

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

STRIVING READERS COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM

CFDA # 84.371C

PR/Award # S371C110009

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10863381

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

****Table of Contents****

Forms

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. <i>Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)</i> | e1 |
| 2. <i>Standard Budget Sheet (ED 524)</i> | e5 |
| 3. <i>SF-424B - Assurances Non-Construction Programs</i> | e7 |
| 4. <i>Disclosure of Lobbying Activities</i> | e9 |
| 5. <i>427 GEPA</i> | e10 |
| <i>Attachment - 1</i> | e11 |
| 6. <i>ED 80-0013 Certification</i> | e12 |
| 7. <i>Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424</i> | e13 |

Narratives

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. <i>Project Narrative - (Abstract Narrative...)</i> | e14 |
| <i>Attachment - 1</i> | e15 |
| 2. <i>Project Narrative - (Project Narrative...)</i> | e17 |
| <i>Attachment - 1</i> | e18 |
| 3. <i>Project Narrative - (Other Narrative...)</i> | e64 |
| <i>Attachment - 1</i> | e65 |
| <i>Attachment - 2</i> | e67 |
| <i>Attachment - 3</i> | e73 |
| 4. <i>Budget Narrative - (Budget Narrative...)</i> | e74 |
| <i>Attachment - 1</i> | e75 |

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

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| * 1. Type of Submission: <input type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application | * 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision | * If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> * Other (Specify): <input type="text"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| * 3. Date Received: <input type="text" value="05/05/2011"/> | 4. Applicant Identifier: <input type="text"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 5a. Federal Entity Identifier: <input type="text"/> | * 5b. Federal Award Identifier: <input type="text"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|

State Use Only:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 6. Date Received by State: <input type="text"/> | 7. State Application Identifier: <input type="text"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name:

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| * b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): <input type="text" value="63-6000619"/> | * c. Organizational DUNS: <input type="text" value="627193386"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|

d. Address:

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| * Street1: | <input type="text" value="50 North Ripley Street"/> |
| Street2: | <input type="text"/> |
| * City: | <input type="text" value="Montgomery"/> |
| County: | <input type="text" value="Montgomery"/> |
| * State: | <input type="text" value="AL: Alabama"/> |
| Province: | <input type="text"/> |
| * Country: | <input type="text" value="USA: UNITED STATES"/> |
| * Zip / Postal Code: | <input type="text" value="36104"/> |

e. Organizational Unit:

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Department Name: <input type="text" value="Department of Education"/> | Division Name: <input type="text" value="Instructional Services Divisio"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Prefix: <input type="text" value="Ms."/> | * First Name: <input type="text" value="Judith"/> |
| Middle Name: <input type="text" value="S"/> | |
| * Last Name: <input type="text" value="Stone"/> | |
| Suffix: <input type="text"/> | |

Title:

Organizational Affiliation:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| * Telephone Number: <input type="text" value="334-353-1389"/> | Fax Number: <input type="text" value="334-353-5455"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|

* Email:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

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

U.S. Department of Education

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.371

CFDA Title:

Striving Readers

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

ED-GRANTS-031011-002

* Title:

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE); Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant Program CFDA Number 84.371C

13. Competition Identification Number:

84-371C2011-1

Title:

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

All counties will be eligible to apply for funds.

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

Alabama's Implementation Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant

* b. Program/Project

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

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date:

* b. End Date:

18. Estimated Funding (\$):

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| * a. Federal | <input type="text" value="1,389,270.00"/> |
| * b. Applicant | <input type="text" value="0.00"/> |
| * c. State | <input type="text" value="(b)(4)"/> |
| * d. Local | <input type="text" value="0.00"/> |
| * e. Other | <input type="text" value="0.00"/> |
| * f. Program Income | <input type="text" value="0.00"/> |
| * g. TOTAL | <input type="text" value="(b)(4)"/> |

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

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

*** 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)**

Yes No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

** I AGREE

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

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: * First Name:
Middle Name:
* Last Name:
Suffix:

* Title:

* Telephone Number: Fax Number:

* Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative: * Date Signed:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

*** Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET INFORMATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
Alabama State Department of Educ...

