-4027). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/8">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/8</a>.</p>	<p>(Table 2, p. 7) Recommendation 1 ("Provide explicit vocabulary instruction") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(Appendix D, p. 43) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring vocabulary output and vocabulary outcomes.</p> <p>(Table 2, p. 7) Recommendation 2 ("Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(Appendix D, p. 43) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring reading comprehension using comprehension questions and expository tests.</p> <p>(Table 2, p. 7) Recommendation 5 ("Make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(Appendix D, p. 51) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 5 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring reading comprehension.</p> <p>PR/Award # S371C240010 Page e70</p>	<p>(Appendix D, p.43) The body of evidence supporting explicit vocabulary instruction represents student populations from low, middle, and upper-middle socioeconomic status in urban, suburban, and rural school districts throughout the United States. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.</p> <p>(Appendix D, p. 45) The body of evidence supporting explicit comprehension strategy instruction represents student populations in urban, suburban, and rural school districts in the Northeastern, Central, and other regions of the United States. About 67 percent of the studies showed a positive impact specifically for students reading below grade level. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.</p> <p>(Appendix D, p, 51) Of this body of scientific evidence, 12 studies included students in upper-elementary or middle school; the remaining study focused on students in high school. All the studies included students with learning disabilities including specific reading impairments. Two also included students with other types of disabilities, such as speech-language impairment, and one study included students without disabilities who were deemed at risk for failure in reading. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.</p>

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
<p>Gersten, R., Baker, S.K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., &amp; Scarcella, R. (2007). Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/6">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/6</a>.</p>	<p>(Table 2, p. 6) Recommendation 1 ("Screen for reading problems and monitor progress") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (p. 9) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring phonological processing, letter knowledge, and word and text reading.</p> <p>(Table 2, p. 6) Recommendation 2 ("Provide intensive small-group reading interventions") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (p.15) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring reading assessment data.</p> <p>(Table 2, p. 6) Recommendation 3 ("Provide extensive and varied vocabulary instruction") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 33) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 3 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring reading comprehension and vocabulary output.</p> <p>(Table 2, p. 6) Recommendation 5 ("Schedule regular peer-assisted learning opportunities") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 36) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 5 reported statistically significant and positive impacts by measuring letter-sound and word attack measures, phoneme awareness, and oral reading fluency.</p> <p>PR/Award # S371C240010 Page e71</p>	<p>(Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 31) Eighteen reviewed studies conducted screening and criterion assessments with English learners at different points in time on measures of phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and word and text reading. The set of screening measures demonstrates moderate predictive validity for English learners from homes speaking a variety of languages: Spanish, Punjabi, Tamil, Mandarin, Cantonese, Farsi, Hmong, and Portuguese, among others. This application to this variety of English learners is especially beneficial to California's diverse English learner student's needs and levels.</p> <p>(Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 31) For sample sizes, there were 91 first graders in one of the studies of Enhanced Proactive Reading, 41 first graders in the other, 33 students in grades 2–5 for Read Well, and 17 students in kindergarten through third grade for SRA Reading Mastery. All the students were English learners. In three of the studies, all were students reading at or below the first-grade level. These study samples overlap with the populations proposed for the project.</p> <p>(Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 34). These three studies were direct tests on the impact of vocabulary instruction on the reading development of English learners. English learners are a demographic that the proposed project will support.</p> <p>(Appendix. Technical information on the studies, p. 37) The studies contributing to Recommendation 5's characterization of "strong evidence" addressed English learners. English learners are a demographic that the proposed project will support.</p>



## Instructions for Evidence Form

1. **Level of Evidence.** Check the box next to the level of evidence for which you are applying. See the Notice Inviting Applications for the evidence definitions.
2. **Citation and Relevance.** Fill in the chart for each of the studies you are submitting to meet the evidence standards. If allowable under the program you are applying for, you may add additional rows to include more than four citations. (See below for an example citation.)
  - a. **Research/Citation.** For Demonstrates a Rationale, provide the citation or link for the research or evaluation findings. For Promising, Moderate, and Strong Evidence, provide the full citation for each study or WWC publication you are using as evidence. If the study has been reviewed by the WWC, please include the rating it received, the WWC review standards version, and the URL link to the description of that finding in the WWC reviewed studies database. Include a copy of the study or a URL link to the study, if available. Note that, to provide promising, moderate, or strong evidence, you must cite either a specific recommendation from a WWC practice guide, a WWC intervention report, or a publicly available, original study of the effectiveness of a component of your proposed project on a student outcome or other relevant outcome.
  - b. **Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s).** For Demonstrates a Rationale, describe how the research or evaluation findings suggest that the project component included in the logic model is likely to improve relevant outcomes. For Promising, Moderate and Strong Evidence, describe: 1) the project component included in the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report) that is also a component of your proposed project, 2) the student outcome(s) or other relevant outcome(s) that are included in both the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report) and in the logic model (theory of action) for your proposed project, and 3) the study (or WWC intervention report) finding(s) or WWC practice guide recommendations supporting a favorable relationship between a project component and a relevant outcome. Cite page and table numbers from the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report), where applicable.
  - c. **Project Component(s)/Overlap of Population and/or Settings.** For Demonstrates a Rationale, explain how the project component(s) is informed by the research or evaluation findings. For Promising, Moderate, and Strong Evidence, explain how the population and/or setting in your proposed project are similar to the populations and settings included in the relevant finding(s). Cite page numbers from the study or WWC publication, where applicable.

*EXAMPLES: For Demonstration Purposes Only (the three examples are not assumed to be cited by the same applicant)*

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C. B., & Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). <i>Teaching secondary students to write effectively</i> (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/22">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/22</a> . This report was prepared under Version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook (p. 72).	<p>(Table 1, p. 4) Recommendation 1 ("Explicitly teach appropriate strategies using a Model – Practice – Reflect instructional cycle") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence."</p> <p>(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts of this practice on genre elements, organization, writing output, and overall writing quality.</p>	(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 were conducted on students in grades 6 through 12 in urban and suburban school districts in California and in the Mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
<p>U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. (2017, February). Transition to College intervention report: Dual Enrollment Programs. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Intervention/1043">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Intervention/1043</a>. This report was prepared under Version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook (p. 1).</p>	<p>(Table 1, p. 2) Dual enrollment programs were found to have positive effects on students' high school completion, general academic achievement in high school, college access and enrollment, credit accumulation in college, and degree attainment in college, and these findings were characterized by a "medium to large" extent of evidence.</p>	<p>(pp. 1, 19, 22) Studies contributing to the effectiveness rating of dual enrollment programs in the high school completion, general academic achievement in high school, college access and enrollment, credit accumulation in college, and degree attainment in college domains were conducted in high schools with minority students representing between 32 and 54 percent of the student population and first generation college students representing between 31 and 41 percent of the student population. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.</p>
<p>Bettinger, E.P., &amp; Baker, R. (2011). <i>The effects of student coaching in college: An evaluation of a randomized experiment in student mentoring</i>. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education. Available at <a href="https://ed.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/bettinger_baker_030711.pdf">https://ed.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/bettinger_baker_030711.pdf</a></p> <p>Meets WWC Group Design Standards without Reservations under review standards 2.1 (<a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/72030">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/72030</a>).</p>	<p>The intervention in the study is a form of college mentoring called student coaching. Coaches helped with a number of issues, including prioritizing student activities and identifying barriers and ways to overcome them. Coaches were encouraged to contact their assignees by either phone, email, text messaging, or social networking sites (pp. 8-10). The proposed project for Alpha Beta Community College students will train professional staff and faculty coaches on the most effective way(s) to communicate with their mentees, suggest topics for mentors to talk to their mentees, and be aware of signals to prevent withdrawal or academic failure.</p> <p>The relevant outcomes in the study are student persistence and degree completion (Table 3, p. 27), which are also included in the logic model for the proposed project.</p> <p>This study found that students assigned to receive coaching and mentoring were significantly more likely than students in the comparison group to remain enrolled at their institutions (pp. 15-16, and Table 3, p. 27).</p>	<p>The full study sample consisted of "13,555 students across eight different higher education institutions, including two- and four-year schools and public, private not-for-profit, and proprietary colleges." (p. 10) The number of students examined for purposes of retention varied by outcome (Table 3, p. 27). The study sample overlaps with Alpha Beta Community College in terms of both postsecondary students and postsecondary settings.</p>

**Paperwork Burden Statement:** According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0001. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to vary from 1 to 4 hours per response, with an average of 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to the Office of Innovation and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202

PR/Award # S371C240010



Wednesday, May 29, 2024

Dear Michael Berry:

I am writing on behalf of First 5 California to support the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant (CLSD) application.

First 5 California funds the statewide public education and outreach campaign Talk.Read.Sing® which works to build public awareness and education about the importance of the brain development that takes place in the earliest days, months, and years of a child's life. Public education focuses on how this period of rapid development and growth is greatly enhanced through regular, ongoing positive interaction and engagement with caring adults by talking, reading, and singing. In First 5's latest [strategic plan](#), we have centered many of our goals around collaborating with our partners, including the CDE and counties across the state.

As another state agency, First 5 California works closely with the CDE on quality improvement for early learning and care settings, and projects focused on early math, social emotional development, positive adult child interactions, and early literacy, all aimed at improving school readiness and outcomes for California's youngest children. We also continue to be a key partner as the CDE updates its Preschool Framework and support the implementation of Universal Prekindergarten. In the 2019 CLSD project, we provided support and resources to the CDE and the county office consortium that supported children birth to age five and their families. We are eager to continue this partnership for the 2024 CLSD grant by providing guidance, technical assistance, and resources to support California's youngest learners and their families.

Through continued partnership and collaboration, First 5 California looks forward to supporting the CDE's efforts to expand and enhance equitable services to all California children and to build statewide capacity to improve student outcomes through effective literacy instruction and intervention.

