



California Department of Education

Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists Educator Training Grant Program Request for Applications

Administered by the:

California Department of Education
Educator Excellence and Equity Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4309
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901
PLIO@cde.ca.gov

Table of Contents

1. Overview	1
A. State Statute and Authority	1
B. Definition	2
C. Alignment to California Literacy Guidance and Initiatives	3
2. Program Description	9
A. Eligibility Requirements	9
B. Program Requirements	10
C. Goals	13
D. Responsibilities of the Grantee	18
E. Administrative Indirect Cost Rate	21
F. Reporting Requirements	21
3. Application Procedures and Processes	22
A. Application Timeline	22
B. Application Process	23
C. Application Review	23
D. Technical Assistance	24
E. Appeals Process	24
F. Grant Award Notification	24
G. Assurances, Certifications, Terms, and Conditions	25
4. Program Application	25
A. Application Narrative	26
B. Budget	31
C. Scoring Rubric	31
Appendices	54
Appendix A: Online Application Instructions	55
Appendix B: Budget Categories	65
Appendix C: Assembly Bill 181, Section 137 (Statutes of 2022)	67
Form A: Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists Grant Program: Lead Applicant Statement of Assurances	71

1. Overview

The California Department of Education (CDE) invites county offices of education (COEs), or consortia of COEs, to apply for funding through the Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists Educator Training (LCRSET) grant program to develop and provide preparation for educators to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists. The LCRSET program will support the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's (SSPI's) goal of all California students reading by third grade by 2026.

The duration of the project will be from August 2023 through March 31, 2027. The successful applicant must be able to demonstrate that their proposed project is evidence-based, conceptually clear, technically feasible, and leads or contributes to a culture of continuous improvement after the grant period.

To be eligible for this funding opportunity, COEs must submit an application in response to this Request for Applications (RFA) by the deadline posted on the LCRSET web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/lcrsprogram.asp>. The application must be signed by an individual with authority to submit applications for funding on behalf of the COE.

A. State Statute and Authority

The LCRSET Grant Program is authorized by Assembly Bill (AB) 181, Section 137 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022) (see Appendix C).

There are two parts to AB 181, Section 137. The first part was a direct allocation of \$225 million to eligible sites within local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop school literacy programs, employ and train literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists, and develop and implement interventions for pupils in need of targeted literacy support. These funds for the Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists (LCRS) program were issued to LEAs in January 2023.

The second part to AB 181, Section 137 is the subject of this RFA: the LCRSET Grant Program. The SSPI, in consultation with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), and subject to the approval of the State Board of Education (SBE) will award the sum of \$25 million to a COE, or consortium of COEs, to develop and provide training for educators to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists. The SSPI shall prioritize applicants with demonstrated success in improving literacy, especially among underperforming pupil groups, and who plan to partner with institutions of higher education (IHEs) with demonstrated success in providing statewide professional development for expert literacy practice. The goal of this grant will be to develop and provide training for educators to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists and provide support for the LEAs that received the LCRS allocation.

Funds appropriated for this purpose are available for encumbrance through June 30, 2027. The project period is from August 2023 to March 31, 2027.

Grant requirements and activities are subject to change if modifications to the program are made in subsequent budget cycles.

Note that COEs that participate in activities offered by the grantee may also participate in the Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program offered by the Commission. More information about this program can be found on the Commission's web page at

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/grant-funded-programs/reading-and-lit-supp-auth-incentive>.

Read Assembly Bill 181, Section 137 at the California Legislative web page:

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB181.

B. Definition of Evidence-Based Practices

For the purposes of this grant, the CDE provides the following definition of “evidence-based practices” to support applicants in completing this application.

Evidence-Based Practices

Professional learning (PL) through the LCRSET program shall prepare educators to implement evidence-based literacy strategies. As defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), an evidence-based practice is an activity, strategy, or intervention that “demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes” based on evidence.¹ Evidence-based practices are supported by data, repeatedly tested, and reproducible.

Evidence-based interventions are practices or programs that have evidence to show that they are effective at producing results and improving outcomes when implemented. This shift from “scientifically-based research” to “evidence-based” interventions was designed to help increase the impact of educational investments by ensuring that interventions being implemented have proven to be effective in leading to desired outcomes, namely improving student achievement. The evidence described in the ESSA has generally been produced through formal studies and research.² More information on evidence-based interventions

¹. Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law 114–95—December 10, 2015. Pages 291-292. Authenticated United States Government Information, Government Publishing Office. <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>.

². California Department of Education. 2022. Evidence-Based Interventions Under the ESSA. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/evidence.asp>. (accessed March 8, 2022).

is available on the CDE Evidence-Based Interventions Under the ESSA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/evidence.asp>.

The National Center on Intensive Intervention at the American Institutes for Research provides information on studies of academic intervention programs on its website at <https://charts.intensiveintervention.org/aintervention>. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) provides Intervention Reports—summaries of findings of the highest-quality research on a given intervention or practice in education—and Reviews of Individual Studies—summaries of individual studies that have been reviewed by the WWC. This information is available on the WWC website at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>.

C. Alignment to California Literacy Guidance and Initiatives

In the fall of 2021, SSPI Tony Thurmond announced a campaign to ensure that every California student will learn to read by third grade by the year 2026. The effort also includes a biliteracy milestone for dual-language learners. Achievement of this vision requires the alignment of literacy initiatives and guidance across the state. The LCRSET supports the achievement of this goal.

The grantee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be in alignment with existing guidance and statewide literacy initiatives, including, but not limited to:

The California English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework

The *California English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*³ was adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in 2014 and is California's foundational document for teaching literacy in kindergarten through grade 12. It is structured around the five key themes of meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills. These five themes cut across the strands of reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language, as detailed in the California Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts and Literacy (ELA/Literacy). They also encompass all three parts of the California English Language Development (ELD) Standards, "Interacting in Meaningful Ways," "Learning How English Works," and "Using Foundational Literacy Skills."

Chapter 2 of the *ELA/ELD Framework* gives an in-depth overview of these five key themes. It is available on the CDE *ELA/ELD Framework* web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/documents/elaeldfwchapter2.pdf>.

³ The *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education July 2014. Accessed February 10, 2023. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp>

Professional learning offered through the LCRSET grant should be firmly grounded in all five key themes of the *ELA/ELD Framework* as well as the document overall. Please review the *ELA/ELD Framework* on the CDE *ELA/ELD Framework* web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/>.

Teacher Preparation Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations

Adopted by the Commission in October 2022, the Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for teacher preparation encompass the study of effective means of teaching literacy across all disciplines. The standards and TPEs are rooted in the ELA/Literacy Standards, the ELD standards, and the *ELA/ELD Framework*. They are also grounded in Universal Design for Learning and asset-based pedagogies and incorporate elements of the California Comprehensive State Literacy Plan (SLP). Preparation and PL offered through the LCRSET program should align with the standards and TPEs for literacy.

All of the guidance and documents referenced in this RFA are reflected within the standards and TPEs for literacy, and as such they should be considered a foundational resource for all applicants. Read the adopted standards and TPEs for literacy on the Commission's web page:

https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms-ss-literacy-standard-tpes.pdf?sfvrsn=eea226b1_

Additionally, the Commission has an authorization and credential for reading and literacy:

- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (CL-812)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-\(cl-812\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-(cl-812))
- Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (CL-537)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-\(CL-537\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-(CL-537))

Preparation and PL offered under the LCRSET should also align with the authorization and credential from the Commission.

California Comprehensive State Literacy Plan

An important goal for the grantee will be to support educators in integrating and implementing state guidance on high-quality, evidence-based literacy instruction. The SLP is grounded in the *ELA/ELD Framework*, encompasses birth through grade 12 instruction, and is designed to build local capacity to effectively address student literacy needs.

The SLP provides a Comprehensive and Integrated Literacy Model designed to set the direction for literacy programs statewide by aligning and integrating state literacy guidance. This model centers on best first instruction and ensures high-quality, evidence-based literacy instruction occurs within the context of inclusive and equitable systems of schooling featuring high levels of engagement, a focus on continuous improvement, and application of California's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Framework. This inclusive and equitable system of supports for all students requires

- a focus on family and community engagement;
- celebration of diversity and an asset-based approach;
- attention to whole child needs; and
- well-prepared and supported teachers and leaders.⁴

A downloadable PDF version of the SLP is available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/documents/cacompstatelitplan.pdf>.

Multi-Tiered System of Support

Multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) is an integrated, comprehensive framework that focuses on the CCSS, core instruction, differentiated learning, student-centered learning, individualized student needs, and the alignment of systems necessary for all students' academic, behavioral, and social success.⁵

The following CDE resources support literacy in strong MTSS first instruction (Tier 1) and should be incorporated into the LCRSET grant program:

- The California CCSS for ELA/Literacy, available on the CDE CCSS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/>.
- The California ELD Standards, available on the CDE ELD Standards web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp>.
- The *ELA/ELD Framework*, including the five key themes of meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills. The *ELA/ELD Framework* is available on the CDE *ELA/ELD Framework* web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cfi/>.
- The *California Dyslexia Guidelines*, available on the CDE Dyslexia web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/dy/>.