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

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

| Budget Categories | Project Year 1(a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Project Year 5 (e) | Total (f) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1. Personnel | \$ 240,000 | \$ 240,000 | \$ 240,000 | \$ 240,000 | \$ 240,000 | \$ 1,200,000 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$ 84,000 | \$ 84,000 | \$ 84,000 | \$ 84,000 | \$ 84,000 | \$ 420,000 |
| 3. Travel | \$ 269,910 | \$ 329,910 | \$ 329,910 | \$ 389,910 | \$ 389,910 | \$ 1,709,550 |
| 4. Equipment | \$ 129,470 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 0 | \$ 118,000 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 365,470 |
| 5. Supplies | \$ 42,480 | \$ 42,480 | \$ 42,480 | \$ 42,480 | \$ 42,480 | \$ 212,400 |
| 6. Contractual | \$ 379,400 | \$ 473,400 | \$ 457,400 | \$ 347,400 | \$ 347,400 | \$ 2,005,000 |
| 7. Construction | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| 8. Other | \$ 55,930 | \$ 55,930 | \$ 55,930 | \$ 55,930 | \$ 55,930 | \$ 279,650 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8) | \$ 1,201,190 | \$ 1,284,720 | \$ 1,209,720 | \$ 1,277,720 | \$ 1,218,720 | \$ 6,192,070 |
| 10. Indirect Costs* | \$ 188,080 | \$ 206,072 | \$ 203,288 | \$ 201,396 | \$ 194,588 | \$ 993,424 |
| 11. Training Stipends | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| 12. Total Costs (lines 9-11) | \$ 1,389,270 | \$ 1,490,792 | \$ 1,413,008 | \$ 1,479,116 | \$ 1,413,308 | \$ 7,185,494 |

***Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

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

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 10/1/2010 To: 9/30/2011 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ED Other (please specify): _____

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

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET INFORMATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
Alabama State Department of Educ...

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

SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY

NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Budget Categories |
| 1. Personnel |
| 2. Fringe Benefits |
| 3. Travel |
| 4. Equipment |
| 5. Supplies |
| 6. Contractual |
| 7. Construction |
| 8. Other |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8) |
| 10. Indirect Costs |
| 11. Training Stipends |
| 12. Total Costs (lines 9-11) |

| |
|--------|
| (b)(4) |
|--------|

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL</p> <p>Judith Stone</p> | <p>* TITLE</p> <p>Alabama State Superintendent of Education</p> |
| <p>* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION</p> <p>Alabama State Department of Education</p> | <p>* DATE SUBMITTED</p> <p>05/05/2011</p> |

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C.1352

Approved by OMB
0348-0046

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. * Type of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance | 2. * Status of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award | 3. * Report Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change |
| 4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> SubAwardee * Name: Alabama State Department of Education * Street 1: 50 North Ripley Street Street 2: * City: Montgomery State: AL: Alabama Zip: 36104 Congressional District, if known: AL-003 | | |
| 5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime: | | |
| 6. * Federal Department/Agency: Department of Education / Office of Elem | 7. * Federal Program Name/Description: Striving Readers CFDA Number, if applicable: 84.371 | |
| 8. Federal Action Number, if known: | 9. Award Amount, if known: \$ | |
| 10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant: Prefix: * First Name: N/A Middle Name: N/A * Last Name: N/A Suffix: * Street 1: Street 2: * City: State: Zip: | | |
| b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a) Prefix: * First Name: N/A Middle Name: * Last Name: N/A Suffix: * Street 1: Street 2: * City: State: Zip: | | |
| 11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure. * Signature: Judith Stone * Name: Prefix: * First Name: Joseph Middle Name: B * Last Name: Morton Suffix: Title: Alabama State Superintendent of Education Telephone No.: 334-242-9700 Date: 05/05/2011 | | |
| Federal Use Only: | | Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97) |

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct

description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is **1894-0005**. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to:** U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.

AL_GEPA_Requirement.pdf

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

Alabama-GEPA Requirements

In the subgrant applications, applicants will identify the school(s) or center(s) that is selected to receive Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) funds. Applicants will further describe the students to be served by the proposed SRCL activities, including students with special needs.

Following the subgrant awards, subgrantees will be required to submit a Section 427 statement when they submit a budget application for program approval. Funds will not be released to subgrantees until a sufficient Section 427 statement has been approved by the SRCL staff. Specific instructions for meeting the requirements of the Section 427 statement will be given at the orientation meeting.