Sincerely,

Jackie Thu-Huong Wong (she/her)  
Executive Director  
First 5 California

2389 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 260, Sacramento, CA 95833 • tel  • 

[www.cfc.ca.gov](http://www.cfc.ca.gov)

PR/Award # S371C240010

Page e74

**Shireen Pavri, Ph.D.**  
**Assistant Vice Chancellor**  
**Educator and Leadership Programs**  
CSU Office of the Chancellor  
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802

[www.calstate.edu](http://www.calstate.edu)

May 23, 2024

Michael Berry  
U.S. Department of Education, OESE  
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program  
400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E230  
Washington, DC 20202-6450

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing on behalf of the California State University (CSU), Center for the Advancement of Reading and Writing (CAR/W), to enthusiastically support the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant application. The CAR/W works with CSU faculty and a variety of public agencies, including the CDE and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to support literacy development for all Californians. Recently, the CAR/W has been working to support CSU teacher preparation programs as they align their literacy coursework and field work to new state literacy program standards. We have begun to develop tools that can be shared across the system and have established workgroups to ensure this work moves forward.

We are excited to see that the 2024 CLSD project includes a priority that focuses on strengthening and enhancing pre-service courses at institutions of higher education (IHE). We look forward to cementing a relationship between the CLSD project and the work to update pre-service coursework so that we can ensure alignment between not only California's universities, county offices of education, and districts, but also the comprehensive, birth through grade 12 approach that the CLSD project brings.

The CAR/W is eager to work with the CDE to meet this priority by collaborating on support and technical assistance offered to IHEs updating their pre-service coursework and field work as well as fostering the critical relationships needed between IHEs, counties, and districts. This comprehensive approach, starting with current students enrolled in IHEs, will strengthen California's literacy instruction and supports and, coupled with the professional learning offered

**CSU Campuses**  
Bakersfield  
Channel Islands  
Chico  
Dominguez Hills  
East Bay

Fresno  
Fullerton  
Humboldt  
Long Beach  
Los Angeles  
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay  
Northridge  
Pomona  
Sacramento  
San Bernardino  
San Diego

San Francisco  
San José  
San Luis Obispo  
San Marcos  
Sonoma  
Stanislaus

Recipient's Full Name

Date

Page 2 of 2

through the 2024 CLSD project, will ensure that every California student has access to literacy instruction that is systematic and evidence based and that produces improved student outcomes.

We are excited to begin this partnership!

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Dr. Shireen Pavri  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Educator and Leadership Programs  
California State University Chancellor's Office





excellence in research, development, and service

May 23, 2024

Michael Berry  
U.S. Department of Education, OESE  
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program  
400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E230  
Washington, DC 20202-6450

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing to express our strong support for the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant application. We plan to support CDE in two key ways:

1. **Ongoing Formative Evaluation:** WestEd, through a contract, will conduct an ongoing formative evaluation, providing CDE with timely information and data throughout the grant period to inform and enhance program activities.
2. **Technical Assistance and Support:** In our role as the Region 15 Comprehensive Center, a federally funded technical assistance provider serving the state educational agencies of Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah, we will provide content expertise, process facilitation, and coaching to support the CDE team in implementing the CLSD.

We look forward to this exciting partnership and are committed to contributing to the success of the CLSD initiative.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covers the signature of Angela Minnici. Below the signature, a small "box SIGN" watermark and a unique alphanumeric code "469788W1-13JNPWV" are visible.

Angela Minnici  
Vice President, Institutional Development  
WestEd  
1140 3rd Street, NE, Ste 360 | Washington, DC 20002  
Office: [REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED]



May 28, 2024

Michael Berry  
U.S. Department of Education, OESE  
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program 400  
Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E230  
Washington, DC 20202-6450

**RE: California Department of Education's Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant Application**

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing on behalf of the California County Superintendents to support the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant application.

The California County Superintendents provide the organizational mechanism for the 58 County Superintendents of Schools to design and implement statewide programs to identify and promote quality cost-effective educational practices and services. The California County Superintendents have developed a regional structure that promotes collaborative leadership to deliver and promote high-quality professional learning and systems support services. This includes delivering support for developing local literacy plans to every district and community in the state.

The primary focus of our organization is to strengthen the service and leadership capabilities of County Offices of Education (COE) to improve student achievement and learning by providing comprehensive support for pre- kindergarten through grade 12, with an emphasis on supporting equity and access for all students. Our Curricular & Improvement Support Committee (CISC) represents all of California's academic content areas as well as early learning and actively collaborates with the CDE on shared projects throughout the state. Our CISC network, in particular our ELA/ELD Subcommittee has actively supported the CDE's past literacy efforts and was a key partner in the 2019 CLSD project.

The 2019 CLSD project involved 20 COEs across the state, organized into 7 Literacy Lead Agencies. These COEs collaborated within consortia spanning urban, rural, and suburban schools, and collaborated across consortia, sharing best practices and resources as they supported schools in 7 priority areas, spanning birth through grade 12. These relationships and the learning that they produced was a critically important outcome for the 2019 CLSD grant, leading to its success in sustaining and scaling the projects throughout the state. For the 2024 CLSD grant, we hope to continue the support and partnership we had in the 2019 grant by providing alignment and communication support across all 58 counties in California.

We look forward to continuing our collaboration with the CDE to expand and enhance the great work that the 2019 CLSD grant began in identifying and closing achievement and opportunity gaps for all of California's students.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Karen Stapf-Walters  
Executive Director



## Commission on Teacher Credentialing

651 Bannon Street, Suite 600 Sacramento, CA 95811

(916) 322-6253

Fax (916) 244-0750

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/>

*Office of the Executive Director*

May 15, 2024

Monique McWayne, Director  
Professional Learning Support Division  
California Department of Education

Dear Ms. McWayne,

I am writing on behalf of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to enthusiastically support the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant application.

The Commission serves as California's independent standards board for educator preparation for the public schools of California and the licensing and credentialing of professional educators. Recently, the Commission updated its educator preparation program literacy standards and teaching performance expectations to ensure candidates learn about effective literacy instruction that is "organized, comprehensive, systematic, evidence-based, culturally and linguistically sustaining, and responsive to students' age and prior literacy development." Therefore, it is particularly exciting to see that the 2024 CLSD project includes a priority that focuses on strengthening and enhancing pre-service courses at institutions of higher education (IHE).

These services provided through this grant will enhance what the Commission is already doing to raise standards and improve literacy instruction in teacher preparation programs that was spurred by SB 488. The Commission's Professional Services Division is ready and willing to work with the CDE to meet this priority by providing support and technical assistance to the CDE and future IHE partners in updating their pre-service coursework. This comprehensive approach, starting with current students enrolled in IHEs, will strengthen California's literacy instruction and supports and, coupled with the professional learning offered through the 2024 CLSD project, will ensure that every California student has access to literacy instruction that is systematic and evidence-based.

We are excited to begin this partnership!

Sincerely,

Mary Vixie Sandy, Ed.D.  
Executive Director



CENTER FOR DYSLLEXIA, DIVERSE LEARNERS, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND INFORMATION STUDIES  
2123 MOORE HALL  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1521

June 20, 2024

Michael Berry  
U.S. Department of Education, OESE  
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program  
400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E230  
Washington, DC 20202-6450

Dear Mr. Berry:

I am writing on behalf of the University of California, Los Angeles Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice (Center) to enthusiastically support the California Department of Education's (CDE) Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant application.

The Center's aim is to provide local, state, national, and global leadership in the research on the neurodiversity of learners, particularly in dyslexia. We leverage groundbreaking advances in cognitive and neurosciences, linguistics, and education to inform and transform kindergarten through grade 12 teaching and learning. We have developed an interdisciplinary network of scientists, researchers, experts, and other allied citizens who can apply their collective expertise to propelling full literacy both in schools in California and as a model for the country. Notably, funding from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, has enabled us to undertake a study with partner schools across Los Angeles to demonstrate that the earlier we can provide literacy assessment and the more we can target intervention to students' specific needs, the more likely we are to help children reach their potential.

In the 2019 CLSD project, the Center supported the CDE with the development of the State Literacy Plan to ensure that students struggling to read and students with dyslexia were supported with cutting edge research and evidence-based practices. For this new project, the Center would like to once again collaborate on the development of the State Literacy Plan as well as support subgrantees with the latest research to support neurodiversity in the classroom.

Ultimately, our partnership in this project will continue to enhance the CDE's efforts to ensure that California educators have access to the latest research in this field in order to best support all types of learners. We look forward to continuing this partnership!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Maryanne Wolf  
(former John DiBiaggio Professor of Citizenship and Public Service)  
Professor-in-Residence  
Director, Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice  
School of Education and Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Presidential Fellow, Chapman University  
Academician, Pontifical Academy of Science  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Laura Rhinehart  
Assistant Researcher  
Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice  
School of Education and Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Rebecca Gotlieb  
Assistant Researcher  
Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice  
School of Education and Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sohyun Kim  
Postdoctoral Scholar  
Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice  
School of Education and Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles  
[REDACTED]



## JENNIFER HOWERTER

### QUALIFICATION HIGHLIGHTS

**EXPERIENCED GRANT ADMINISTRATOR**  
**EXCELLENT ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS**  
**SKILLED WRITER**  
**ENGAGING PRESENTER**  
**EIGHT YEARS CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE**

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

#### **EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONSULTANT, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 2016-PRESENT**

- Expert in literacy, with a focus on secondary and media literacy.
- Lead on Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists grant.
- Lead on media literacy professional learning and state collaboration.
- Lead on Recommended Literature List.
- Supports Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant by providing technical assistance and monitoring to Priorities 5 and 6.
- State liaison to several professional literacy organizations.
- Developed and conducted presentations and workshops on secondary literacy, writing, media literacy, civics, global education, etc.
- Experience in writing budget change proposals, requests for applications, and federal grants.

#### **ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE, 2010-PRESENT**

- Nine years of experience lecturing in a college setting, including facilitating discussions and communicating complex ideas to an audience with a variety of skill levels.
- Developed first year college composition curriculum and assignments.
- Co-advised campus English Club, supervised publication of first campus literary magazine.