⁴. California Comprehensive State Literacy Plan. Page 34. Adopted by the California State Board of Education March 2021. Accessed on October 6, 2021. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/documents/stateliteracyplan2021fin.docx>.

⁵. California Comprehensive State Literacy Plan. Page 12.

- *Improving Education for Multilingual and English Learner (EL) Students*, available on the CDE Improving Education: Research to Practice web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/improvingmleeducation.asp>.
- The *California Practitioners' Guide for Educating ELs with Disabilities*, available on the CDE website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/ab2785guide.pdf>.

Additionally, the Scaling Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS) Initiative focuses on: (1) developing resources for MTSS within an LEA that align the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional supports to serve the whole child; (2) improving school climate to encourage LEAs to establish and align schoolwide, data-driven systems of academic and behavioral supports to more effectively meet the needs of California's diverse learners in the most inclusive environments; and (3) supporting schoolwide and districtwide implementation of services or practices aligned to the MTSS Framework. These goals involve family and community engagement, administrative leadership, integrated education frameworks, and inclusive policy and practice. PL under the LCRSET grant should also reflect these principles. Additional information is available on the CDE MTSS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/>.

Additional Statewide Literacy Initiatives

In order to work toward the SSPI's goal of all students reading by third grade, it is critical that this grantee align its work with other literacy initiatives in California. These include but are not limited to:

- 21st Century California School Leadership Academy: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ai/ca21csla.asp>
- Grantees of the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/clsd.asp>
- Grantee of the Reading Instruction and Intervention grant: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/riigrant.asp>
- Grantee(s) of the Educator Workforce Investment Grant (EWIG) for EL Roadmap Policy Implementation: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/ewiglrmpolicy.asp>
- Grantee(s) of the EWIG for Special Education-Related PL: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/fo/r18/seewig19rfa.asp>
- California Dyslexia Initiative: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/dy/cadyslexiainitiative.asp>

D. Alignment to Other California Guidance and Policy

Family Engagement

Families are integral to student literacy and executive functioning skill development, as well as student achievement. A focus of the LCRSET grant is to support LEAs with eligible sites for LCRS (see AB 181, Section 137) funds in developing and implementing a family literacy initiative. The California Family Engagement Framework and accompanying toolkit provide direction for the grantee in working with families and communities to plan, implement, and evaluate family engagement practices. The framework and toolkit are available on the CDE Family/Parent web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/pf/>.

Asset-Based/Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Culturally sustaining pedagogy builds upon preceding asset-based pedagogies. It encompasses the following features: valuing community languages, practices, and ways of being; school accountability to the community; connecting the curriculum to cultural and linguistic histories; and sustaining cultural and linguistic practices, while providing access to the dominant culture.⁶ The CDE's EL Roadmap and Improving Education for Multilingual and EL Students provide insight on supporting multilingual students in a culturally sustaining way. Culturally sustaining pedagogies require educators to be aware of classroom materials, structure, and culture to ensure a safe and relevant learning environment. The grantee should support LEAs under the LCRS grant to implement culturally sustaining policies, pedagogy, and curriculum. Additional information is available on the CDE website on the links below:

- Asset-Based Pedagogies: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/assetbasedpedagogies.asp>
- Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/culturallysustainingped.asp>
- EL Roadmap: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/>
- *Improving Education for Multilingual and EL Students*: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/improvingmleeducation.asp>

⁶. California Department of Education. 2021. Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. Accessed on September 21, 2021. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/culturallysustainingped.asp>.

Well-Prepared and Supported Teachers and Leaders

To ensure teachers and leaders are well-prepared, care should be taken to ensure that PL opportunities are aligned to the CDE's Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS). The QPLS serve as a foundation for the content, processes, and conditions essential to all educator PL over time, which leads to improved educator knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Seven interdependent standards support PL that are:

- Rooted in student and educator needs demonstrated through data
- Focused on content and pedagogy
- Designed to ensure equitable outcomes
- Designed and structured to be ongoing, intensive, and embedded in practice
- Collaborative with an emphasis on shared accountability
- Supported by adequate resources
- Coherent and aligned with other standards, policies, and programs

Additional information about the QPLS is available on the CDE QPLS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/qpls.asp>.

The California Subject Matter Project (CSMP) is a network of nine discipline-based statewide projects housed at IHEs that provide content-specific, regional PL supporting teacher PL communities and maintaining the critical link between higher education and transitional kindergarten through grade twelve. The CSMP, and particularly the California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP), can serve as a valuable partner to the grantee as they support PL across the state. More information about the CSMP can be found on the CSMP website at <https://csmp.ucop.edu/>.

Data-Informed Interventions

In order to ensure all students are learning, PL through the LCRSET grant must focus on preparing literacy coaches and reading specialists to support teachers in collecting and responding to student performance data, including effectively collecting, analyzing, and responding to data, prior to, during, and after interventions are administered. Therefore, an important part of the LCRSET grant will be collecting and analyzing student level data, disaggregated by group. Information on collecting, analyzing, and responding to assessment data can be found in Chapter 8 of the *ELA/ELD Framework* document: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/documents/elaeldfwchapter8.pdf>.

2. Program Description

A. Eligibility Requirements

The CDE shall allocate grant funding to an eligible COE. The CDE shall prioritize and award points to applicants that propose partnerships with an IHE, or a consortium of IHEs, that has demonstrated success in providing statewide PL for expert literacy practice. Examples include IHEs that partner with the CRLP and those that support educators in obtaining the reading and literacy added authorization and/or specialist credential accredited by the Commission. A list of CRLP sites can be found at the CRLP's Regional Sites web page: <https://crlpstatewideoffice.ucsd.edu/regional-sites/index.html>. More information on the added authorization and specialist credential can be found here:

- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (CL-812)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-\(cl-812\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-(cl-812))
- Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (CL-537)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-\(CL-537\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-(CL-537))

A list of IHEs that are approved by the Commission to offer the added authorization and/or specialist credential can be found on the Commission's Approved Institutions and Programs web page:
<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/reports/data/approved-institutions-and-programs>.

COEs may also partner as a consortium with other COEs in the development of the proposal and throughout the duration of the grant period. If a consortium of COEs submits an application, one COE must be identified as the Lead Applicant.

As stated in AB 181, Section 137 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022), the grantee must demonstrate success in improving literacy, especially among underperforming pupil groups. To satisfy this requirement, applicants will be prompted to detail their previous experience with and evidence of success in providing PL and coaching to LEAs in the following areas:

- Developing school literacy programs
- Preparing and providing PL for literacy coaches and reading specialists
- Implementing evidence-based literacy instruction and interventions, including implementation of dual language acquisition and ELD programs, culturally sustaining curriculum and instruction, the use of data to support effective instruction, the use of data to identify and support struggling pupils, and the *ELA/ELD Framework*

- Implementing evidence-based family literacy initiatives

All aspects of this project must be rooted in evidence-based practices. Applicants are required to cite their evidence and provide a works cited page as part of the application.

B. Program Requirements

Leadership

The grantee will work closely with the CDE and any project partners over the course of this grant. The grantee will participate on an advisory committee composed of COE and CDE staff and led by the CDE, in monthly virtual meetings to review current and upcoming grant activities. All grant activities will be subject to prior approval by the CDE.

Development

The grantee will create a solid foundation for this project, ensuring that it is well-rounded and informed by practitioners in the field, by using grant funds to inform the PL for literacy coaches with an in-person convening of literacy coaches from across the state. The grantee will solicit participation from these literacy coaches, gather and implement feedback from the convening participants, and ensure that any materials or resources developed as a result are aligned with California guidance, policy, and frameworks in order to develop participants' knowledge of literacy instruction and skills in leadership.

Additionally, the grantee will provide opportunities for educators interested in receiving the required added authorization and/or credential for becoming a reading specialist, as well as use the class curriculum for becoming a reading specialist to inform the PL for literacy coaches. A grantee who proposes partnership with an IHE or consortium of IHEs should work with them to perform this task.

Collaboration and Communication

The grantee will meet monthly with the advisory committee to review work and collaborate on next steps. The grantee will also collaborate with and facilitate meetings among the LEAs across the state that received LCRS funds, as well as any partner agencies, such as IHEs, the CSMP, other COEs, other literacy initiatives, etc. The grantee will use these partnerships to host several events, including, but not limited to, statewide panel discussions and literacy summits.

A critical aspect of the grantee's work will be to incentivize LEAs that receive LCRS funds to participate in the activities led by the grantee. This will entail hosting communities of practice on a quarterly basis and in response to LEA needs, such as communities of practice focusing on the needs of rural LEAs, as well as local PL events in the north, central, and southern regions of the state. The grantee will also provide opportunities for the LEAs to share their work with each other and gather feedback from the LEAs to inform offered PL and resources.

The grantee will also provide regular communications on grant work to update all educational partners on their activities. This will include media releases, newsletters, conference presentations, presentations to the SSPI's Literacy and Biliteracy Task Force, and regular work with the selected evaluator to review data collected and discuss best practices for dissemination.