The 427 statement must include a description of the steps the subgrantee will take to identify any possible barriers that might prevent equal access and participation in the proposed SRCL activities. The statement will take into account local circumstances that might limit participation of students, parents, caregivers, or teachers with special needs. These local circumstances may include barriers related to gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age.

Subgrantees that have students with limited-English-proficiency will be required to describe the specific steps that will be taken to ensure that communication with parents and caregivers, as well as students, is provided in the native language.

The Section 427 statement will ensure that subgrantees have taken the necessary steps to allow all participants to have the opportunity to participate fully and to achieve at a high level.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

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

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

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

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

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

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

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| * APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION Alabama State Department of Education | |
| * PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE | |
| Prefix: Dr. | * First Name: Joseph |
| Middle Name: B | |
| * Last Name: Morton | Suffix: |
| * Title: Alabama State Superintendent of Education | |
| * SIGNATURE: Judith Stone | * DATE: 05/05/2011 |

Close Form

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
REQUIRED FOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANTS

1. Project Director:

| | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| Prefix: | * First Name: | Middle Name: | * Last Name: | Suffix: |
| Mrs. | Reeda | | Betts | |

Address:

| | |
|-------------|------------------------|
| * Street1: | 50 North Ripley Street |
| Street2: | |
| * City: | Montgomery |
| County: | Montgomery |
| * State: | AL: Alabama |
| * Zip Code: | 36104 |
| * Country: | USA: UNITED STATES |

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

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| 334-353-1389 | 334-353-5455 |
|--------------|--------------|

Email Address:

| |
|------------------|
| rbetts@alsde.edu |
|------------------|

2. Applicant Experience:

Novice Applicant Yes No Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research

Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project Period?

Yes No

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

Yes Provide Exemption(s) #:

No Provide Assurance #, if available:

Please attach an explanation Narrative:

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | Add Attachment | Delete Attachment | View Attachment |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|

Project Narrative

Abstract Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1234-AL_SRCL_Abstract.pdf**

Alabama ED Abstract

The **objectives** of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) grant program are to:

- Significantly increase the amount of time that disadvantaged students are engaged in high-quality literacy instruction and intervention.
- Significantly increase the quality of literacy instruction for all students through professional development and ongoing support for teachers.
- Collect, analyze, and use high-quality data to make timely decisions in order to improve instructional practices and student literacy outcomes.

State-level **activities** include developing a Web site and a wide variety of online literacy resources including online courses; professional development modules; activities and resources for students, teachers, and parents; and an online data “warehouse.” A local-level activity will be the formation and support of literacy partnerships—including parents, caregivers, and school and community leaders—to coordinate and focus community resources on the implementation of the state literacy plan, *Alabama’s Action Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12*.

The **first absolute priority**—improving learning outcomes—will be accomplished through high-level implementation of the essential elements from the state literacy plan. These essential elements include a standards-based curriculum, assessment, instruction and intervention, professional development, and collaborative leadership. Local education agencies (LEAs) and early education providers will be required to use SRCL funds to increase both the quality of literacy instruction for disadvantaged students and the amount of instructional time for these students.

The SRCL program will accomplish the **second absolute priority**, more data-based decision-making, through implementation of the assessment expectations from the state literacy plan and through the development of a comprehensive online data reporting system that will be made available to all literacy stakeholders. The system will generate reports from a variety of data sources. Online tutorials

will be developed to help all stakeholders interpret the available data reports and to use the data to inform decisions.

SRCL funds will help subgrantees make **more effective use of technology** through highly engaging intervention and instructional software made available to students and to teachers to increase the amount of instructional time, increase student engagement, student achievement, and teacher effectiveness.

The following **outcomes** will be accomplished through the SRCL program:

- More disadvantaged children will enter kindergarten with the early literacy skills needed to be successful learners as evidenced by significant gains by participating four-year-old children in oral language skills.
- Disadvantaged students will have more high-quality literacy instruction and intervention so that they stay on track to graduate college- and/or career-ready as evidenced by:
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating Grade 5 and Grade 8 students who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on the *Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test*.
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the language and reading portions of the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam*.
- Teachers will have professional development, materials, and ongoing support to deliver more high-quality instruction and intervention as evidenced by implementation data.
- Literacy stakeholders will collaborate to provide high-quality literacy experiences for all learners from Birth through Grade 12 as evidenced by implementation data.