#### **ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 2006-2016**

- Led the federal National School Lunch Program Equipment Assistance Grants, including developing the request for applications, scoring, and analysis of invoices and final projects.
- Worked with both federal, state, and local agencies in implementing these grants, familiar with the unique needs of all stakeholders.
- Led a grant team of over 20 people, monitoring their workload and ensuring a consistent, successful outcome.

### EDUCATION

**MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SACRAMENTO**

# Eve Fabiaschi

## PROFILE

- 22 years in education
- 3 years at the state
- 8.5 years of school leadership
- 2.5 additional years coaching

## CERTIFICATIONS

California Clear Administrative Credential

California Clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

## EDUCATION

Master of Education  
Curriculum and Instruction / Leadership  
Leslie University, Cambridge, MA, May 2005

Bachelor of Science  
Major: Education Studies / Concentration:  
English  
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY,  
May 2002

## OTHER PERTINENT TRAINING

Certificate to Teach English to Speakers of  
Other Languages (TESOL – 120 Hour)

Guided Language Acquisition Design  
(GLAD) / Trainer In-Training program

Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading  
and Spelling (LETRS) – in progress

## SKILLS

- Grant Monitoring
- Instructional Coaching
- Professional Development
- Data-Driven Instruction
- Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support
- Universal Design for Learning
- Social Emotional Learning
- English Language Development
- Family Engagement

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**California Department of Education** - Sacramento, CA  
Education Programs Consultant: June 2021-Present  
Professional Learning Innovations Office.  
Professional Learning Support Division

- Grant Lead for the Early Literacy Support Block Grant Program
- Grant Lead for the Reading Instruction and Intervention Grant Program
- Grant support for the 2019 Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant Program

**Rocklin Academy Family of Schools** - Rocklin, CA  
Site Administrator (Rocklin Academy Gateway): Dec. 2016 – June 2021

ELA Instructional Coach (Rocklin Academy Charter Management Office): July 2015 – Dec. 2016  
4<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher (Rocklin Academy Gateway): Aug. 2014 – June 2015

**Rocketship Public Schools** - San José, CA  
Principal (Rocketship Mateo Sheedy): July 2013 – June 2014  
Assistant Principal / Academic Dean (Rocketship Los Sueños): July 2010 – June 2013  
2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher / Instructional Coach (Rocketship Mateo Sheedy): Aug. 2008 – June 2010

**Elihu Greenwood Leadership Academy** - Boston, MA  
4<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher: Aug. 2007 – June 2008

**TEFL International** | Manuel Antonio, Costa Rica  
Teacher Trainer and Course Administrator: April 2006 – March 2007

**The Hebrew Day School** - Escazú, Costa Rica  
Kindergarten and 6<sup>th</sup> Grade English Teacher: Sept. 2005 – March 2006

**Universal de Idiomas** - San José, Costa Rica  
English Teacher – Adult Classes: Sept. 2005 – March 2006

**Citizen Schools** - Boston, MA  
AmeriCorps National Teaching Fellow: June 2003 – June 2005  
Teaching Associate: Sept. 2002 – May 2003

# ERIKA ST. ANDRE

Davis, CA 95616 · [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

My objective is to use my experience and expertise to provide educational supports and services to students and staff throughout the state of California in order to meet the academic and social/emotional needs of students and to ensure the progress of programs and services in the state toward the goal of increasing student achievement and well-being.

## EXPERIENCE

JULY 2020 – PRESENT

**EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONSULTANT**, CA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Lead Consultant for California's Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant including ongoing technical assistance for the seven Literacy Lead Agencies, alignment of statewide literacy initiatives, and oversight of the \$37.5 million dollars in grant funds

JULY 2015 – JUNE 2020

**PRINCIPAL**, ESPARTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Director of English Learner Services-Esparto Unified School District, ELPAC LEA Coordinator, Esparto State Preschool Director, Instructional leadership and professional development (Site and District), Curriculum development, evaluation, adoption, and implementation

OCT 2013 – JUNE 2015

**ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL**, NATOMAS PARK ELEMENTARY

Assist principal in all areas including supervision and evaluation of teachers, instructional leadership and professional development for certificated and classified staff, communication with parent and community organizations

AUGUST 2009 – OCT 2013

**EL SPECIALIST**, NORTH DAVIS ELEMENTARY

Train teaching staff on ELD strategies in the classroom, evaluate, pilot, and implement ELD curriculum, teach designated ELD to students, Site CELDT Coordinator, Site ELAC Coordinator

JULY 1998 – JUNE 2009

**TEACHER**, FAIRFIELD-SUISUN USD, DODEA, DIXON USD

Elementary school self-contained classroom teacher

## EDUCATION

JUNE 2013

**ADMIN SERVICES CREDENTIAL**, SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION



DECEMBER 2004

**MASTER OF HUMAN RELATIONS**, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Adult education, training, and professional development

JUNE 1999

**MULT. SUB TEACHING CEREDENTIAL**, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Clear, CLAD Authorization

JUNE 1998

**BACHELOR OF ARTS**, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA CRUZ

Environmental Studies and Community Studies, Honors in Community Studies

## SKILLS

- Bilingual/biliterate in Spanish
- Google Level 1 certified
- 10 years of TK-12 Teaching experience (self-contained classrooms and small-group intervention), 6 years of teaching experience (intern teaching credential program)
- Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) trained (Units 1-4 complete, Units 5-8 to be completed in 2025)
- CA Dyslexia Guidelines trained
- CA Comprehensive State Literacy Plan writer

## ACTIVITIES

ACSA Member since 2013

- ACSA Principal's Institute June 2016
- ACSA Curriculum and Instruction Academy August 2018-April 2019

## PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES

**MONIQUE MCWAYNE**, DIVISION DIRECTOR, PROFESSIONAL LEARNING SUPPORT DIVISION, CDE

[REDACTED]

**AILEEN ALLISON-ZAREA**, CA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

[REDACTED]

**JULIANNA SIKES**, DIRECTOR, YOLO-SOLANO TEACHER CREDENTIALING PROGRAM

[REDACTED]

INDIRECT COST RATE AGREEMENT  
STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

**Organization:**

California Department of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 2213  
Sacramento, CA 98514-5901

**Date:** March 4, 2024

**Agreement No:** 2023-087

**Filing Reference:** This replaces previous  
Agreement No. 2023-086

**Dated:** 9/28/2023

The approved indirect cost rates herein are for use on grants, contracts, and other agreements with the Federal Government. The rates are subject to the conditions included in Section II of this Agreement and regulations issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards under 2 CFR 200.

**Section I - Rates and Bases**

<u>Type</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Base</u>	<u>Applicable To</u>
Fixed	7/1/2023	6/30/2024	21.9%	MTDC	APwR
Predetermined	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	20.4%	MTDC	APwR

**Distribution Base:**

MTDC                      Modified Total Direct Cost - Total direct costs excluding equipment, capital expenditures, participant support costs, pass-through funds and the portion of each subaward (subcontract or subgrant) above \$25,000 (each award; each year).

**Applicable To:**

APwR                      The rates herein are applicable to All Programs including those that require a restricted rate per 34 CFR 75.563 and 34 CFR 76.563.

**Treatment of Fringe Benefits:**

Fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are treated as direct costs. Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.431, (b), (3), Paragraph (i), unused leave costs for all employees are allowable in the year of payment. The treatment of unused leave costs should be allocated as an indirect cost except for those employee salaries designated as a direct cost for the restricted rate calculation.

**Capitalization Policy:** Items of equipment are capitalized and depreciated if the initial acquisition cost is equal to or greater than \$5,000.

## **Section II – Particulars**

**Limitations:** Application of the rates contained in this Agreement is subject to all statutory or administrative limitations on the use of funds, and payments of costs hereunder are subject to the availability of appropriations applicable to a given grant or contract. Acceptance of the rates agreed to herein is predicated on the following conditions: (A) that no costs other than those incurred by the Organization were included in the indirect cost pools as finally accepted, and that such costs are legal obligations of the Organization and allowable under the governing cost principles; (B) the same costs that have been treated as indirect costs are not claimed as direct costs; (C) that similar types of information which are provided by the Organization, and which were used as a basis for acceptance of rates agreed to herein, are not subsequently found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate; and (D) that similar types of costs have been accorded consistent accounting treatment.

**Accounting Changes:** The rates contained in this agreement are based on the organizational structure and the accounting systems in effect at the time the proposal was submitted. Changes in organizational structure or changes in the method of accounting for costs which affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from use of the rates in this agreement, require the prior approval of the responsible negotiation agency. Failure to obtain such approval may result in subsequent audit disallowance.

**Provisional/Final/Predetermined Rates:** A proposal to establish a final rate must be submitted. The awarding office should be notified if the final rate is different from the provisional rate so that appropriate adjustments to billings and charges may be made. Predetermined rates are not subject to adjustment.

**Fixed Rate:** The negotiated fixed rate is based on an estimate of the costs that will be incurred during the period to which the rate applies. When the actual costs for such period have been determined, an adjustment will be made to a subsequent rate calculation to compensate for the difference between the costs used to establish the fixed rate and the actual costs.

**Notification to Other Federal Agencies:** Copies of this document may be provided to other Federal agencies as a means of notifying them of the agreement contained herein.

**Audit:** All costs (direct and indirect, federal and non-federal) are subject to audit. Adjustments to amounts resulting from audit of the cost allocation plan or indirect cost rate proposal upon which the negotiation of this agreement was based may be compensated for in a subsequent negotiation.

**Reimbursement Ceilings/Limitations on Rates:** Awards that include ceiling provisions and statutory/regulatory requirements on indirect cost rates or reimbursement amounts are subject to the stipulations in the grant or contract agreements. If a ceiling is higher than the negotiated rate in Section I of this agreement, the negotiated rate will be used to determine the maximum allowable indirect cost.