Alignment

The grantee will support each required element of the LCRSET grant program with evidence-based strategies, including assessments, that align with state guidance, policy, standards, and frameworks. Professional learning should also align with the Commission's newly adopted Literacy Standards and TPEs for the state's teacher education programs to inform the PL for both literacy coaches and reading specialists. Review the Commission's Literacy Standards and TPEs on the Commission's web page at https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms-ss-literacy-standard-tpes.pdf?sfvrsn=eea226b1_3. The Commission also has an added authorization and a specialist credential for reading and literacy:

- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (CL-812)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-\(cl-812\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/reading-and-literacy-added-authorization-(cl-812))
- Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (CL-537)
[https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-\(CL-537\)](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/Reading-Literacy-Leadership-Special-Cred-(CL-537))

Preparation and PL offered under the LCRSET should align with the 2022 Commission credential requirements for literacy. Grantees are encouraged to partner with an IHE, particularly those supporting the CRLP or offering educators an added authorization and/or specialist credential for reading and literacy.

A list of CRLP sites can be found at the CRLP's Regional Sites web page: <https://crlpstatewideoffice.ucsd.edu/regional-sites/index.html>.

A list of IHEs that are approved by the Commission to offer the authorization and/or credential can be found on the Commission's Approved Institutions and Programs web page: <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/reports/data/approved-institutions-and-programs>.

See Section 1.C for a full description of California's Literacy Guidance and Initiatives.

Implementation and Expansion

The grantee will develop and disseminate PL and support, resources, and PL materials across the state to all sites that have received the allocation, as well as differentiated PL and support to meet the needs of the local context. To learn more about differentiating PL to meet local needs, review the QPLS on the CDE QPLS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/qpls.asp>. The grantee will incentivize all LEAs that receive LCRS funds to participate in the PL and adopt the resources developed through this grant program. The grantee will expand upon existing structures to ensure resources created through the grant are available free of charge after the grant's completion.

The grantee will also support teachers with PL on providing best first instruction, along with collaboratively collecting and analyzing student data, making instructional adjustments, identifying students needing interventions and providing those interventions promptly, and monitoring ongoing student progress. The grantee will ensure PL opportunities are provided to urban, suburban, and rural settings throughout the state and are differentiated to meet the needs of local communities and diverse student populations.

Evaluation

As part of the LCRSET program, the grantee will be required, in consultation with and subject to the approval of the SBE and the SSPI, to contract with an independent evaluator. The grantee must commit to engaging in a request for proposals process after receiving the grant award to select an independent evaluator. The evaluation will include, but is not limited to, an examination of the following:

- How funds were used to employ literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists
- How funds were used to develop and implement school literacy programs, including assessment and ongoing monitoring of student performance, provision of needed interventions, and coaching of classroom teachers
- How expenditures impacted pupils' literacy achievement, including for pupil groups
- How the LEAs plan to continue to fund literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists past the award period

- How the offerings developed and provided by the grantee impacted the preparation and PL of literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists, including but not limited to the literacy knowledge and leadership skills.

To support this evaluation, the grantee will collect and monitor data to ensure professional learning project goals are being met, including meeting the overarching SSPI goal of students reading by third grade. The grantee's PL will directly impact classroom instruction that results in improved student outcomes, disaggregated by student group, and will impact the knowledge and skills of participating coaches, specialists, and classroom teachers. The grantee will also collect data on all community literacy events. Additionally, the grantee will review grantee and LEA activities and work with the CDE and the evaluator to develop interim and final reports.

C. Goals

The grantee will support PL project goals as well as achieving the goal of California students reading by third grade by 2026 by working with the CDE to build the capacity of LEAs receiving LCRS funds. The grantee will align all PL offerings to teacher preparation standards and TPEs, the *ELA/ELD Framework*, the SLP, the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy, the California ELD Standards, and the QPLS. Preparation and PL opportunities provided by the grantee must support educators to do all of the following:

1. Develop and implement school literacy programs, including school literacy plans with metrics to measure progress toward goals and actions.
2. Develop the knowledge and skills necessary, including literacy knowledge and leadership skills, to become literacy coaches.
3. Attain the required specialist credential and/or added authorization to become a reading specialist; attain, if qualified, their bilingual authorization; and participate in PL aligned to the Commission's literacy standards and TPEs.
4. Develop knowledge and skills in literacy instruction, including implementation of the *ELA/ELD Framework*, the development and implementation of culturally sustaining curriculum and instruction, and the use of assessment data to identify and support effective instruction and struggling students and diverse learners, including early learners, EL students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia.
5. Develop knowledge and skills for appropriate identification and use of screening instruments, assessment strategies, and evidence-based literacy instruction, including biliteracy instruction, for diverse learners.
6. Implement intensive intervention strategies for pupils struggling with literacy, including tutoring and small group strategies, and strategies for target pupil

groups based on data.

7. Develop and implement family literacy plans that identify literacy and biliteracy goals, benchmarks, activities, and roles for all family members, as well as promote the availability of the State Seal of Biliteracy.

Quality Professional Learning Standards

Preparation and PL opportunities must align with the best evidence regarding effective learning for educators. This includes, but is not limited to, the QPLS and sample indicators as described in the table below.

Quality Professional Learning Standards and Sample Indicators

Standard	Sample Indicators
Data: Uses varied sources and kinds of information to guide priorities, design, and assessment	● Uses formative and summative student achievement data, disaggregated by race, gender, EL student status, special needs, foster youth, and/or socioeconomic status, to identify critical student needs that require improved instruction, support, and leadership. ● Develops educators' ability to meet students' academic, cultural, social, physical, and emotional needs. ● Collects and reviews evidence of changes and/or improvements in collective practice.

Standard	Sample Indicators
Content and Pedagogy: Enhances educators' expertise to increase students' capacity to learn and thrive	• Focuses on specific teaching strategies associated with discipline-specific curriculum content that supports teacher learning within the teachers' classroom contexts. • Deepens and extends subject-matter knowledge within educators' own discipline and across other disciplines. • Increases educators' use of linguistically and culturally sustaining materials. • Creates multiple opportunities, in different settings, including built-in time for educators to practice, to receive feedback, and to revise their practice by the facilitation of reflection and solicitation of feedback. • Uses instructional techniques and strategies, such as using authentic artifacts and interactive activities, that educators then use with students. • Develops knowledge of, and skills for, how to address students' academic, cultural, social, physical, and emotional well-being.
Equity: Focuses on equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students, with an emphasis on addressing achievement and opportunity disparities between student groups	• Helps educators develop and understand that building on students' abilities, perspectives, and potential contributes to increased student learning. • Ensures that all educators have equitable access to effective PL and support. • Supports educators to build trusting relationships with students, their families, communities, and one another; provides messages of high expectations; and creates opportunities for meaningful participation.

Standard	Sample Indicators
Design and Structure: Reflects evidence-based approaches, recognizing that focused, sustained learning enables educators to acquire, implement, and assess improved practices	• Provides educators with dedicated time within the school schedule and leverages extended-time opportunities to learn, practice, implement, assess, and reflect upon new strategies that facilitate changes in their practice. • Uses curriculum models, such as lesson plans, unit plans, sample student work, observations of peer teachers, and video or written cases of teaching that provide teachers with a clear vision of effective practices. • Actively engages educators in inquiry centered on authentic problems and instructional practices designed to be job-embedded and situated in a realistic work setting so that theoretical learning and its practical applications are directly linked.
Collaboration and Shared Accountability: Facilitates the development of a shared purpose for student learning and collective responsibility for achieving it	• Ensures that educators interact with content and are provided space to share ideas and collaborate in the learning—often in job-embedded contexts—to create communities that positively change the culture and instruction of their entire grade level, department, school, and/or district. • Sets clear purposes, goals, and working agreements that support the sharing of practices and results within a safe and supportive environment. • Structures collective learning around an evidence-based cycle of continuous learning and improvement, maintaining a consistent focus on shared goals.

Standard	Sample Indicators
Resources: Dedicates resources that are adequate, accessible, and allocated appropriately toward established priorities and outcomes	• Capitalizes on relationships with networks that have specialized expertise or resources, in order to extend educators' access to resources not available locally. • Uses technology to support cross-community communication and extend educators' access to learning and resources. • Recognizes the leadership capacity of internal staff to present, facilitate, or coach targeted PL. • Capitalizes on flexible staffing arrangements that allow for peer-to-peer learning. • Requires that time for collaboration and learning is made available in an ongoing and systematic way. • Develops a cycle of activities, including theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, reflection, and coaching, that are spaced over time. • Uses time within the school day for practice-embedded learning, but also provides release time when needed. • Provides technology (hardware, software, and web-based) to enable educator learning, practice, and use of equipment and materials.

Standard	Sample Indicators
Alignment and Coherence: Contributes to a coherent system of educator learning and support that connects district and school priorities and needs with state and federal requirements and resources	• Offers learning and practice activities that are directed toward meeting educators' professional and performance standards. For this grant, this also specifically includes alignment with the Commission's Literacy Standards and TPEs, which can be found on the Commission's web page: https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms-ss-literacy-standard-tpes.pdf?sfvrsn=eea226b1_3. • Reflects classroom, school, and district goals for students and educator growth, to which policies, structures, and practices are aligned. • Supports novice educators' induction and their ability to apply theoretical learning to real-world assignments and reflect upon results and next steps. • Continuously extends experienced educators' capacity to meet professional expectations and to meet the needs of all students through a coordinated system.
	• Enables skilled veteran educators to assist novice educators and peers and to lead schoolwide and districtwide initiatives.