With award amounts of approximately \$750 to \$1,000 per student, the expectation is to serve between 35,000 and 38,000 **students**. Depending on the number of students per site, there will be ten to 24 early childhood sites, 24 to 40 elementary sites, 12 to 20 middle school sites, and 12 to 20 high school sites. The **locations** of the sites will be determined through the subgrant process.

Project Narrative

Project Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1240-AL_SRCL_Project_Narrative.pdf**

Project Narrative

Alabama

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| State-Level Activities | 2 |
| Sample Activities from State Literacy Plan | 7 |
| Subgrant Competition | |
| Process for Awarding Subgrants | 15 |
| Sample Subgrant Application | 22 |
| Sample Subgrant Budget Summary | 31 |
| Sample Pre-Application Rubric | 32 |
| Sample Scoring Rubric | 34 |
| Project Management | 35 |
| Timeline for SRCL Activities | 37 |
| Resources | 44 |

A. State-Level Activities

The mission of the Alabama State Department of Education (SDE) is to provide the standards, resources, and support that local education agencies (LEAs) need to ensure that all students graduate college- and/or career-ready. Literacy skills provide the foundation for all learning and these skills begin to develop at birth.

(A.i. Additional Requirement a) With a recent history of successful literacy efforts, Alabama is well-equipped to carry out expanded state-level literacy activities that are aligned with the state literacy plan. In 1998, Alabama began a K-12 reading initiative, the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI), focused on improving literacy skills. The first 16 schools to participate in the initiative, fondly known as the “Sweet Sixteen,” experienced a renewed commitment to improving reading instruction. These schools saw an increase in student achievement and decreases in discipline and special education referrals. The demand for expanding ARI professional development to other schools far outpaced the funding necessary to support high-quality implementation.

In 2002, Alabama was one of the first three states to be awarded Reading First funds. These additional federal funds provided the financial support and the accountability to implement the evidence-based practices advocated by the ARI. As a result of the success of the Reading First schools, ARI’s state budget was increased from \$12 million to \$56 million with the goal of expanding ARI support for evidence-based reading instruction to every K-3 school in the state. Alabama remains one of the few states that used the Reading First program to make a statewide impact on literacy.

Over the past few years, the ARI has benefited from the commitment and ongoing support of the former two-term Governor, Bob Riley, and from much bi-partisan support in the state legislature. The ARI has been fortunate to have a sustained level of state funding—approximately \$55 million annually over the past six years—that has allowed the initiative to expand to include every K-3 school in the state. Every ARI school received initial professional development on evidence-based reading instruction and receives ongoing professional development and support for every K-3 school through an ARI-funded

reading coach. The ARI currently provides differentiated levels of support, including professional development, on-site support, and school literacy coaches to over 1,000 schools. The initiative focuses intensely on three aspects of the teaching of reading: preventing reading difficulties, identifying struggling readers and intervening to help them become proficient readers, and expanding the reading power of all students.

In 2006, the ARI was able to hire and support a small secondary staff to develop and implement the Alabama Reading Initiative-Project for Adolescent Literacy (ARI-PAL). Groups of school leaders from several other states—including Louisiana, Kansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, and West Virginia—have visited ARI-PAL schools to learn more about this powerful model for adolescent literacy. ARI-PAL received a grant from the National Governor’s Association through the *Reading to Achieve: State Policies to Promote Adolescent Literacy* Grant Program. The project also received recognition from a study by the Carnegie Foundation. Through the ARI-PAL project, the ARI state and regional staffs have learned valuable lessons about providing support for adolescent literacy. These lessons can inform the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) implementation for middle and high school teachers and leaders.

In 2000, the Office of School Readiness was created to oversee early childhood education. State funding for pre-school programs has increased very slowly since that time. Currently, there are approximately 215 state-funded pre-kindergarten programs, known as First Class programs. Alabama’s pre-kindergarten program has been nationally recognized by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) as one of the only two states to meet all ten NIEER benchmarks of quality. The Office of School Readiness utilizes a mixed delivery system for the pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) programs. Although the majority of the Pre-K programs are located within a public school, others are part of child care centers, Head Start centers, and faith-based programs.