### Section III - Special Remarks

Alternative Reimbursement Methods: If any federal programs are reimbursing indirect costs by a methodology other than the approved rates in this agreement, such costs should be credited to the programs and the approved rates should be used to identify the maximum amount of indirect costs allocable.

Submission of Proposals: New indirect cost proposals are necessary to obtain approved indirect cost rates for future fiscal years. **The next indirect cost rate proposal is due six months prior to the expiration dates of the rates in this agreement.**

### Section IV – Approvals

For the State Education Agency:

California Department of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 2213  
Sacramento, CA 98514-5901

For the Federal Government:

U.S. Department of Education  
OFO / OAGRM / ICD  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-4500

Signature

Leisa Maestretti

Name

Director, Fiscal and Administrative Services Division

Title

March 4, 2024

Date

Signature

Andre Hylton

Name

Director, Indirect Cost Division

Title

March 4, 2024

Date

Negotiator:

Telephone Number:

## Budget Narrative File(s)

---

\* Mandatory Budget Narrative Filename: 1234-Budget Narrative 6.5.2024\_V2.pdf

Add Mandatory Budget Narrative

Delete Mandatory Budget Narrative

View Mandatory Budget Narrative

---

To add more Budget Narrative attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

Add Optional Budget Narrative

Delete Optional Budget Narrative

View Optional Budget Narrative



**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

The California Department of Education (CDE) is requesting \$38,000,000 to build on the success of the 2019 California's Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) Grant program to expand and enhance existing statewide infrastructure, guidance, and expertise to bring further coherence to the system of literacy supports to improve student outcomes. The itemized budget and the basis for estimating the costs of personnel salaries, benefits, project staff travel, consultants, subcontracts, indirect costs, and other projected expenditures are described below. The project duration covers a five-year period (60 months) from October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2029.

**SECTION A: U.S. Department of Education Funds**

**Year One: October 1, 2024–September 30, 2025**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED] (Personnel calculation is less than Years Two through Five due to the approved 2019 Grant No-Cost Time Extension)

This proposal provides funding for one full-time Education Programs Consultant (EPC), with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded through the grant over a period of five years. Additionally, the CDE will fund one in-kind EPC position for the duration of the grant, for a total of two EPCs to perform the duties of this proposal. The EPCs will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows:

- Collaboratively write the Request for Applications and announcement to apply for regional grant making.
- Review applications and disseminate awards.
- Facilitate a reconvened State Literacy Team (SLT) to review results from a Statewide Comprehensive Literacy Needs Assessment.
- Revise California's Comprehensive State Literacy Plan (SLP) to align literacy initiatives and guidance resources statewide.
- Continue Department-wide literacy team and specialty roundtables to share data and expertise.
- Prepare State Board of Education Items.
- Facilitate all communications to the field.
- Conduct monthly technical assistance meetings for grantees.
- Conduct quarterly convenings for grantees.

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.
- Review and monitor all fiscal reports and requests from the field related to the grant awards and contract.
- Formalize educational and community partnerships for statewide collaborations.
- Establish and enhance relationships between subgrantees and early learning organizations.
- Conduct trainings for local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop their own local literacy plans and provide ongoing implementation support.

This proposal also provides funding for one half-time (.50) Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA) to provide high-level fiscal support for the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded through the grant over a period of five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The AGPA will conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows:

- Prepare and disseminate Grant Award Notifications to grantees.
- Develop and disseminate budget and fiscal reporting templates to grantees for quarterly reporting.
- Monitor and distribute grant funds to the grantees.
- Monitor, review, and process contract invoice payments.
- Review and monitor all budget revisions and fiscal reports from the field related to the grant awards and contract.
- Respond to all fiscal related inquiries from the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.

**Fringe Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Travel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will use grant funds to travel to attend regional topical meetings and Project Director meetings and an annual conference in Washington DC.

For internal purposes only. Do not disseminate.

Page 2

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**CDE Out of State Travel:**

- Rental/Gas/ State Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Out of State Conference Travel [REDACTED]
- Out of State Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals: [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**Equipment: \$0**

**Supplies: \$0**

**Contractual: [REDACTED]**

The CDE will contract with the Region 15 Comprehensive Center to facilitate a quarterly formative evaluation process through a WestEd professional evaluator, assessing all partners and efficacy of work products.

**Construction: \$0**

**Other: [REDACTED]**

- **Grant Awards: [REDACTED]**  
No less than 95 percent of grant funds will be awarded to county office of education consortia to serve as Literacy Lead Agencies.
- **Fixed Facilities/Operations: [REDACTED]**  
  
Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.
- **Fixed Communication: [REDACTED]**  
  
Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.
- **Fixed Signs and Displays: [REDACTED]**  
  
Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.
- **General Expense: [REDACTED]**



**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

Department of General Services fees for contract review; General office supplies needed for in-person trainings and regional literacy activities. Miscellaneous expenses that may occur to support the work of the grant.

**Total Direct Costs:** [REDACTED]

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**Training Stipends: \$0**

**TOTAL YEAR ONE COSTS: \$36,292,532**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Two: October 1, 2025–September 30, 2026**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The two literacy EPCs (one in-kind) will continue to work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Two:

- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Revise California's Comprehensive SLP to align literacy initiatives and guidance resources statewide.
- Facilitate all communications to the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.
- Formalize educational and community partnerships for statewide collaborations.
- Establish and enhance relationships between subgrantees and early learning organizations; and
- Conduct trainings for LEAs to develop their own local literacy plans and provide ongoing implementation support.

The half-time (.50) AGPA will continue to provide high-level fiscal support for the CLSD Grant. The AGPA will conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Two:

- Monitor and distribute grant funds to the grantees.
- Monitor, review, and process contract invoice payments.
- Review, approve, and monitor all budget revisions and fiscal reports from the field related to the grant awards and contract.
- Respond to all fiscal related inquiries from the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.

**Fringe Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Travel:** [REDACTED]

For internal purposes only. Do not disseminate.

Page 5

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

The CDE, in collaboration with the Statewide System of Support Partners (Partners) as appropriate, will monitor and conduct trainings for the subgrantees (Local Literacy Lead Agencies). Trainings will include support for developing local literacy plans, reviewing data to inform regional literacy activities, and guided technical assistance as part of a continuous improvement process in Years Two through Five. Grant partners will cover their own travel and training expenses. The travel budget requested for two EPCs and includes 11 one-day site visits and includes travel to three regional meetings, travel to attend and present at several in-state conferences, and the annual conference in Washington DC.

CDE In State Travel: [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Conference Travel [REDACTED]
- Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals: [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

CDE Out of State Travel: [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Out of State Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**Equipment: \$0**

**Supplies: \$0**

**Contractual: [REDACTED]**

The Region 15 Comprehensive Center will continue to facilitate a quarterly formative evaluation process through a WestEd professional evaluator, assessing all partners and efficacy of work products.

**Construction: \$0**

**Other: [REDACTED]**

- **Publications: [REDACTED]**

The CDE Press will provide services for professional publication and web posting of the SLP.

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **General Expense:** [REDACTED]

Postage/shipping for the distribution of the SLP. General office supplies needed for in-person trainings and regional literacy activities. Miscellaneous expenses that may occur to support the work of the grant.

**Total Direct Costs:** [REDACTED]

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**Training Stipends: \$0**

**TOTAL YEAR TWO COSTS: \$445,422**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Three: October 1, 2026–September 30, 2027**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The two literacy EPCs (one in-kind) will continue to work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Three:

- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Facilitate all communications to the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.
- Review and approve annual reports.
- Review and approve budget revisions and expenditure reports.
- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Provide ongoing literacy plan implementation support for LEAs.

The half-time (.50) AGPA will continue to provide high-level fiscal support for the CLSD Grant. The AGPA will conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Three:

- Monitor and distribute grant funds to the grantees.
- Monitor, review, and process contract invoice payments.
- Review, approve, and monitor all budget revisions and fiscal reports from the field related to the grant awards and contract.
- Respond to all fiscal related inquiries from the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.

**Fringe Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Travel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE, in collaboration with the Partners, will conduct trainings for literacy leads across all 11 regions. Trainings will include reviewing data and utilizing state and local literacy plans to inform regional literacy activities and guided technical assistance as part of a continuous improvement process in Years Three through Five. The Partners will cover their own travel and training expenses. The travel budget requested is for two EPCs and includes 11 one-day site trainings and includes travel to two regional meetings and the annual conference in Washington DC.

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**CDE In State Travel:** [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Conference Travel [REDACTED]
- Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals: [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**CDE Out of State Travel:** [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Out of State Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**Equipment: \$0**

**Supplies: \$0**

**Contractual:** [REDACTED]

The Region 15 Comprehensive Center will continue to facilitate a quarterly formative evaluation process through a WestEd professional evaluator, assessing all partners and efficacy of work products.

**Construction: \$0**

**Other:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Total Direct Costs:** [REDACTED]

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**Training Stipends: \$0**

**TOTAL YEAR THREE COSTS: \$420,682**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Four: October 1, 2027–September 30, 2028**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The two literacy EPCs (one in-kind) will continue to work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Four:

- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Facilitate/oversee all communications to the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.
- Review and approve annual reports.
- Review and approve budget revisions and expenditure reports.
- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Provide ongoing literacy plan implementation support for LEAs.

The half-time (.50) AGPA will continue to provide high-level fiscal support for the CLSD Grant. The AGPA will conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Four:

- Monitor and distribute grant funds to the grantees.
- Monitor, review, and process contract invoice payments.
- Review, approve, and monitor all budget revisions and fiscal reports from the field related to the grant awards and contract.
- Respond to all fiscal related inquiries from the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.

**Fringe Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Travel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE, in collaboration with the Partners, will conduct trainings for literacy leads across all 11 regions. Trainings will include reviewing data and utilizing state and local literacy plans to inform regional literacy activities and guided technical assistance as part of a continuous improvement process in Years Three through Five. The Partners will cover their own travel and training expenses. The travel budget requested is for two EPCs and includes 11 one-day site trainings and includes travel to two regional meetings and the annual conference in Washington DC.