Source: CDE. 2015. Adapted from the QPLS.

D. Responsibilities of the Grantee

The grantee will focus on professional learning that supports the goal of students reading by third grade by doing the following:

- Work with the CDE as part of the advisory committee in all aspects of this grant.
- Incentivize LEAs receiving LCRS funds to participate in PL opportunities and use grant-developed resources to build their capacity.
- Inform literacy coach PL by gathering literacy coaches to develop resources and materials.

- Provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain the required added authorization or specialist credential to become reading specialists and encourage those that qualify to attain their bilingual authorization.
- Create and facilitate communities of practice on a quarterly basis and in response to LEA needs, such as communities of practice focusing on the needs of rural LEAs as well as local PL events in the northern, central, and southern regions of California to support LEAs across the state and provide opportunities for LEAs to collaborate and share with each other on topics related to the LCRSET.
- Generate and disseminate PL opportunities for educators across the state, including webinars, resources, and statewide literacy conferences, in the areas of:
 - Evidence-based literacy instruction
 - Culturally sustaining curriculum and instruction
 - Identifying and using assessment approaches and instruments and analyzing resulting data to support effective instruction and identify and support struggling students
 - The implementation of the *ELA/ELD Framework*
 - Developing and implementing school literacy plans
 - Becoming literacy coaches
 - Establishing an evidence-based family literacy initiative
 - Any other topic identified as necessary by the LEAs, all of which will support diverse learners, including early learners, EL students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia
- Ensure all PL opportunities are aligned with the literacy initiatives that are outlined in Section 1.C and the Commission's Literacy Standards and TPEs provided on the Commission's web page:
https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/ms-ss-literacy-standard-tpes.pdf?sfvrsn=eea226b1_3
- Follow a communication plan set by the CDE, including monthly meetings, communications, and conference presentations as needed.
- Ensure that any new instructional and PL materials developed as a result of this grant are available as open educational resources during and beyond the life of the grant.

- Work with the selected evaluator to collect data, analyze it annually, and adjust course as necessary, ensuring that the data collected is disaggregated by student group and reflects progress toward the goals of the project and of students reading by third grade. Other data will include metrics measuring the outcomes of PL opportunities, including quantitative and qualitative measures.
- Monitor the performance of any services provided through funds awarded under this grant by partners, consultants, or other organizations.
- Receive and administer the grant funds and submit the required reports to account for the use of grant funds.

Allowable and Non-Allowable Activities and Costs

Applicant budgets for the use of grant funds will be reviewed by the CDE grant reviewers and any items that are deemed non-allowable, excessive, or inappropriate will be rejected and will impact an applicant's final score. Generally, all expenditures must contribute to the goals and objectives outlined in Overview and Program Description (Sections 1 and 2 of this RFA). Funds may not be used for rental of a venue to provide professional development unless the expense is determined by the CDE to be a necessary and reasonable expense. Funds provided under this grant may not be used for the following purposes:

- Supplanting of existing funding and efforts
- Acquisition of equipment for administrative or personal use
- Acquisition of furniture (e.g., bookcases, chairs, desks, file cabinets, tables), unless an integral part of an equipment workstation or to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities
- Food services, refreshments, banquets, meals
- Purchase of space
- Payment for memberships in professional organizations
- Purchase of promotional favors, such as bumper stickers, pencils, pens, or T-shirts
- Subscriptions to journals or magazines
- Travel outside the United States
- Travel to states included in AB 1887's travel prohibition list found at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab1887>.

Direct Costs

Direct costs for this grant are those costs that can be identified specifically with a particular final cost objective. Costs incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, must be treated consistently as either direct or indirect costs.

The salaries of administrative and clerical staff should normally be treated as indirect costs. Direct charging of these costs may be appropriate only if all of the following conditions are met:

- Administrative or clerical services are integral to a project or activity.
- Individuals involved can be specifically identified with the project or activity.
- Direct costs are explicitly included in the budget.
- Direct costs are not also recovered as indirect costs.

Note: If salary costs are included in the budget, they should reflect anticipated annual increases over the life of the grant period.

E. Administrative Indirect Cost Rate

Information regarding indirect cost rates, as well as responses to frequently asked questions, is available on the CDE Indirect Cost Rates web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/ic/>.

Certain types of costs (activities) require relatively minimal administrative support compared to the amount of dollars spent. These costs would distort the indirect cost process and are excluded from the calculation of the indirect cost rate. The most common costs excluded from the calculation are Subagreements for Services (Object Code 5100), which include expenditures for subagreements and subawards pursuant to certain contracts, subcontracts, and subgrants.

Unlike other costs in Object Codes 5000–5999, Object Code 5100 costs are excluded from the calculation of the indirect cost rate and from eligible program expenditures on which indirect costs are charged (see Procedure 915). However, in recognition that some general administration is necessary to process a subagreement, indirect cost guidelines allow that up to \$25,000 of each individual subagreement may be coded to Object Code 5800, Professional/Consulting Services and Operating Expenditures, with the remainder charged to Object Code 5100. The amount charged to Object Code 5800 is included in the calculation of the indirect cost rate and in eligible program expenditures on which indirect costs are charged. The \$25,000 limit per subagreement applies each year throughout the duration of the subagreement.

F. Reporting Requirements

An integral part of the reporting requirements is ongoing communication with the

CDE and the selected evaluator. The grantee will participate in regular meetings with the CDE and participate in all required evaluation activities as requested by the CDE.

The grantee is required to do the following:

- Provide a written quarterly expenditure and progress report to the CDE demonstrating expenditures are consistent with the agreed-upon budget.
- Provide an annual report to the CDE on the achievement towards the goals, objectives, and actions described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified in the applicant's program application. The grantee must provide a summary of activities in the annual report identifying both individual and collective contributions including, but not limited to:
 - Student outcome data demonstrating impact on student achievement and adjustments to the plan in response to the data
 - Number of activities accomplished; the impact of these activities on educator capacity; and the number of teachers, paraprofessionals, school leaders, districts, counties, and regions impacted by these activities

If the grantee does not provide the required reports to the CDE, program activities are not completed as agreed upon, there is a lack of participation in meetings, or there is a negative trend in the dissemination of technical assistance, the CDE may halt funding at any time.

3. Application Procedures and Processes

A. Application Timeline

Activity	Date
RFA Release	Week of April 3, 2023*
Application Workshop Webinar	April 10, 2023*
Applications Due	May 26, 2023, by 4 p.m.*
Intent to Award Posted	Week of July 10, 2023*
Appeals Due	Week of July 17, 2023*
Notification of Final Award Posted	Week of July 31, 2023*

Grant Work Begins	August 2023*
--------------------------	--------------

*Timeline subject to change. Refer to the CDE LCRS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/lcrsprogram.asp> for the most up-to-date timeline.

B. Application Process

The application will consist of four general types of information: (1) Applicant Information, (2) Applicant Narrative, (3) Budget Information, and (4) Attachments. In completing the application narrative, applicants should address the prompts in each section of the narrative description and refer to the scoring rubric in Section 4, Part C.

Applicants must submit the application by **4 p.m. on May 26, 2023**, through the online application system accessed on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. The timeline is subject to change. Refer to the CDE LCRS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/lcrsprogram.asp> for the most up-to-date information.

Note:

- The Lead Applicant will receive email confirmation of the information submitted. If changes need to be made, the Lead Applicant must resubmit the entire application **prior to the submission deadline**.
- The last submitted application will be the one considered for review.
- The CDE is not able to modify the application information after it is submitted.
- Incomplete or late applications will not be considered. Please allow time to account for unanticipated technical issues.

C. Application Review

Complete applications submitted by the deadline will be reviewed for eligibility by the CDE and evaluated by a reading panel of CDE staff with expertise in literacy and PL using the scoring rubric. Reviewers will certify that they have no conflicts of interest relating to applicants. Members of the reading panel will be instructed to take a holistic approach in the application review process to rank and evaluate each application. The readers will make every effort to allow any part of the narrative to satisfy the evaluation points in the rubric.

Each applicant will receive a single score. Although scores from the review of the applications are important, they are not the sole determiners for funding. When selecting a project to award, the panelists will consider statutory requirements that

prioritize grantees with demonstrated success in improving literacy, especially among underperforming student groups, as well as for grantees planning on partnering with IHEs with demonstrated success in providing statewide professional development for expert literacy practice. Applicants may be invited to interview with CDE and/or SBE staff as part of the selection process. All costs associated with the interviews will be the responsibility of the applicant.

The proposed awardee is subject to approval by the Executive Director of the SBE. The CDE reserves the right to not make an award if no application submitted meets the requirements of this RFA.

D. Technical Assistance

CDE staff will conduct a virtual application information session to provide an overview of the RFA and offer potential applicants the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. The date and time of the LCRSET information session is **April 10, 2023, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.** Register on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. Note that the timeline is subject to change. Refer to the CDE LCRS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/lcrsprogram.asp> for the most up-to-date information.

E. Appeals Process

The CDE must receive requests for appeal no later than the due date provided on the timeline posted on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. Only the Lead Applicant may electronically submit an appeal via the link on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page. Appeals submitted via means other than the electronic link will **not** be accepted.