During the past ten years, a number of other entities have provided direction, education, and support to the literacy experiences of children from birth to preschool. The Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy formula grant helped to bring representatives from these various early childhood

entities together with representatives from the Alabama Early Childhood Advisory council, from professional organizations, and many sections of the SDE to work collaboratively on the Alabama State Literacy Team.

Over the course of several months, the Alabama State Literacy Team worked collaboratively to develop a state literacy plan, based on the combined literacy experiences of this diverse group. The state literacy plan was developed as an action plan to help translate the knowledge and experience of literacy stakeholders into powerful collaborative literacy activities. Team members thoughtfully studied current research on best practices in literacy instruction for children from Birth through Grade 12, as well as literacy plans developed by other states. The state literacy plan, *Alabama's Action Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12*, affords all literacy stakeholders a critical opportunity to combine available resources and to commit to a comprehensive and cohesive framework to ensure that every child has the literacy skills necessary to be successful in school and to graduate college- and/or career-ready. The literacy plan is designed to help all stakeholders—parents, caregivers, community agencies, schools, local education agencies, the state education agency, and all applicable state agencies—to identify specific essential elements that support literacy and to work together to strengthen those elements.

One focus of the state literacy plan is to form literacy partnerships among all stakeholders in order to develop and carry out local literacy action plans. Literacy partnerships can focus community resources and efforts to reduce the gaps in school readiness by providing quality early literacy experiences for all children, including disadvantaged children. These partnerships will help ensure that disadvantaged children have the additional support that is critical to the development of the pre-literacy and literacy skills needed to read, comprehend, and use language effectively. The partnerships will continue to support learners as they transition from one literacy setting to the next. Literacy becomes the community's responsibility.

The State Literacy Team will meet in May 2011 to develop a statewide campaign to introduce and begin implementation of the state literacy plan. Team members will coordinate efforts to disseminate the plan to all literacy stakeholders and to develop local literacy partnerships to include parents,

caregivers, community agencies, schools, and LEAs. These literacy partnerships will begin the work of assessing community needs for literacy services and identifying any local gaps in services. They will identify all current resources—federal, state, and local—that can be leveraged to focus on community literacy needs. The State Literacy Team will meet quarterly to share information related to local literacy efforts toward implementation of the literacy plan and to make adjustments to improve the plan.

(Additional Requirement b) Alignment of federal and state funds and programs at the state level will be accomplished through close communication and planning between the State Literacy Team, the SDE Steering Committee, and the SRCL staff (see the Management Plan on page 35). The SRCL staff, the director and four specialists, will work half-time on the SRCL program while continuing to work half-time in their current positions of support to children from Birth through Grade 12. This dual role will ensure the alignment of the funds and programs of these major literacy efforts. The director will work with the SDE Steering Committee and the State Literacy Team to help inform and coordinate literacy programs statewide to make better use of all available resources in support of evidence-based literacy practices.

The SRCL subgrant application will require that SRCL funds and activities in the selected schools and early education centers are aligned with current literacy efforts and needs in order to focus and strengthen those efforts and to ensure maximum impact from all available federal, state, and local funds and programs. Professional development and technical assistance will be provided to subgrantees to help utilize SRCL funds to repurpose, expand, and strengthen all current resources to continue implementation of evidence-based activities at the end of the SRCL funding period. All literacy providers represented on the State Literacy Team will work to identify and re-focus statewide and local resources to support the expectations identified in the state literacy plan. These literacy resources will be used to provide the materials, professional development, and ongoing technical assistance required for effective implementation at all levels of literacy development.

(Additional Requirement c) The State Literacy Team will develop a plan for disseminating information about the SRCL subgrant process and the results of the reviews through local literacy

partnerships. The SRCL subgrant application and review process will be explained in a letter from the state superintendent of education to all LEAs and early education providers. A Webinar following the award announcement letter will further clarify eligibility and the application and award process. A recording of the Webinar will be available to the public on the SDE Web site (<http://www.alsde.edu>). All application documents and resources will also be available, including the state literacy standards and resources for verifying the evidence base of curriculum materials. Following the reviews, award results will be posted on the Web site.