**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**CDE In State Travel:** [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Conference Travel [REDACTED]
- Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals: [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**CDE Out of State Travel:** [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Out of State Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**Equipment: \$0**

**Supplies: \$0**

**Contractual:** [REDACTED]

The Region 15 Comprehensive Center will continue to facilitate a quarterly formative evaluation process through a WestEd professional evaluator, assessing all partners and efficacy of work products.

**Construction: \$0**

**Other:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Total Direct Costs:** [REDACTED]

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**Training Stipends: \$0**

**TOTAL YEAR FOUR COSTS: \$420,682**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Five: October 1, 2028–September 30, 2029**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The two literacy EPCs (one in-kind) will continue to work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Five:

- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Facilitate/oversee all communications to the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.
- Review and approve annual reports.
- Review and approve budget revisions and expenditure reports.
- Continue monthly Department-wide team meetings and quarterly roundtables.
- Provide ongoing literacy plan implementation support for LEAs.
- Conduct final grant closing activities.

The half-time (.50) AGPA will continue to provide high-level fiscal support for the CLSD Grant. The AGPA will conduct all the CDE grant logistics as follows in Year Five:

- Monitor and distribute final grant funds to the grantees.
- Monitor, review, and process final contract invoice payments.
- Review, approve, and monitor all budget revisions and fiscal reports from the field related to the closing of grant awards and contract.
- Respond to all fiscal related inquiries from the field.
- Provide ongoing technical assistance for grantees.

**Fringe Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, LTD and STD Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Travel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE, in collaboration with the Partners, will conduct trainings for literacy leads across all 11 regions. Trainings will include reviewing data and utilizing state and local literacy plans to inform regional literacy activities and guided technical assistance as part of a continuous improvement process in Years Three through Five. The Partners will cover their own travel and training expenses. The travel budget requested is for two

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

EPCs and includes 11 one-day site trainings and includes travel to two regional meetings and the annual conference in Washington DC.

CDE In State Travel: [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Conference Travel [REDACTED]
- Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals: [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

CDE Out of State Travel: [REDACTED]

- Rental/Gas/Ground Transportation [REDACTED]
- Out of State Air Transportation [REDACTED]
- Meals [REDACTED]
- Lodging [REDACTED]
- Incidentals [REDACTED]

**Equipment: \$0**

**Supplies: \$0**

**Contractual: [REDACTED]**

The Region 15 Comprehensive Center will continue to facilitate a quarterly formative evaluation process through a WestEd professional evaluator, assessing all partners and efficacy of work products.

**Construction: \$0**

**Other: [REDACTED]**

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Total Direct Costs:** [REDACTED]

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**Training Stipends: \$0**

**TOTAL YEAR FOUR COSTS: \$420,682**

**TOTAL GRANT FUNDING: \$38,000,000**

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**SECTION B: Non-Federal Funds**

**In-Kind Contributions from the California Department of Education**

**Year One In-kind: October 1, 2024–September 30, 2025**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will fund one full time, in-kind EPC with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded using State General Funds for five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The in-kind EPC will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as described above.

**Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Fixed Costs:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**In-kind Year One Total:** [REDACTED]

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Two In-kind: October 1, 2025–September 30, 2026**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will fund one full time, in-kind EPC with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded using State General Funds for five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The in-kind EPC will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as described above.

**Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Fixed Costs:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**In-kind Year Two Total:** [REDACTED]

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Three In-kind: October 1, 2026–September 30, 2027**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will fund one full time, in-kind EPC with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded using State General Funds for five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The in-kind EPC will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as described above.

**Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Fixed Costs:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**In-kind Year Three Total:** [REDACTED]



**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Four In-kind: October 1, 2027–September 30, 2028**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will fund one full time, in-kind EPC with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded using State General Funds for five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The in-kind EPC will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as described above.

**Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, Long Term Disability and Short Term Disability Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Fixed Costs:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**In-kind Year Four Total:** [REDACTED]

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant  
California Department of Education  
2024 Budget Narrative**

**Year Five In-kind: October 1, 2028–September 30, 2029**

**Personnel:** [REDACTED]

The CDE will fund one full time, in-kind EPC with expertise in literacy and professional learning to support the work of the CLSD Grant. This position will be funded using State General Funds for five years and will be sustained by the CDE beyond the life of the grant. The in-kind EPC will work collaboratively to conduct all the CDE grant logistics as described above.

**Benefits:** [REDACTED]

Benefits are calculated using an average benefit rate of 50.2 percent which may vary depending on enrolled benefits and salary. Benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Health, Dental, Vision, Life, LTD and STD Insurance at varying levels, depending on coverage, salary, and retirement.

**Fixed Costs:** [REDACTED]

- **Fixed Facilities/Operations:** [REDACTED]

Facilities and operations expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

- **Fixed Communication:** [REDACTED]

Communication expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes. MIFI usage charges to support staff while traveling for the duration on the grant.

- **Fixed Signs and Displays:** [REDACTED]

Signs and Display expenses are determined using the CDE's internal cost processes.

**Indirect Costs:** [REDACTED]

The indirect cost is based upon a predetermined rate for a total rate of 20.4 percent.

**In-kind Year Five Total:** [REDACTED]

**TOTAL IN-KIND FOR FIVE YEARS: \$1,182,815**



**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**  
See Instructions.

OMB Number: 1894-0017  
Expiration Date: 06/30/2026

**Applicant Information**

**Legal Name:**

California Department of Education

**1. Project Objective:**

Year 1: Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year one, CDE will fund a team of four dedicated staff to lead a statewide effort to build local capacity.	PROGRAM	4		/	

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year one, CDE will facilitate twelve monthly meetings to promote CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs and will attend four quarterly meetings of the Statewide System of Support.	PROGRAM	16		/	

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year one, CDE will coordinate with IHEs through monthly meetings.	PROGRAM	12		/	

1.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year one, CDE will hold twelve monthly external partner meetings Continuation of statewide partnerships with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**2. Project Objective:**

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

Year 2: Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year two, CDE will fund a team of four dedicated staff to lead a statewide effort to build local capacity.	PROGRAM	4		/	

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will facilitate twelve monthly meetings to promote CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs and will attend four quarterly meetings of the Statewide System of Support.	PROGRAM	16		/	

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year two, CDE will coordinate with IHEs through monthly meetings.	PROGRAM	12		/	

2.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will hold twelve monthly external partner meetings Continuation of statewide partnerships with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**3. Project Objective:**

Year 3: Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year three, CDE will fund a team of four dedicated staff to lead a statewide effort to build local capacity.	PROGRAM	4		/	

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year three, CDE will facilitate twelve monthly meetings to promote CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs and will attend four quarterly meetings of the Statewide System of Support.	PROGRAM	16		/	

3.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year three, CDE will coordinate with IHEs through monthly meetings.	PROGRAM	12		/	

3.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year three, CDE will hold twelve monthly external partner meetings Continuation of statewide partnerships with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**4. Project Objective:**

Year 4: Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year four, CDE will fund a team of four dedicated staff to lead a statewide effort to build local capacity.	PROGRAM	4		/	

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year four, CDE will facilitate twelve monthly meetings to promote CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs and will attend four quarterly meetings of the Statewide System of Support.	PROGRAM	16		/	

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year four, CDE will coordinate with IHEs through monthly meetings.	PROGRAM	12		/	

PR/Award # S371C240010

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

4.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year four, CDE will hold twelve monthly external partner meetings Continuation of statewide partnerships with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**5. Project Objective:**

Year 5: Leverage state capacity and partnerships, including coordination with IHEs and subgrantees, to ensure pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have sufficient and consistent knowledge and skills to support evidence-based literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention.

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year five, CDE will fund a team of four dedicated staff to lead a statewide effort to build local capacity.	PROGRAM	4		/	

5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will facilitate twelve monthly meetings to promote CDE-internal alignment and integration of literacy-related initiatives, data, and programs and will attend four quarterly meetings of the Statewide System of Support.	PROGRAM	16		/	

5.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
Throughout year five, CDE will coordinate with IHEs through monthly meetings.	PROGRAM	12		/	

5.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will hold twelve monthly external partner meetings Continuation of statewide partnerships with organizations focused on literacy and structures to ensure ongoing collaborations.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**6. Project Objective:**

Year 1: Revise CA's Comprehensive SLP to include updated evidence-based practices and guidance documents, as well as promising practices and implementation guides.

PR/Award # S371G240010

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

<b>6.a. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, CDE will reconvene California's Comprehensive Statewide Literacy Needs Assessment (NA) team through a series of four meetings to update the NA.	PROGRAM	4	/		
<b>6.b. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, the NA will be disseminated to all 977 school districts in California via electronic survey, with a response rate of 50 percent.	PROGRAM		489 /	977	50.05
<b>6.c. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, CDE will reconvene the State Literacy Team (SLT) through a series of two meetings to analyze the results of the NA.	PROGRAM	2	/		
<b>6.d. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, CDE will reconvene the SLT through a series of three meetings to revise the State Literacy Plan (SLP).	PROGRAM	3	/		
<b>6.e. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, CDE will present the revised SLP to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval through a series of two SBE meetings to present the draft and receive feedback, and then to present a final draft for approval.	PROGRAM	2	/		
<b>6.f. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year one, CDE will disseminate the revised SLP to LEAs statewide electronically, with the option for LEAs to request a hard copy.	PROGRAM		977 /	977	100.00

**7. Project Objective:**

Year 1: Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options.

PR/Award # S371C240010

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

7.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year one, CDE will conduct a grant competition to identify subgrantees across regions based on local NA, to serve high-needs school and students, with no less than 50 percent of county offices of education represented in the subgrantees.	PROGRAM		29	/	58 50.00

7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year one, CDE will provide one technical assistance (TA) webinar to sub grantees on grant management and reporting.	PROGRAM	1		/	

7.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year one, CDE will have collected baseline literacy data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, using statewide literacy assessments.	GPRA		29	/	29 100.00

**8. Project Objective:**

Year 2: Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options.