Appeals are limited to the grounds that the CDE failed to correctly apply the RFA's specified standards for reviewing the application; however, disagreement with an application reader's professional judgment is not grounds for appeal, and appeals based on such disagreement will be denied. The appellant must file a full and complete written appeal, include the issue(s) in dispute, the legal authority or other basis for the appeal position, and the remedy sought. The CDE will not consider incomplete or late appeals. The appellant may not supply any new information that was not contained in the original application. A final decision will be provided in writing within 10 business days from the date that appeals are due to the CDE for this specific RFA.

F. Grant Award Notification

The applicant selected for funding will receive a Grant Award Notification (AO-400), the official CDE document that awards funds to local projects. The grantee and fiscal

agent must be the same entity. The superintendent of the COE, acting as the fiscal agent, must sign and return the AO-400 to the CDE before funds are disbursed.

G. Assurances, Certifications, Terms, and Conditions

The selected awardee may be requested to revise budgets prior to receiving a grant award. Following final program and budget negotiations, funds will be issued only after a signed agreement on the terms of the award has been received by the CDE.

Assurances and Certifications

The superintendent of the COE, acting as the fiscal agent, must agree to Form A: LCRSET Lead Applicant Statement of Assurances as well as the CDE's general assurances and certifications. General assurances and certifications are available on the CDE Funding Forms web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/fo/fm/ff.asp>.

Applicants do not need to sign and return these documents with the application. Instead, applicants must maintain them on file and have them available for compliance reviews, complaint investigations, or audits.

Terms and Conditions

The grant award will be processed upon receipt of the signed AO-400. The AO-400 must be signed by the authorized fiscal agent and returned to the CDE within 10 working days of receipt.

All funds must be expended or legally obligated by the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the 2022–23 fiscal year, and for not more than the maximum amount indicated on the AO-400. Encumbrances may be made at any time after the beginning date of the grant stated on the AO-400. No extensions of this grant will be allowed.

A budget revision is required if expenditures for any budget category exceed 10 percent of the authorized budget item total in the approved budget. The budget revision must be approved by the CDE before expenditures are made.

The budgets should display annual implementation showing how the grant will be used to fulfill the goals and responsibilities described within the RFA. Proposed expenditures must demonstrate appropriate use of state funds.

Note: Funding requested for purchases over \$5,000 in Capital Outlay, Category 6000, requires approval by the CDE.

4. Program Application

The complete LCRSET Grant Application is submitted electronically and is available on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. See Appendix A for instructions. Through the online application, applicants must attach supporting evidence, including the proposed budget, project timeline, works cited, and letters of commitment.

A. Application Narrative

Successful applicants must be able to demonstrate that their proposed project is conceptually clear, evidence-based, technically feasible, sustainable, scalable, and leads or contributes to a culture of continuous improvement after the grant period. To complete the narrative, applicants must:

- Address the prompts for the sections below.
- Refer to the scoring rubric in Part 4.C to understand how responses will be evaluated by the reading panel.
- Follow all application instructions in Appendix A. Application Narrative.

Part 1a—Project Plan: Theory of Action

1. Articulate a theory of action which will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI's goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Includes an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.

The U.S. Department of Education defines a theory of action as:

A well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice (i.e., the active “ingredients” that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally.⁷

⁷. *Non-regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments*. U.S. Department of Education web document

Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications

Part 1b contains sets of two related prompts. The first prompt of each set provides applicants with the opportunity to describe how the proposed PL will increase educator capacity in a particular area and to identify the corresponding evidence base. The second prompt provides an opportunity to specify relevant expertise, experience, and qualifications related to that same area. At the end of this section, applicants will be required to submit a works cited page.

- 1.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of **evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the *ELA/ELD Framework* and dual language acquisition and ELD programs**, for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 1.b Describe the applicant’s previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of **evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the *ELA/ELD Framework* and dual language acquisition and ELD programs**, as described above. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
- 2.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of **reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners**, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 2.b Describe the applicant’s previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of **reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners**, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
- 3.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment **data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers**. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 3.b Describe the applicant’s previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of

assessment **data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers.** Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.

- 4.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of **evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy.** Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 4.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of **evidence-based intensive literacy assessments, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy.** Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
- 5.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of **developing and implementing a school literacy plan.** Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 5.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of **developing and implementing a school literacy plan.** Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
- 6.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of **developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction.** Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
- 6.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader **knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction.** Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
- 7.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of **developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative,** including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy; and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.

- 7.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of **developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative**, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy; and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.

Applicants will also be asked to provide a works cited that details the evidence base for all PL and strategies mentioned in the project plan.

Part 1c—Project Plan: Professional Learning Dissemination

1. Provide an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.
2. Provide an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.
3. Provide an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators, including those intending to be literacy coaches, employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.
4. Describe how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.
5. Describe the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those becoming literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.
6. Provide a project timeline for implementation of proposed activities that includes approximate dates for implementation of all major proposed activities, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.

Part 2—Alignment

1. Describe how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy; the California ELD standards; and all five themes of the *ELA/ELD Framework*, including language development, meaning making, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills; and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*.
2. Describe how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission's work.

Part 3—Expanding Capacity

1. Describe how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.
2. Explain how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.

Part 4—Priority Points: Institution of Higher Education

The CDE shall prioritize and award points to applicants that propose partnerships with an IHE or a consortium of IHEs with demonstrated success in providing statewide professional development for expert literacy practice, especially those that can support educators in obtaining reading and literacy added authorization and/or specialist credential, as defined by the Commission.

1. If applicable, describe how the Lead Applicant will work together to implement proposed activities in a consortium with one or more IHEs. Describe the proposed role, relevant expertise and experience, and applicable qualifications of IHEs, including how their expertise, experience, and qualifications will meet the literacy needs of a wide range of learners.
2. If applicable, describe how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.
3. If applicable, provide Letters of Commitment addressed to the Lead Applicant and signed by the Dean of the specific department within an IHE. If applicable, also provide Letters of Commitment addressed to the

Lead Applicant and signed by the COE Superintendent of each COE participating in the consortium.

B. Budget

A projected four-year budget is required in the application. The template for the budget is available on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. Project expenses will be identified using grant funds in the 2023–24 through the 2026–27 fiscal years.

The applicant must provide a thorough and detailed justification for each identified cost associated with implementing the proposed initiatives and goals, including why the costs are reasonable and necessary to support the proposal's initiatives and goals.

The applicant must ensure that the budget is not overly heavy in administrative costs and takes into consideration the costs of educators' time to attend PL. Finally, the applicant must account for the required funds for a contract with an evaluator.

- Complete the LCRSET Proposed Project Budget Summary (Form B), including allowable costs for the project's performance period from August 2023 through March 31, 2027.
- Provide a detailed explanation on the LCRSET Project Budget Narrative (Form C) for each line-item for each year of the four-year performance period. The narrative should include a description of how the proposed costs to implement the proposed project are necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.

C. Scoring Rubric

The scoring rubric is valued at a maximum of 212 points. The grant award may not necessarily be made to the application that has the highest score. These scores are advisory to the panelists who will make the final decisions to ensure that the applications meet the goals and requirements of the program. The table below displays the maximum point values for each section:

Scoring Rubric Point Values

Part	Description	Point Value
Application Narrative Part 1a	Project Plan: Theory of Action	8

Part	Description	Point Value
Application Narrative Part 1b	Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications	112
Application Narrative Part 1c	Project Plan: PL Dissemination	48
Application Narrative Part 2	Alignment	16
Application Narrative Part 3	Expanding Capacity	8
Application Narrative Part 4	Priority Points: IHE	12
Budget	Budget	8
Total Points	Total of Scoring Rubric Sections	212

Definition of Terms:

- **Thorough:** Includes every part or detail
- **Convincing:** Brings to belief
- **Clear:** Adequate, of a quality that is good or acceptable, easily understood, includes sufficient detail
- **Plausible:** Feasible, reasonable, realistic
- **Partial:** Incomplete details or elements essential to program component, leaves the reader with questions
- **Minimal:** With the least amount of detail

Part 1a—Project Plan: Theory of Action (8 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
1. Articulates a thorough and convincing theory of action and describes how it will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI’s goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Includes an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.	1. Articulates a clear and plausible theory of action and describes how it will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI’s goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Includes an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.	1. Articulates a partial theory of action and partially describes how it will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI’s goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Includes an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.	1. Articulates a minimal theory of action and minimally describes how it will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI’s goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Does not include an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.

Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (112 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
1.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs, for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.	1.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs, for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a clear evidence base for the proposed practices and any proposed materials.	1.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs, for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a partial evidence base for the proposed practices and any proposed materials.	1.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs, for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. May not identify the evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
1.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	1.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	1.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	1.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission’s Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> and dual language acquisition and ELD programs. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
2.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.	2.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a clear evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.	2.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identifies a partial evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.	2.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. May not identify the evidence base for the practices and any proposed materials.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
2.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	2.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	2.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	2.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
3.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for these practices.	3.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Identifies a clear evidence base for these practices.	3.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Identifies a partial evidence base for these practices.	3.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. May not identify the evidence base for these practices.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
3.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	3.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	3.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	3.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
4.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for these practices.	4.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Identifies a clear evidence base for these practices.	4.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Identifies a partial evidence base for these practices.	4.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. May not identify the evidence base for these practices.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
4.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	4.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	4.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	4.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.
5.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for these practices.	5.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Identifies a clear evidence base for these practices.	5.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Identifies a partial evidence base for these practices.	5.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. May not identify the evidence base for these practices.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
5.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	5.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	5.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	5.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.
6.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for these practices.	6.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Identifies a clear evidence base for these practices.	6.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Identifies a partial evidence base for these practices.	6.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. May not identify the evidence base for these practices.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
6.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	6.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	6.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	6.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
7.a Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Identifies a thorough and convincing evidence base for these practices.	7.a Clearly describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Identifies a clear evidence base for these practices.	7.a Partially describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Identifies a partial evidence base for these practices.	7.a Minimally describes how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. May not identify the evidence base for these practices.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
7.b Thoroughly and convincingly demonstrates that the applicant has a high level of relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Thoroughly and convincingly specifies strong and relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	7.b Clearly demonstrates that the applicant has relevant previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Clearly specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	7.b Partially demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Partially specifies relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.	7.b Minimally demonstrates that the applicant has previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative, including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy, and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. May not specify qualifications of any proposed consortium members or qualifications may not be relevant.

Part 1c—Project Plan: Professional Learning Dissemination (48 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
1. Provides a thorough and convincing overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.	1. Provides a clear and plausible overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.	1. Provides a partial overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.	1. Provides a minimal overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.
2. Thoroughly and convincingly provides an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.	2. Clearly provides an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.	2. Partially provides an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.	2. Minimally provides an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
3. Thoroughly and convincingly provides an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators, including those intending to be literacy coaches, employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.	3. Clearly provides an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators, including those intending to be literacy coaches, employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.	3. Partially provides an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators, including those intending to be literacy coaches, employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.	3. Minimally provides an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators, including those intending to be literacy coaches, employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.
4. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.	4. Clearly describes how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.	4. Partially describes how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.	4. Minimally describes how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
5. Thoroughly and convincingly describes the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those intending to be literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.	5. Clearly describes the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those intending to be literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.	5. Partially describes the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those intending to be literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.	5. Minimally describes the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those intending to be literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.
6. Timeline provides a thorough and convincing illustration of the sequence of events and activities of the project that includes approximate dates for implementation, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.	6. Timeline provides a clear and plausible illustration of the sequence of events and activities of the project that includes approximate dates for implementation, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.	6. Timeline provides a partial illustration of the sequence of events and activities of the project that includes approximate dates for implementation, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.	6. Timeline provides a minimal illustration of the sequence of events and activities of the project. May not include approximate dates for implementation, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and/or how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.

Part 2—Alignment (16 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (7–8 Points)	Strong (5–6 Points)	Partial (3–4 Points)	Minimal (0–2 Points)
1. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy; the California ELD standards; and all five themes of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> , including language development, meaning making, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills; and the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i> .	1. Clearly describes how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy; the California ELD standards; and all five themes of the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> , including language development, meaning making, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills; and the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i> .	1. Partially describes how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy, the California ELD standards, the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> , and the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i>	1. Minimally describes how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy, the California ELD standards, the <i>ELA/ELD Framework</i> , and/or the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i> .
2. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission’s work.	2. Clearly describes how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission’s work.	2. Partially describes how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission’s work.	2. Minimally describes how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission’s work.

Part 3—Expanding Capacity (8 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (4 Points)	Strong (3 Points)	Partial (2 Points)	Minimal (0–1 Points)
1. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.	1. Clearly describes how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.	1. Partially describes how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.	1. Minimally describes how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.
2. Thoroughly and convincingly explains how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.	2. Clearly explains how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.	2. Partially explains how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.	2. Minimally explains how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.

Part 4—Priority Points: Institution of Higher Education (12 Total Points Possible)

The CDE shall prioritize and award points to applicants that propose partnerships with an IHE or consortium of IHEs.

Outstanding (4 Points)	Strong (3 Points)	Partial (2 Points)	Minimal (0 Points)
1. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the Lead Applicant will work together to implement proposed activities in a consortium with one or more IHEs. Thoroughly and convincingly describes the proposed role, relevant expertise and experience, and applicable qualifications of consortium partners, including how their expertise, experience, and qualifications will meet the literacy needs of a wide range of learners. If applicable, describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	1. Clearly describes how the Lead Applicant will work together to implement proposed activities in a consortium with one or more IHEs. Clearly describes the proposed role, relevant expertise and experience, and applicable qualifications of consortium partners, including how their expertise, experience, and qualifications will meet the literacy needs of a wide range of learners. If applicable, describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	1. Partially describes how the Lead Applicant will work together to implement proposed activities in a consortium with one or more IHEs. Partially describes how the proposed role, relevant expertise and experience, and applicable qualifications of consortium partners, including how their expertise, experience, and qualifications will meet the literacy needs of a wide range of learners. If applicable, describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	1. Does not propose or describe a consortium.

Outstanding (4 Points)	Strong (3 Points)	Partial (2 Points)	Minimal (0 Points)
2. Thoroughly and convincingly describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	2. Clearly describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	2. Partially describes how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.	2. Does not propose or describe a consortium.
3. Provides Letters of Commitment from all IHE partners. May include letters from COE partners.	3. Provides Letters of Commitment from all IHE partners, but may be missing some components. May include letters from COE partners.	3. Provides some Letters of Commitment from IHE consortium partner(s), but not from all. May include letters from COE partners.	3. Does not provide Letters of Commitment.

Budget

Budget Summary and Budget Narrative (8 Total Points Possible)

Outstanding (4 Points)	Strong (3 Points)	Partial (2 Points)	Minimal (0–1 Points)
1. Thoroughly and convincingly identifies allowable and appropriate project expenses to support the activities of the grant for the project's performance period. The budget is not overly heavy in administrative costs and takes into consideration the costs of educators' time to attend PL as well as accounts for the required funds for a contract with an evaluator.	1. Clearly identifies allowable and appropriate project expenses to support the activities of the grant for the project's performance period. The budget is not overly heavy in administrative costs and takes into consideration the costs of educators' time to attend PL as well as accounts for the required funds for a contract with an evaluator.	1. Partially identifies allowable and appropriate project expenses to support the activities of the grant for the project's performance period. The budget may be heavy in administrative costs. Budget may not take into consideration the costs of educators' time to attend PL or the funds for a contract with an evaluator.	1. Minimally identifies project expenses to support the activities of the grant for the project's performance period. Expenses may not be allowable and appropriate. The vast majority of the budget goes towards administrative costs. Budget may not take into consideration the costs of educators' time to attend PL or the funds for a contract with an evaluator.
2. Provides a thorough and convincing budget narrative describing each line item and how each proposed cost is necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.	2. Provides a clear budget narrative describing each line item and how each proposed cost is necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.	2. Provides a partial budget narrative describing each line item and how each proposed cost is necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.	2. Provides a minimal budget narrative.

Appendices

Appendix A: Online Application Instructions

Applicants should use the instructions below for filling out the LCRSET Grant online application, a link to which is available on the CDE LCRSET RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r12/lcrs23rfa.asp>. Complete all required fields in the application, upload attachments, and provide the appropriate digital signature. **The CDE must receive all online submissions no later than 4 p.m. on May 26, 2023.** The timeline is subject to change. Review the current timeline on the CDE's LCRS web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/lcrsprogram.asp>.

Adhere to character limits for each of the fields. Responses that exceed the character limits will not be captured by the system and will not be reviewed.

Saving Responses

You must select the Save Responses button on the online application if you do not intend to complete the application in one session. Once you select the Save Responses button, a page will appear that asks for your email address. You will receive an email with a unique URL (web address) for entrance back into the application. It is recommended that you copy the URL on the application page and save it in case you do not receive the confirmation email. This URL will allow you to return to your application.

Project Director Information

Please list the name of the person who will serve as the Project Director of the grant. This person will be the main point of contact between the CDE and the grantee.

Application Field	Instructions
Project Director First Name	Please provide the first name of the Project Director.
Project Director Last Name	Please provide the last name of the Project Director.
Project Director Title	Please provide the title of the Project Director.
Project Director Office	Please provide the name of the Project Director's office.
Project Director Telephone Number	Please provide the Project Director's telephone number. This number will be used to contact the Project Director, if needed.
Project Director Telephone Extension	Please provide the Project Director's telephone extension number, if necessary.

Application Field	Instructions
Project Director Email Address	Please provide the Project Director's email address. Most communication with the grantee will be through email, so please ensure the email address is correctly inputted.

Lead Applicant Address

Application Field	Instructions
Lead Applicant Name	Please provide the name of the entity (LEA) applying for the grant.
Lead Applicant Street Address (Ex: 1430 N Street)	Please provide the street address of the applying entity.
Lead Applicant City	Please provide the city where the applying entity is located.
Lead Applicant State (Ex: CA)	Please provide the state where the applying entity is located.
Lead Applicant Zip Code (5-digit: 00000)	Please provide the zip code where the applying entity is located.
Funding Amount Requested	Please provide the total funding amount requested for this grant.