A new Web site, devoted to supporting literacy efforts in Alabama, will be developed and made available to the public with state-level SRCL funds. This Web site, to be named by the State Literacy Team, will serve as an anchor for implementation of the statewide literacy plan in order to improve literacy outcomes and to provide support for high-quality professional development. It will provide easy, one-click access for parents, teachers, and other community partners to a wealth of resources that will be made available for assessing and strengthening the literacy development of all learners, including limited-English-proficient (LEP) students and learners with special needs. Online courses, professional development modules, lesson plans, and activity guides will be developed to support implementation of the essential elements in the state literacy plan. The resources made available on the Web site will support sustainability for SRCL activities.

The literacy Web site will also provide a link to a comprehensive data reporting site to be developed with SRCL funds. This data site will be designed to help literacy stakeholders collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data to make more informed decisions related to literacy activities and resources. The site will generate reports from multiple sources of data to help identify both student needs and professional development needs and to document progress toward desired literacy outcomes. Online tutorials will be developed to help all stakeholders, including parents of LEP students, interpret the available data reports to improve school readiness, respond to the literacy needs of students, improve the

quality of instruction through focused professional development, and to target all available resources to the continuous improvement of children's literacy and language development.

(Additional Requirement d) The state literacy plan, *Alabama's Action Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12*, will serve as the focus of all SRCL discretionary grant activities. The essential elements identified in the plan—standards-based curriculum, assessment, instruction and intervention, professional development, and collaborative leadership—serve as the basis of an effective literacy program. Evidence-based expectations included in the plan identify specific action steps for the SDE and for local educators for each of the five essential elements. A local needs assessment, required as part of the application process, will guide the selection of specific activities from the state literacy plan. When implemented in concert with each other, the activities contribute to a powerful program of literacy development for learners of all ages.

The following is a sample page from the state literacy plan which shows the action steps for assessment. There is a similar page for each of the five essential elements.

The Alabama State Department of Education will:

- Identify formative and summative assessments to support state-adopted guidelines, standards, and expectations.
- Provide technical assistance to educators in the selection, administration, and use of formative and summative assessments that support literacy development.
- Develop a data system that makes longitudinal and current data readily available to all stakeholders.
- Use multiple forms of data to differentiate state support to local education agencies and organizations.
- Collaborate with teacher preparation programs to ensure that teacher candidates have the knowledge and skills to use assessment data to deliver high-quality literacy instruction.

Local educators will:

Local educators refer to the teachers and leaders in all literacy settings.

- Align all assessments to the state-adopted, research-based standards.
- Implement a comprehensive assessment plan that includes both formative and summative assessments.
- Increase adults' capacity to assess learning by scheduling frequent opportunities for data analyses and discussions.
- Disaggregate and analyze data for instructional decision-making.
- Communicate assessment results in a timely manner to all literacy stakeholders in a format that is easily understandable.
- Collaborate with all literacy stakeholders to ensure that assessment results are available when students transition from one literacy setting to the next.
- Utilize a comprehensive plan to assess the effectiveness of the instructional program and to guide adjustments for improvement.

Community partners will commit to partner with local educators.

Community partners refer to individuals, local businesses, organizations, and agencies that are concerned with literacy development.

(A.ii) Over the last ten years, Alabama has made much progress in literacy education, making national headlines when 2007 scores were released for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the "Nation's Report Card." Fourth grade students in Alabama made more gains in reading than any state had ever made. Even with those historic gains, however, Alabama still remains below the national average.

Results on the state accountability assessment for Grades 3-8, the *Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test* (ARMT), demonstrate slow but steady progress toward reading proficiency. The chart

below shows the percentages of students scoring proficient, Levels 3 and 4, on the reading portion of the ARMT.

Levels 3 and 4 Reading

| Grade | Spring 2006 | Spring 2007 | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Grade 3 | 84% | 85% | 85% | 86% | 87% |
| Grade 4 | 84% | 85% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| Grade 5 | 81% | 85% | 84% | 85% | 86% |
| Grade 6 | 83% | 85% | 86% | 86% | 86% |
| Grade 7 | 75% | 77% | 79% | 81% | 83% |
| Grade 8 | 72% | 72% | 74% | 75% | 74% |

The *Stanford Achievement Test*, Tenth Edition (Stanford 10) is also given to all students in Grades 3-8. The primary purpose of this test is to compare individual and group performance with others across the nation. Additionally, the Stanford 10 provides data to study changes in performance over time. The chart below shows the percentages of students scoring in Stanines 5-9, which is Alabama's definition of proficiency.