8.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have monitored implementation of each sub grant through monthly monitoring meetings with each consortium of sub grantees.	PROGRAM	12		/	

8.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have facilitated four quarterly convenings of all sub grantees to provide technical assistance, and opportunities for alignment and collaboration.	PROGRAM	4		/	

8.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have provided technical assistance on the NA process and the Literacy Planning Toolkit.	PROGRAM	1		/	

PR/Award # S374C240010

Page e116



**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

8.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE staff will have conducted at least one site visit per sub grantee for the purpose of monitoring implementation of grant activities.	PROGRAM	10		/	

8.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have collected interim literacy assessment data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, as measured by an approved assessment, at three times throughout the school year; beginning of year (BOY), middle of year (MOY), and end of year (EOY).	PROGRAM		29	/	29
					100.00

8.f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have reviewed from each sub grantee, local literacy plans for each participating LEA designed to meet the needs of students in that LEA as determined by local NA data.	PROGRAM		29	/	29
					100.00

8.g. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year two, CDE will have collected literacy data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, using statewide literacy assessments, demonstrating growth in student literacy scores of three percent as compared with year one data.	PROGRAM		29	/	29
					100.00

**9. Project Objective:**

Year 3: Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options.

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year three, CDE will have monitored implementation of each sub grant through monthly monitoring meetings with each consortium of sub grantees.	PROGRAM	12		/	

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

<b>9.b. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year three, CDE will have facilitated four quarterly convenings of all sub grantees to provide technical assistance, and opportunities for alignment and collaboration.	PROGRAM	4	/		

<b>9.c. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year three, CDE staff will have conducted at least one site visit per sub grantee for the purpose of monitoring implementation of grant activities.	PROGRAM	10	/		

<b>9.d. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year three, CDE will have collected interim literacy assessment data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, as measured by an approved assessment, at three times throughout the school year; beginning of year (BOY), middle of year (MOY), and end of year (EOY).	PROGRAM		29 /	29	100.00

<b>9.e. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year three, CDE will have collected literacy data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, using statewide literacy assessments, demonstrating growth in student literacy scores of three percent as compared with year one data.	PROGRAM		29 /	29	100.00

<b>9.f. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year three, CDE will disseminate the revised SLP to LEAs statewide electronically, with the option for LEAs to request a hard copy.	GPRA		29 /	29	100.00

**10. Project Objective:**

Year 4: Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options.

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

<b>10.a. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE will have monitored implementation of each sub grant through monthly monitoring meetings with each consortium of sub grantees.	PROGRAM	12	/		

  

<b>10.b. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE will have facilitated four quarterly convenings of all sub grantees to provide technical assistance, and opportunities for alignment and collaboration.	PROGRAM	4	/		

  

<b>10.c. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE staff will have conducted at least one site visit per sub grantee for the purpose of monitoring implementation of grant activities.	PROGRAM	10	/		

  

<b>10.d. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE will have collected interim literacy assessment data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, as measured by an approved assessment, at three times throughout the school year; beginning of year (BOY), middle of year (MOY), and end of year (EOY).	PROGRAM		29 /	29	100.00

  

<b>10.e. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE will have reviewed from each sub grantee, local literacy plans for each participating LEA, updated to reflect the literacy data and outcomes of the previous year.	PROGRAM		29 /	29	100.00

  

<b>10.f. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>			
		<b>Target</b>			
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>		<b>%</b>
By the end of year four, CDE will have collected literacy data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, using statewide literacy assessments, demonstrating growth in student literacy scores of three percent as compared with year one data.	GPRA		29 /	29	100.00

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

Year 5: Continue to build local capacity to establish, align, and implement literacy initiatives that emphasize family and community involvement and expand educational options.

11.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will have monitored implementation of each sub grant through monthly monitoring meetings with each consortium of sub grantees.	PROGRAM	12		/	

11.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will have facilitated four quarterly convenings of all sub grantees to provide technical assistance, and opportunities for alignment and collaboration.	PROGRAM	4		/	

11.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE staff will have conducted at least one site visit per sub grantee for the purpose of monitoring implementation of grant activities.	PROGRAM	10		/	

11.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will have collected interim literacy assessment data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, as measured by an approved assessment, at three times throughout the school year; beginning of year (BOY), middle of year (MOY), and end of year (EOY).	PROGRAM		29	/	29 100.00

11.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will have reviewed from each sub grantee, local literacy plans for each participating LEA, updated to reflect the literacy data and outcomes of the previous year.	PROGRAM		29	/	29 100.00

11.f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target			
		Raw Number	Ratio		%
By the end of year five, CDE will have collected literacy data from 100 percent of subgrantees, representing all participating LEAs, using statewide literacy assessments, demonstrating growth in student literacy scores of three percent, as compared with year one data.	PROGRAM		29	/	29 100.00

PR/Award # S371C240010

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Application Form for Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information**

11.g. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target				
		Raw Number	Ratio		%	
By the end of year five, CDE will have collected from each subgrantee an implementation guide, an analysis of student literacy outcomes, and locally developed resources, which will be housed on a publicly-available platform for LEAs interested in replicating the literacy grant work.	PROGRAM		29	/	29	100.00

## INSTRUCTIONS GRANT APPLICATION FORM FOR PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION

### PURPOSE

Applicants must submit a **GRANT APPLICATION FORM FOR PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION** via Grants.gov or in G5 when instructed to submit applications in G5. This form collects project objectives and quantitative and/or qualitative performance measures at the time of application submission for the purpose of automatically prepopulating this information into the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) automated Grant Performance Report form (ED 524B), which is completed by ED grantees prior to the awarding of continuation grants. Additionally, this information will prepopulate into ED's automated ED 524B that may be required by program offices of grant recipients that are awarded front loaded grants for their entire multi-year project up-front in a single grant award, and will also be prepopulated into ED's automated ED 524B for those grant recipients that are required to use the ED 524B to submit their final performance reports.

### GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

#### Applicant Information

- **Legal Name:** The legal name of the applicant that will undertake the assistance activity will prepopulate from the Application Form for Federal Assistance (SF 424 Form). This is the organization that has registered with the System for Award Management (SAM). Information on registering with SAM may be obtained by visiting [www.Grants.gov](http://www.Grants.gov).

#### Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

Your grant application establishes project objectives stating what you hope to achieve with your funded grant project. Generally, one or more performance measures are also established for each project objective that will serve to demonstrate whether you have met or are making progress towards meeting each project objective.

- **Project Objective:** Enter each project objective that is included in your grant application. When completing this form in Grants.gov, a maximum of 26 project objectives may be entered. Only one project objective should be entered per row. Project objectives should be numbered sequentially, i.e., 1., 2., 3., etc. If applicable, project objectives may be entered for each project year; however, the year to which the project objective applies must be clearly identified as is presented in the following examples:
  1. **Year 1.** Provide two hour training to teachers in the Boston school district that focuses on improving test scores.
  2. **Year 2.** Provide two hour training to teachers in the Washington D.C. school district that focuses on improving test scores.
- **Performance Measure:** For each project objective, enter each associated quantitative and/or qualitative performance measure. When completing this form in Grants.gov, a maximum of 26 quantitative and/or qualitative performance measures may be entered. There may be multiple quantitative and/or qualitative performance measures associated with each project objective. Enter only one quantitative or qualitative performance measure per row. Each quantitative or qualitative performance measure that is associated with a particular project objective should be labeled using an alpha indicator. Example: The first quantitative or qualitative performance measure associated with project objective "1" should be labeled "1.a.," the second quantitative or qualitative performance measure for project objective "1" should be labeled "1.b.," etc. If applicable, quantitative and/or qualitative performance measures may be entered for each project year; however, the year to which the quantitative and/or qualitative performance measures apply must be clearly identified as is presented in the following examples:

- 1.a. **Year 1.** By the end of year one, 125 teachers in the Boston school district will receive a two hour training program that focuses on improving test scores.
- 2.a. **Year 2.** By the end of year two, 125 teachers in the Washington D.C. school district will receive a two hour training program that focuses on improving test scores.

- **Measure Type:** For each performance measure, select the appropriate type of performance measure from the drop down menu. There are two types of measures that **ED** may have established for the grant program:

1. **GPRA:** Measures established for reporting to Congress under the Government Performance and Results Act; and
2. **PROGRAM:** Measures established by the program office for the particular grant competition.

In addition, you will be required to report on any project-specific performance measures (**PROJECT**) that you established in your grant application to meet your project objectives.

In the **Measure Type** field, select one (1) of the following measure types: **GPRA; PROGRAM; or PROJECT.**

- **Quantitative Target Data:** For quantitative performance measures with established quantitative targets, provide the target you established for meeting each performance measure. Only quantitative (numeric) data should be entered in the Target boxes. If the collection of quantitative data is not appropriate for a particular performance measure (i.e., for **qualitative** performance measures), please leave the target data boxes blank.

The Target Data boxes are divided into three columns: **Raw Number; Ratio, and Percentage (%)**.

For performance measures that are stated in terms of a single number (e.g., the number of workshops that will be conducted or the number of students that will be served), the target data should be entered as a single number in the **Raw Number column** (e.g., **10** workshops or **80** students). Please leave the **Ratio and Percentage (%) columns** blank.

For performance measures that are stated in terms of a percentage (e.g., percentage of students that attain proficiency), complete the **Ratio column**, and leave the **Raw Number and Percentage (%) columns** blank. The **Percentage (%)** will automatically calculate based on the entered ratio. In the **Ratio column** (e.g., **80/100**), the numerator represents the numerical target (e.g., the number of students that are expected to attain proficiency), and the denominator represents the universe (e.g., all students served).