Fiscal Agent Information (optional)

The Grantee and Fiscal Agent must be the same entity. Please list the name of the superintendent, who will serve as the Fiscal Agent of the grant. This person will be included on communications regarding budget and accounting for the grant.

Application Field	Instructions
Fiscal Agent First Name	Please provide the first name of the Fiscal Agent.
Fiscal Agent Last Name	Please provide the last name of the Fiscal Agent.
Fiscal Agent Title	Please provide the title of the Fiscal Agent.
Fiscal Agent Telephone Number	Please provide the Fiscal Agent's telephone number.
Fiscal Agent Telephone Extension	Please provide the Fiscal Agent's telephone extension number, if needed.
Fiscal Agent Email Address	Please provide the Fiscal Agent's email address.

Partners (optional)

Application Field	Instructions
IHE Partners	Please list any IHE partners for this grant.
COE Partners	Please list any COE partners for this grant.

Application Narrative Part 1

Application Field	Instructions
Part 1a—Project Plan: Theory of Action (3,000 character max)	1. Articulate a theory of action which will achieve the goals of the grant to (1) support the SSPI's goal of students reading by third grade by 2026; (2) develop and provide training for educators, specifically for those at sites that have received funds as part of the \$225 million allocation authorized by AB 181, Section 137, to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists; and (3) to provide PL on the allowable activities outlined in AB 181. Include an approximate number of students that this project plan has the capacity to impact.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (5,000 character max)	1.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission's Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the ELA/ELD Framework and dual language acquisition and ELD programs , for diverse learners, including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (5,000 character max)	1.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based literacy assessment and instruction as described in the Commission's Literacy Standards and TPEs, including implementation of the ELA/ELD Framework and dual language acquisition and ELD programs , as described above. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	2.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners , including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Identify

Application Field	Instructions
	the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	2.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of reading and acquisition of language for diverse learners , including all of the following: early learners, EL and multilingual students, pupils with disabilities, and pupils with dyslexia. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	3.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers . Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	3.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of assessment data collection and analysis, data-driven decision making, using data to identify and support struggling students, and how to facilitate conversations about data with teachers . Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	4.a Describe how the proposed PL will develop knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy . Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	4.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL for knowledge and understanding of evidence-based intensive literacy assessment, identification, and provision of interventions, which may include high dosage or group tutoring, for pupils struggling with literacy .

Application Field	Instructions
	Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	5.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan . Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	5.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a school literacy plan . Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	6.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction . Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	6.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing culturally sustaining curriculum, assessment, and instruction . Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	7.a Describe how the proposed PL will increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative , including, but not limited to family literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy; and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Identify the evidence base for these practices and any proposed materials.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (2,500 character max)	7.b Describe the applicant's previous experience and/or expertise in developing and delivering PL to increase educator and school leader knowledge of developing and implementing a family-based literacy and biliteracy initiative , including, but not limited to family

Application Field	Instructions
	literacy plans; home visiting programs; extended-day summer, or weekend opportunities; information on earning a State Seal of Biliteracy; and community partnerships, such as public libraries, including but not limited to digital tools. Specify the relevant qualifications of any proposed consortium members.
Part 1b—Project Plan: Evidence-Based Practices and Qualifications (upload attachment)	Provide a works cited that details the evidence base for all PL and strategies mentioned in the project plan.
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (2,500 character max)	1. Provide an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to host a gathering of literacy coaches across the state to inform and develop resources for the proposed PL for literacy coaches.
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (2,500 character max)	2. Provide an overview of how the applicant will provide opportunities for interested educators to obtain a reading specialist credential and/or added authorization.
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (2,500 character max)	3. Provide an overview of how the applicant will use the funding to generate and disseminate PL opportunities, including communities of practice, webinars, and conferences, for educators employed by the identified eligible sites as part of the allocation in AB 181 identified within the bill.
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (2,500 character max)	4. Describe how the applicant will ensure that the diverse needs of the identified eligible sites are met across the northern, central, and southern regions, including urban, suburban, and rural settings as well as the needs of local communities and diverse student populations, including opportunities for LEAs with eligible sites to collaborate with each other.
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (2,500 character max)	5. Describe the plan for securing participation from identified eligible sites that received LCRS funds in the proposed PL opportunities for all target participants, including those intending to be literacy coaches or reading specialists, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, as well as how any anticipated challenges to recruitment will be overcome.

Application Field	Instructions
Part 1c—Project Plan: PL Dissemination (upload attachment)	6. Provide a project timeline for implementation of proposed activities that includes approximate dates for implementation of all major proposed activities, the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured.

Application Narrative Part 2

Application Field	Instructions
Part 2—Alignment (2,500 character max)	1. Describe how the proposed activities align with the California CCSS for ELA/Literacy, the California ELD standards, and all five themes of the ELA/ELD Framework, including language development, meaning making, effective expression, content knowledge, and foundational skills, and the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i> .
Part 2—Alignment (2,500 character max)	2. Describe how the proposed activities align with the preparation program standards set by the Commission for literacy and the TPEs, as well as how the activities will expand upon the Commission's work.

Application Narrative Part 3

Application Field	Instructions
Part 3—Expanding Capacity (2,500 character max)	1. Describe how the applicant will work with an independent evaluator to select the quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used to examine the measures defined in Section 2.B (Program Requirements) as well as other measures, such as determining impact on achievement of the goal of students reading by third grade, increased capacity of educators and school leaders and the plan for analyzing and responding to these measures.
Part 3—Expanding Capacity (2,500 character max)	2. Explain how the applicant will ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit.

Application Narrative Part 4

Application Field	Instructions
Part 4—Priority Points: Institution of Higher Education (2,500 character max)	1. If applicable, describe how the Lead Applicant will work together to implement proposed activities in a consortium with one or more IHEs. Describe the proposed role, relevant expertise and experience, and applicable qualifications of IHEs, including how their expertise, experience, and qualifications will meet the literacy needs of a wide range of learners.
Part 4—Priority Points: Institution of Higher Education (2,500 character max)	2. If applicable, describe how the partner IHEs will support educators in obtaining a reading and literacy added authorization and/or credential.
Part 4—Priority Points: Institution of Higher Education (upload attachment)	3. If applicable, provide Letters of Commitment addressed to the Lead Applicant and signed by the Dean of the specific department within an IHE. If applicable, also provide Letters of Commitment addressed to the Lead Applicant and signed by the COE Superintendent of each COE participating in the consortium.

Budget

Application Field	Instructions
Budget (upload attachment)	1. Complete the LCRSET Proposed Project Budget Summary (Form B), including allowable costs for the project's performance period from August 2023 through March 31, 2027.
Budget (upload attachment)	2. Provide a detailed explanation on the LCRSET Project Budget Narrative (Form C) for each line-item for each year of four-year performance period. The narrative should include a description of how the proposed costs to implement the proposed project are necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.

Electronic Signature

Application Field	Instructions
Project Statement of Assurances	Please select the checkbox to declare: I have reviewed the LCRSET Lead Applicant Statement of Assurances (Form A) and hereby certify that each of the requirements contained therein will be met.
Signature by Authorizing Official	The authorizing official should type their name in the field which will serve as a signature that certifies agreement with the statement below. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is correct and complete. I support the proposed project and commit my organization to completing all of the tasks and activities that are described in the application.

Attachment Instructions

Required attachments will be requested at the end of the online application. Applicants are required to upload the Works Cited, Project Timeline, LCRSET Proposed Budget Forms B and C, and Letters of Commitment into the online application system. These files should be saved into a single zip file for uploading into the system as only one file can be uploaded per applicant. No additional information included in the zip file will be reviewed. The zip file size limit is 20MB.

Appendix B: Budget Categories

Budget Categories

Each budget category is described below.

Object Code	Description
1000	Certificated Salaries Certificated salaries are salaries that require a credential or permit issued by the Commission. List all certificated project employees, including percentage or fraction of full-time equivalent (FTE) and rate of pay per day, month, and/or annual salary. Note: Funds in this category are not intended to supplant current fixed costs.
2000	Classified Salaries Classified salaries are salaries for services that do not require a credential or permit issued by the Commission. List all classified project employees, including percentage of FTE, and rate of pay per day, month, and/or year. Note: Funds in this category are not intended to supplant current fixed costs.
3000	Employee Benefits Record employer's contributions to retirement plans and health and welfare benefits. List and include the percentage and dollar amount for each employee benefit being claimed.
4000	Books and Supplies Record expenditures for books, supplies, and other non-capitalized property/equipment (movable personal property of a relatively permanent nature that has an estimated useful life greater than one year and an acquisition cost less than the LEA capitalization threshold but greater than the LEA's inventory threshold). This category includes expenditures for books and supplies (e.g., textbooks, other books, instructional materials). This category also includes supplies used in support services and auxiliary programs, publications, and subscriptions necessary to operate a project office. A listing of all equipment, including the serial and model numbers, purchased with any portion of these grant funds, must be recorded and maintained in the file.