Reading Comprehension Scores

| Grade | Spring 2006 | Spring 2007 | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Grade 3 | 67% | 68% | 69% | 70% | 71% |
| Grade 4 | 68% | 69% | 70% | 71% | 72% |
| Grade 5 | 65% | 67% | 67% | 69% | 70% |
| Grade 6 | 59% | 61% | 62% | 64% | 64% |
| Grade 7 | 62% | 64% | 65% | 67% | 67% |
| Grade 8 | 60% | 61% | 62% | 64% | 64% |

These reports of statewide accountability data indicate the same steady progress toward proficiency in reading—the direction is good but the pace is unacceptable.

In 2009, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education published a report of College Remediation Data. On average, about one out of three (33%) of Alabama's students who graduate and enroll in a public college or university requires remediation courses in reading, demonstrating the critical need for more rigorous literacy instruction through high school.

College Remediation Data

| | # Graduates | # Enrolled | # Remediation | % Remediation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| All Public Schools | 41,869 | 23,397 | 7,661 | 32.7% |
| Schools with the Largest Percentage of Students Requiring Remediation | | | | |
| School #1 | 31 | 18 | 16 | 88.9% |
| School #2 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 88.3% |
| School #3 | 54 | 35 | 27 | 77.1% |
| School #4 | 188 | 46 | 34 | 73.9% |
| School #5 | 50 | 18 | 13 | 72.2% |

The foundation for literacy skills and the achievement gaps in reading are established long before students ever enter school. Alabama students in Grades K-2 are assessed using the *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills* (DIBELS). The DIBELS is comprised of a developmental sequence of one-minute measures of early literacy skills: phonological awareness, the alphabetic principle, accuracy and fluency in reading connected text, and vocabulary. The chart below shows the percentage of students entering kindergarten who scored proficient on the letter naming fluency assessment. DIBELS results over the past few years demonstrate significant gaps in the literacy skills among Alabama students entering kindergarten, indicating the need for more high-quality early literacy experiences.

Comparison of Kindergarten Readiness Skills – DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency

| Kindergarten | % Free Lunch | Fall 2006 | Fall 2007 | Fall 2008 | Fall 2009 | Fall 2010 |
|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Rural LEA | 93% | 66% | 55% | 51% | 68% | 57% |
| Urban LEA | 86% | 70% | 62% | 60% | 65% | 66% |
| Suburban LEA | 0% | 97% | 93% | 92% | 94% | 93% |

The goal of the SRCL discretionary grant program is to advance literacy skills (including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing) for students from Birth through Grade 12, including LEP students and students with disabilities. Alabama's subgrant competition will identify selected LEAs and early education providers who demonstrate the capacity and commitment to use SRCL funds in order to:

- Significantly increase the amount of time that disadvantaged students are engaged in literacy instruction and intervention.
- Significantly increase the quality of literacy instruction for all students through professional development and ongoing support for teachers.
- Collect, analyze, and use high-quality data to make timely decisions in order to improve instructional practices and student literacy outcomes.

As a result of this increased time for high-quality literacy instruction, Alabama will achieve the following outcomes:

- More disadvantaged students will enter kindergarten with the early literacy skills needed to be successful learners as evidenced by significant gains by participating four-year-old children in oral language skills.
- Disadvantaged students will have more high-quality literacy instruction and intervention so that they stay on track to graduate college and/or career ready as evidenced by:
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating Grade 5 and Grade 8 students who meet or exceed proficiency on the *Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test*.
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the language and reading portions of the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam*.
- Teachers will have professional development, materials, and ongoing support to deliver more high-quality instruction and intervention as evidenced by implementation data.
- Literacy stakeholders will collaborate to provide high-quality literacy experiences for all learners from Birth through Grade 12 as evidenced by implementation data.