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BUDGET INFORMATION  
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Number: 1894-0008  
Expiration Date: 08/31/2026

Name of Institution/Organization

California Department of Education

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Project Year 6 (f)	Project Year 7 (g)	Total (h)
1. Personnel								
2. Fringe Benefits								
3. Travel								
4. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
5. Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
6. Contractual								
7. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
8. Other								
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)								
10. Indirect Costs*								
11. Training Stipends	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	36,292,532.00	445,422.00	420,682.00	420,682.00	420,682.00			38,000,000.00

\*Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office): If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? ☒ Yes ☐ No

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07/01/2024 To: 06/30/2026 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ☒ ED ☐ Other (please specify):

The Indirect Cost Rate is 20.40 %.

(3) If this is your first Federal grant, and you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, are not a State, Local government or Indian Tribe, and are not funded under a training rate program or a restricted rate program, do you want to use the de minimis rate of 10% of MTDC? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, you must comply with the requirements of 2 CFR § 200.414(f).

(4) If you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, do you want to use the temporary rate of 10% of budgeted salaries and wages?  
☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, you must submit a proposed indirect cost rate agreement within 90 days after the date your grant is awarded, as required by 34 CFR § 75.560.

(5) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

☐ Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? Or, ☐ Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)? The Restricted Indirect Cost Rate is %.

(6) For Training Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a rate that:

☐ Is based on the training rate of 8 percent of MTDC (See EDGAR § 75.562(c)(4))? Or, ☐ Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, because it is lower than the training rate of 8 percent of MTDC (See EDGAR § 75.562(c)(4))?

PR/Award # S371C240040

Page e124



Name of Institution/Organization	Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.
California Department of Education	

SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY

NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Project Year 6 (f)	Project Year 7 (g)	Total (h)
1. Personnel								
2. Fringe Benefits								
3. Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
4. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
5. Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
6. Contractual	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
7. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
8. Other								
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)								
10. Indirect Costs								
11. Training Stipends	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	229,611.00	238,301.00	238,301.00	238,301.00	238,301.00			1,182,815.00

SECTION C - BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)

Name of Institution/Organization <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">California Department of Education</div>	Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.
--	---

**IF APPLICABLE: SECTION D - LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES**

(1) List administrative cost cap (x%):

(2) What does your administrative cost cap apply to? ☐ (a) indirect and direct costs or, ☐ (b) only direct costs

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Project Year 6 (f)	Project Year 7 (g)	Total (h)
1. Personnel Administrative								
2. Fringe Benefits Administrative								
3. Travel Administrative								
4. Contractual Administrative								
5. Construction Administrative								
6. Other Administrative								
7. Total Direct Administrative Costs (lines 1-6)								
8. Indirect Costs								
9. Total Administrative Costs								
10. Total Percentage of Administrative Costs								

U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424  
Application for Federal Assistance

OMB Number: 1894-0007  
Expiration Date: 04/30/2026

1. Project Director and Applicable Entity Identification Numbers:

Prefix:	* First Name:	Middle Name:	* Last Name:	Suffix:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Erika"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="St. Andre"/>	<input type="text"/>

\* Project Director Level of Effort (percentage of time devoted to grant):

Address:

* Street1:	<input type="text" value="1430 N Street"/>
Street2:	<input type="text"/>
* City:	<input type="text" value="Sacramento"/>
County:	<input type="text" value="CA"/>
* State:	<input type="text" value="CA: California"/>
* Zip Code:	<input type="text" value="95814-5901"/>
* Country:	<input type="text" value="USA: UNITED STATES"/>

\* Phone Number (give area code)      Fax Number (give area code)

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

\* Email Address:

<input type="text"/>
----------------------

Alternate Email Address:

<input type="text"/>
----------------------

OPE ID(s) (if applicable)

<input type="text"/>
----------------------

NCES School ID(s) (if applicable)

<input type="text"/>
----------------------

NCES LEA/School District ID(s) (if applicable)

<input type="text"/>
----------------------

2. New Potential Grantee or Novice Applicant:

☒ N/A. This item is not applicable because the program competition's notice inviting applications (NIA) does not include a definition of either "New Potential Grantee" or "Novice Applicant." This item is not applicable when the program competition's NIA does not include either definition.

For NIA's that include a definition of "New Potential Grantee" or "Novice Applicant," complete the following:

a. Are you either a new potential grantee or novice applicant as defined in the program competition's NIA?

☐ Yes      ☐ No

**3. Human Subjects Research:**

a. Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed Project Period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

b. Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

☐ Yes Provide Exemption(s) #(s): ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8

☐ No Provide Federal Wide Assurance #(s), if available:

c. If applicable, please attach your "Exempt Research" or "Nonexempt Research" narrative to this form as indicated in the definitions page in the attached instructions.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**4. Infrastructure Programs and Build America, Buy America Act Applicability:**

If the competition Notice Inviting Applications (NIA) in section III. 4. "Other" states that the program under which this application is submitted is subject to the Build America, Buy America Act (Pub. L. 117-58) (BABAA) domestic sourcing requirements, complete the following:

☒ This application does not include any infrastructure projects or activities and therefore **IS NOT** subject the BABAA domestic sourcing requirements.

☐ This application **IS** subject to the BABAA domestic sourcing requirements, because the proposed grant project described in this application includes the following infrastructure projects or activities:

☐ Construction

☐ Remodeling

☐ Broadband Infrastructure

If this application **IS** subject to the BABAA domestic sourcing requirements, please list the page numbers from within the application narrative where the proposed infrastructure project or activities are described:

## NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS: EQUITY FOR STUDENTS, EDUCATORS, AND OTHER PROGRAM BENEFICIARIES

Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) ([20 U.S.C. 1228a](#)) applies to applicants for grant awards under this program.

**ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW GRANT AWARDS MUST INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

Please respond to the following requests for information. Responses are limited to 4,000 characters.

1. Describe how your entity's existing mission, policies, or commitments ensure equitable access to, and equitable participation in, the proposed project or activity.

The California Department of Education's (CDE) mission is that California will provide a world-class education for all students, from early childhood to adulthood. The CDE ensures equitable access and participation in its 2019 Comprehensive Literacy State Development program. The CDE ensures that no barriers exist that could impede equitable access or participation in the 2024 for the Comprehensive Literacy State Development program. All persons in public schools regardless of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age are provided equitable access to, and participation in, federally-assisted education programs. Per California Education Code: Section 200: It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor. Section 201(a): All pupils have the right to participate fully in the educational process, free from discrimination and harassment. Section 220: No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid. Section 250: Prior to receipt of any state financial assistance or state student financial aid, an educational institution shall provide assurance to the agency administering the funds, in the manner required by the funding agency, that each program or activity conducted by the educational institution will be conducted in compliance with the provisions of this chapter and all other applicable provisions of state law prohibiting discrimination. A single assurance, not more than one page in length and signed by an appropriate responsible official of the educational institution, may be provided for all the programs and activities conducted by an educational institution. Section 260: The governing board of a school district shall have the primary responsibility for ensuring that school district programs and activities are free from discrimination based on age and the characteristics listed in Section 220 and for monitoring compliance with any and all rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to Section 11138 of the Government Code. Section 262.3(a): A party to a written complaint of prohibited discrimination may appeal the action taken by the governing board of a school district pursuant to this article, to the State Department of Education. The CDE is committed to

PR/Award # S371C240010

adhering to all provisions necessary to ensure that this plan is in compliance with the General Education and Provisions Act and in accordance with the California Education Code.

2. Based on your proposed project or activity, what barriers may impede equitable access and participation of students, educators, or other beneficiaries?

Based on CDE's proposed project, we do not anticipate barriers impeding access and participation of students, educators, or other beneficiaries.

3. Based on the barriers identified, what steps will you take to address such barriers to equitable access and participation in the proposed project or activity?

N/A

4. What is your timeline, including targeted milestones, for addressing these identified barriers?

N/A

**Notes:**

1. Applicants are not required to have mission statements or policies that align with equity in order to submit an application.

2. Applicants may identify any barriers that may impede equitable access and participation in the proposed project or activity, including, but not limited to, barriers based on economic disadvantage, gender, race, ethnicity, color, national origin, disability, age, language, migrant status, rural status, homeless status or housing insecurity, pregnancy, parenting, or caregiving status, and sexual orientation.

3. Applicants may have already included some or all of this required information in the narrative sections of their applications or their State Plans. In responding to this requirement, for each question, applicants may provide a cross-reference to the section(s) and page number(s) in their applications or State Plans that includes the information responsive to that question on this form or may restate that information on this form.

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0005. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering, and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this individual collection, send your comments to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference OMB Control Number 1894-0005. All other comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual form may be addressed to either (a) the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section in the competition Notice Inviting Applications, or (b) your assigned program officer.



U.S. Department of Education  
Evidence Form

OMB Number: 1894-0001  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2025

1. Level of Evidence

Select the level of evidence of effectiveness for which you are applying. See the Notice Inviting Applications for the relevant definitions and requirements.

☐ Demonstrates a Rationale    ☐ Promising Evidence    ☐ Moderate Evidence    ☒ Strong Evidence

2. Citation and Relevance

Fill in the chart below with the appropriate information about the studies that support your application.

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Taylor, M. J., Newman-Gonchar, R., Krowka, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D., Sanchez, M., St. Martin, K., Wexler, J., Morgan, S., Yañez, A., & Jayanthi, M. (2022). Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9 (WWC 2022007). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/29">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/29</a> .	(Table 1, p. 3) Recommendation 1 ("Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix C, Table C.2, p. 92) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts on measures of general reading proficiency and ELA, passage reading fluency both oral and silent, reading comprehension, and word and pseudoword reading. (Table 1, p. 3) Recommendation 2 ("Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix C, Table C.2, p. 92) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2 reported statistically significant and positive impacts on measures of general reading proficiency and ELA, passage reading fluency both oral and silent, and reading comprehension. (Table 1, p. 3) Recommendation 3 ("Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help	(Appendix C, Table C.4, pp. 96-109) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 1 were conducted on students in grades 4-9 in urban and suburban schools throughout the U.S., including high percentages of EL students. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project. (Appendix C, Table C.6, pp.112-123) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 2 were conducted on linguistically diverse students, with the highest percentages among Black and Hispanic students. The settings ranged from rural districts to major cities. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project. (Appendix C, Table C.8, pp.126-140) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 2 were conducted on students in grades 4-9 in urban and suburban schools throughout the U.S., including high percentages of EL students. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.