Object Code	Description
5000	Services and Other Operating Expenditures Record expenditures for services, rentals, leases, maintenance contracts, dues, travel, insurance, utilities, legal, and other operating expenditures. Travel and Conference: Include expenditures incurred by and/or for employees and other representatives of the LEA for travel and conferences, including lodging, mileage, parking, bridge tolls, shuttles, taxis, and conference registration expenses necessary to meet the objectives of the program. Receipts are required to be kept on file by your agency for audit purposes. Bus transportation for students should be listed here. Contracting Services: Services provided to the school by outside contractors appear under this category. Identify what, when, and where the services(s) will be provided. Appropriate activities include conducting workshops, trainings, and technical assistance activities.
6000	Capital Outlay Record expenditures for sites, buildings, and equipment, including leases with option to purchase that meet the LEA's threshold for capitalization. (Equipment is movable personal property that has both an estimated useful life over one year and an acquisition cost that meets the LEA's threshold for capitalization. Refer to the LEA's threshold amount for capitalization, anything less than this amount should be posted in Object Code 4000). A listing of all equipment, including the serial and model numbers, purchased with any portion of these grant funds, must be recorded and maintained in the file. This category also covers sites, improvement of sites, buildings, and improvement of buildings.
7000	Indirect if applicable (not to exceed CDE-approved rate) Indirect costs are not assessed on expenditures for capital outlay. For a listing of indirect cost rates visit the CDE Indirect Cost Rates web page at https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/ic/.

Appendix C: Assembly Bill 181, Section 137 (Statutes of 2022)

Section 137 (a) The sum of two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000) is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists Grant Program, which is hereby established, in the manner and for the purposes set forth in this section. Funds appropriated for this purpose are available for encumbrance through June 30, 2027.

(b) (1) Of the amount appropriated in subdivision (a), two hundred twenty-five million (\$225,000,000) shall be allocated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to local educational agencies for schools eligible pursuant to paragraph (2), to develop school literacy programs, employ and train literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists, and develop and implement interventions for pupils in need of targeted literacy support. Local educational agencies may opt not to participate in the program described pursuant to this subdivision by informing the State Department of Education, by September 30, 2022, and via a form provided by the State Department of Education, of their intent to decline program funds for their eligible schoolsites. Local educational agencies who receive funding pursuant to this section may also be eligible for the Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program.

(2) Of the amount identified in paragraph (1), the department shall compute an amount per pupil enrolled in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 3, inclusive, at each eligible schoolsite, such that no local educational agency shall receive less than four hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$450,000) per eligible schoolsite. Grant amounts shall be determined using 2021–22 school enrollment data determined as of the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System Fall 1 Certification. Local educational agencies receiving an allocation of funds pursuant to this paragraph are encouraged to use these funds over the full grant period, through June 30, 2027. For purposes of allocations and apportionments under this paragraph, a locally-funded charter school shall be included with the chartering authority.

(3) On or before June 30, 2027, a recipient local educational agency shall report to the State Department of Education how it used funds awarded pursuant to this subdivision. The State Department of Education shall create a reporting template for the purposes of this requirement no later than December 31, 2022. Specifically, these reports shall include:

(A) How funds were used to employ literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists for its eligible schools.

(B) How funds were used to develop and implement school literacy programs.

(C) How expenditures impacted pupils' literacy achievement, including for pupil subgroups.

(D) How the local educational agency plans to continue to fund literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists past the award period.

(E) Other metrics as determined by the State Department of Education.

(4) On or before December 31, 2027, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall provide a comprehensive report to the Department of Finance, State Board of Education, and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of both houses of the Legislature summarizing the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3).

(c) (1) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subdivision (a), twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) shall be available for the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in collaboration with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and subject to the approval of the executive director of the State Board of Education, to select a county office of education, through a competitive process, to develop and provide training for educators to become literacy coaches and reading and literacy specialists. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall prioritize applicants with demonstrated success in improving literacy, especially among underperforming pupil subgroups, as well as for those planning on partnering with institutions of higher education with demonstrated success in providing statewide professional development for expert literacy practice. Applicants who participate in the training established pursuant to this subdivision may also participate in the Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program.

(2) The grantee selected pursuant to paragraph (1) shall consider the preparation program standards set by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for reading and literacy in developing the standards for educator training developed pursuant to this subdivision.

(d) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Eligible schoolsite" means an elementary schoolsite operated by a local educational agency with an unduplicated pupil percentage of 97 percent or greater for pupils enrolled in kindergarten and grades 1 to 3, inclusive, based on 2021–22 Fall 1 census day pupil data submitted through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System. The unduplicated pupil percentage for a schoolsite shall be calculated by the sum of the number of unduplicated pupils eligible for free and reduced-price meals, English language learners, and youth in foster care, divided by each schoolsite's total enrollment for kindergarten and grades 1 to 3, inclusive.

(2) "Local educational agency" means a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

(3) "School" and "schoolsite" means an elementary school of a local educational agency.

(4) "School literacy program" means a program that includes all of the following:

(A) A school literacy plan that includes goals and actions to improve literacy acquisition for pupils in preschool, if applicable, and kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 3, inclusive. The plan shall identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and actions.

(B) At least one literacy coach or reading and literacy specialist per school to support educators and pupils in improving literacy instruction and pupil outcomes.

(C) Increased access to evidence-based literacy instruction, through strategies, including, but not limited to, any of the following:

(i) Providing bilingual reading specialists to support dual language acquisition and English language development programs.

(ii) Developing and implementing culturally responsive curriculum and instruction.

(iii) Providing professional development for educators and school leaders in literacy instruction and the use of data to identify and support struggling pupils.

(iv) Providing professional development for educators and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for English Language Arts/English Language Development adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 60207 of the Education Code and the use of data to support effective instruction.

(v) Establishing an evidence-based family literacy initiative, which may include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

(I) Family literacy plans that identify literacy and biliteracy goals, benchmarks, and roles for all family members.

(II) Family literacy home visiting programs, including, but not limited to, “promotora” family literacy outreach specialists. Local educational agencies may establish literacy and biliteracy home visits to engage families in how to best support their pupils and every family member in reaching their literacy goals.

(III) Extended-day, summer, or weekend family institutes related to literacy and biliteracy. Local educational agencies are encouraged to work with in-house expanded learning programs to establish literacy and biliteracy support programs and literacy enrichment programs during after school, weekend, and summer hours.

(IV) Public library family literacy partnerships, including, but not limited to, digital tools to support whole family literacy.

(e) For purposes of making the computations required by Section 8 of Article XVI of the California Constitution, the appropriation made pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be deemed to be “General Fund revenues appropriated for school districts,” as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 41202 of the Education Code, for the 2020–21 fiscal year, and included within the “total allocations to school districts and community college districts

from General Fund proceeds of taxes appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B,” as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 41202 of the Education Code, for the 2020–21 fiscal year.

Form A: Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists Grant Program: Lead Applicant Statement of Assurances

I support the proposed project and commit my organization to completing all of the tasks and activities that are described in the application. As Lead Applicant, I also certify that each of the following requirements will be met:

- All grant requirements and activities are subject to change if modifications to the program are made in subsequent budget cycles.
- If the grantee seeks to make a significant change in the work plan and/or budget, a project amendment must be requested and approved by the California Department of Education (CDE) Project Monitor and the assigned CDE Office prior to making any changes in the activities or expenditures of the project.
- All of the entities entering into this grant agree to be subject to the examination and audit of the State Auditor for a period of five years after final payment under the grant. Grantee agrees to obtain a timely audit where required in accordance with applicable audit guidelines.
- All subcontracts or subgrants pursuant to this grant must be approved by the CDE prior to execution of the agreement and shall be subject to the examination and audit by the State Auditor for a period of five years after the final payment under the grant. Grantee must submit a formal request to the CDE Project Monitor for review.
- Grantee will be adaptive, be responsive, and work with the statewide agencies to ensure coherence with existing systems of support and Professional Learning (PL) within the state.
- Grantee will work collaboratively to build the capacity of local educational agencies (LEAs) statewide through PL aligned to the Quality Professional Learning Standards.
- Grantee will participate in an advisory committee led by the CDE, including participating in monthly meetings, providing overviews of current and future work and opportunities for the advisory committee to review and give feedback, and providing biannual presentations to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Literacy/Biliteracy Task Force.
- Grantee will provide regular communications on grant activities to a variety of audiences, including high level administration, media, peer-to-peer, and families/communities.
- Grantee will attend appropriate and relevant conferences, subject to approval by the CDE, to provide updates on grant activities and disseminate best practices and strategies.

- Grantee will provide information and all reports according to the predetermined reporting schedule. Reports shall include at a minimum, activities accomplished, the impact of these activities on educator capacity and student achievement, and the number of educators and school leaders, LEAs, and counties impacted by these activities, and any other related data requested by the CDE.
- No single entity in an eligible partnership “may use more than 50 percent” of the grant. The provision focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly uses or benefits from them.
- Grantee will comply with the General Assurances.
- Grantee will use funds to supplement and not supplant funding that would otherwise be used to support proposed activities.
- Grantee will ensure that any new PL or course materials, including curriculum, developed as a result of this grant, are available as open educational resources. Ownership of any copyrights, patents, or other proprietary interests that may result from grant activities shall be governed by applicable state regulations.
- Grantee will review the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in relation to the proposed project. Information on FERPA is available at the U.S. Department of Education FERPA web page at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>.

California Department of Education
April 2023