	<p>students make sense of the text") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(Appendix C, Table C.2, p. 92) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2 reported statistically significant and positive impacts on measures of general reading proficiency and ELA, reading comprehension, and reading vocabulary.</p>	
<p>Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C.B., &amp; Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). Teaching secondary students to write effectively (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/22">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/22</a>.</p>	<p>(p. 9) Recommendation 1 ("Use a Model-Practice-Reflect instructional cycle to teach writing strategies") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(Appendix D, Table D2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant impacts on an increase in overall writing quality and writing output. All of the studies found positive effects on at least one writing outcome, including outcomes in the overall writing quality, genre elements, organization, word choice, writing output, and writing process domains.</p>	<p>(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) In some studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 1, teachers were provided with professional learning that emphasized writing strategy instruction. These studies also included general-education students, English learners, and students with learning and writing difficulties. Professional learning and training towards various student learning levels are proposed for the project.</p>
<p>Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., &amp; Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/21">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/21</a>.</p>	<p>(p. 14) Recommendation 2 ("Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(p. 15) Seventeen studies that examined interventions to help students develop an awareness of segmented sound and lettersound correspondences included relevant outcomes and positive effects in letter names and sounds and/or phonology outcomes, which contribute to the statistically significant "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 2.</p> <p>(p. 23) Recommendation 3 ("Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence".</p> <p>(p. 23) The body of evidence which contributed to Recommendation 3's label of "strong evidence" consistently indicated that the practices outlined in Recommendation 3 had positive effects on word reading and encoding outcomes for diverse students of all ability levels.</p>	<p>(Appendix D, Table D.5, pp. 69-73) The studies included diverse American students in the relevant grades-kindergarten and 1st grade; six studies included students at risk for reading difficulties, while 11 studies included readers at all levels. Twelve of the studies implemented the interventions with groups of two to eight students and supplemented regular literacy instruction. The studies typically compared students receiving the intervention to students receiving regular classroom instruction.</p> <p>(Appendix D, Table D.6, pp. 77-81) The study samples included students of various ability levels in kindergarten through 3rd grade. Four studies targeted kindergartners or 5-year-olds, three studies examined 1stgrade samples, two studies had a 2nd grade sample, and one study focused on 8-year-olds. The three remaining studies had samples that spanned multiple grades. Eight studies examined only students at risk for reading difficulties, and the other five studies included students of all ability levels. Recommendations 2 and 3 focus on early literacy from kindergarten through 3rd grade. This aligns with California's State Superintendent of Public Instruction's</p>

		commitment to ensuring that every California student learns to read by 3rd grade, by 2026. This therefore aligns with the proposed project's overall aims and <u>goals for this demographic of students.</u>
Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/19">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/19</a> .	(Table 1, p. 7) Recommendation 1 ("Teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix D, pp. 83-84) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant, and positive impacts, on measures of selection of informational texts and target academic words, explicit instruction in academic vocabulary, activities to promote word learning, and instruction in word-language strategies. (Table 1, p. 7) Recommendation 2 ("Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content area teaching") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (Appendix D, p. 89). Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2 reported statistically significant, and positive impacts, on measures of instructional tools to anchor instruction, explicit instruction in general and contentspecific academic vocabulary, opportunities for students to talk about content, and writing opportunities to extend learning of content material.	(Appendix D, Table D.1, pp. 85-87) Every study that supported Recommendation 1 as being backed by "strong evidence" involved English Learner students and resulted in statistically significant positive outcomes. This overlaps with the proposed project because California seeks to serve our large English Learner community in early literacy development and intervention. (Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 90) Every study that supported Recommendation 2 as being backed by "strong evidence" involved English Learner students and resulted in statistically significant positive outcomes. This overlaps with the proposed project because California seeks to serve our large English Learner community in early literacy development and intervention.
Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N.(2012).Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCEE 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/17">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/17</a> .	(Table 2, p. 9) Recommendation 2 ("Teach students to use the writing process for a variety of purposes") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence". (pp. 52-53) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence", supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 2, reported statistically significant and positive impacts when measuring overall writing quality.	(Appendix D, Table D.3, pp. 54-73) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting Recommendation 2 were conducted on students determined to be at risk. These study samples overlap with the populations proposed for the project.
Please see attached document titled Promising Evidence	Please see attached document titled Promising Evidence	Please see attached document titled Promising Evidence

## Instructions for Evidence Form

1. **Level of Evidence.** Check the box next to the level of evidence for which you are applying. See the Notice Inviting Applications for the evidence definitions.
2. **Citation and Relevance.** Fill in the chart for each of the studies you are submitting to meet the evidence standards. If allowable under the program you are applying for, you may add additional rows to include more than four citations. (See below for an example citation.)
  - a. **Research/Citation.** For Demonstrates a Rationale, provide the citation or link for the research or evaluation findings. For Promising, Moderate, and Strong Evidence, provide the full citation for each study or WWC publication you are using as evidence. If the study has been reviewed by the WWC, please include the rating it received, the WWC review standards version, and the URL link to the description of that finding in the WWC reviewed studies database. Include a copy of the study or a URL link to the study, if available. Note that, to provide promising, moderate, or strong evidence, you must cite either a specific recommendation from a WWC practice guide, a WWC intervention report, or a publicly available, original study of the effectiveness of a component of your proposed project on a student outcome or other relevant outcome.
  - b. **Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s).** For Demonstrates a Rationale, describe how the research or evaluation findings suggest that the project component included in the logic model is likely to improve relevant outcomes. For Promising, Moderate and Strong Evidence, describe: 1) the project component included in the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report) that is also a component of your proposed project, 2) the student outcome(s) or other relevant outcome(s) that are included in both the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report) and in the logic model (theory of action) for your proposed project, and 3) the study (or WWC intervention report) finding(s) or WWC practice guide recommendations supporting a favorable relationship between a project component and a relevant outcome. Cite page and table numbers from the study (or WWC practice guide or intervention report), where applicable.
  - c. **Project Component(s)/Overlap of Population and/or Settings.** For Demonstrates a Rationale, explain how the project component(s) is informed by the research or evaluation findings. For Promising, Moderate, and Strong Evidence, explain how the population and/or setting in your proposed project are similar to the populations and settings included in the relevant finding(s). Cite page numbers from the study or WWC publication, where applicable.

*EXAMPLES: For Demonstration Purposes Only (the three examples are not assumed to be cited by the same applicant)*

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C. B., & Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). <i>Teaching secondary students to write effectively</i> (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/22">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/22</a> . This report was prepared under Version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook (p. 72).	<p>(Table 1, p. 4) Recommendation 1 ("Explicitly teach appropriate strategies using a Model – Practice – Reflect instructional cycle") is characterized as backed by "strong evidence."</p> <p>(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 reported statistically significant and positive impacts of this practice on genre elements, organization, writing output, and overall writing quality.</p>	(Appendix D, Table D.2, pp. 70-72) Studies contributing to the "strong evidence" supporting the effectiveness of Recommendation 1 were conducted on students in grades 6 through 12 in urban and suburban school districts in California and in the Mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.

A. Research/Citation	B. Relevant Outcome(s)/Relevant Finding(s)	C. Project Component(s)/Overlap of Populations and/or Settings
<p>U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. (2017, February). Transition to College intervention report: Dual Enrollment Programs. Retrieved from <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Intervention/1043">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Intervention/1043</a>. This report was prepared under Version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook (p. 1).</p>	<p>(Table 1, p. 2) Dual enrollment programs were found to have positive effects on students' high school completion, general academic achievement in high school, college access and enrollment, credit accumulation in college, and degree attainment in college, and these findings were characterized by a "medium to large" extent of evidence.</p>	<p>(pp. 1, 19, 22) Studies contributing to the effectiveness rating of dual enrollment programs in the high school completion, general academic achievement in high school, college access and enrollment, credit accumulation in college, and degree attainment in college domains were conducted in high schools with minority students representing between 32 and 54 percent of the student population and first generation college students representing between 31 and 41 percent of the student population. These study samples overlap with both the populations and settings proposed for the project.</p>
<p>Bettinger, E.P., &amp; Baker, R. (2011). <i>The effects of student coaching in college: An evaluation of a randomized experiment in student mentoring</i>. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education. Available at <a href="https://ed.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/bettinger_baker_030711.pdf">https://ed.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/bettinger_baker_030711.pdf</a></p> <p>Meets WWC Group Design Standards without Reservations under review standards 2.1 (<a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/72030">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/72030</a>).</p>	<p>The intervention in the study is a form of college mentoring called student coaching. Coaches helped with a number of issues, including prioritizing student activities and identifying barriers and ways to overcome them. Coaches were encouraged to contact their assignees by either phone, email, text messaging, or social networking sites (pp. 8-10). The proposed project for Alpha Beta Community College students will train professional staff and faculty coaches on the most effective way(s) to communicate with their mentees, suggest topics for mentors to talk to their mentees, and be aware of signals to prevent withdrawal or academic failure.</p> <p>The relevant outcomes in the study are student persistence and degree completion (Table 3, p. 27), which are also included in the logic model for the proposed project.</p> <p>This study found that students assigned to receive coaching and mentoring were significantly more likely than students in the comparison group to remain enrolled at their institutions (pp. 15-16, and Table 3, p. 27).</p>	<p>The full study sample consisted of "13,555 students across eight different higher education institutions, including two- and four-year schools and public, private not-for-profit, and proprietary colleges." (p. 10) The number of students examined for purposes of retention varied by outcome (Table 3, p. 27). The study sample overlaps with Alpha Beta Community College in terms of both postsecondary students and postsecondary settings.</p>

**Paperwork Burden Statement:** According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0001. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to vary from 1 to 4 hours per response, with an average of 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to the Office of Innovation and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202

PR/Award # S371C240010