The state literacy plan, *Alabama's Action Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12*, outlines the path to improving student literacy outcomes. The different sections in the literacy plan—the Continuum of Literacy Development, the Conceptual Framework, and the Essential Elements—provide a framework of action for literacy stakeholders. The Action Planning section gives a specific, powerful, step-by-step plan to enhance high-quality instruction by: 1) planning specific actions that are observable and measurable, 2) identifying who is responsible for completion of the actions, 3) listing the resources needed, 4) setting target dates for completion, and 5) determining how the plan will be monitored and evaluated. The plan will serve as the foundation of the SRCL subgrant plans.

Collaboration with the colleges of education is one of the most critical activities identified for the SDE in the state literacy plan. This collaboration is expected in the SDE-level implementation of each of the essential elements. The SDE will collaborate with teacher preparation faculty to plan and prepare professional development resources and materials to be used by SRCL subgrantees. These resources and materials will be a combination of online courses, modules, and resource kits targeted to improving the quality of instruction for early childhood, for elementary students, and for middle and high school students. The materials and resources will be developed jointly by SRCL staff and higher education partners in three phases. Phase 1 materials will introduce basic instructional strategies for language and literacy development and enrichment. Phase 2 materials will support teachers to provide targeted interventions for literacy and language. Phase 3 materials will be developed to support parents and community partners.

(A.iii.) The mission of the Alabama State Department of Education (SDE) is to provide the standards, resources, and support to ensure that every student graduates college- and/or career-ready. The SDE Steering Committee is made up of the directors and coordinators for each of the instructional sections. The entire Steering Committee meets together monthly to identify technical assistance and support needs, to determine which sections are best equipped to address the needs, and to plan that coordinated support.

While most of the SDE offices and sections are involved to some degree with support for literacy, the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) is most directly responsible for literacy support in Grades K-12 and is well-equipped to provide this support. The ARI state staff consists of nine professional and three clerical staff members and a regional staff of approximately 60 members. Each of the state staff members serves as the Team Leader for a regional team made up of former teachers, coaches, and principals. The ARI regional teams meet regularly to review local data, to determine support needs at the district and the school level, and to plan how best to deliver that support. Each of the 132 LEAs has appointed an ARI contact person. The ARI regional teams plan with the LEA contacts to coordinate state and local literacy efforts. The ARI provides funding, professional development, and support to approximately 800 ARI coaches in every K-3 school in the state and to a very small number of ARI coaches in middle and high schools.

This ARI technical assistance structure—state staff, regional teams, LEA contacts, and local coaches—allows for targeted and intensive technical assistance and support. Implementation of the state literacy plan will be the focus of ARI professional development, technical assistance, and support for all schools. Additional technical assistance for the SRCL subgrantees will be a very natural addition to this support structure. Through the literacy partnerships between schools and other community agencies, the regional teams will expand support to participating SRCL early education providers.

The Office of School Readiness provides technical assistance and support to 215 pre-kindergarten sites. These technical assistance providers will also work with the local literacy partnerships to provide support for SRCL activities for children from birth to age five. The State Literacy Team will coordinate training and technical assistance with the child care community and the Head Start community through the Department of Children's Affairs.

In order to build sustainability for SRCL activities, subgrantees may designate a local literacy instructional specialist. These specialists will receive weekly professional development and coaching by the SRCL staff and/or ARI regional teams to develop expertise in supporting high-quality instruction, assessment, and professional development. The literacy specialists will work in different schools or early

education centers to support high-quality implementation of SRCL activities. At the end of the SRCL funding period, the specialists will be better equipped to support continuous improvement of evidence-based practices in all schools and early childhood centers.

(A.iv.) An evaluation of the SRCL program will be conducted by an independent evaluator, Dr. Edward Moscovitch of Cape Ann Economics, Gloucester, Massachusetts. The evaluation will examine both student- and teacher-level data to determine whether SRCL goals and outcomes were met.

Statewide assessments will be used to measure whether participating students in Grades K -12 increased their literacy skills as measured by DIBELS in Grades K-2, the *Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test* in Grades 3-8, and the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* in Grades 11-12. The evaluator will use these data to prepare the annual performance report for the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures. The evaluation will compare progress at participating schools with non-participating schools, including the progress of disadvantaged students.

For participating students from birth through age five, growth in language development will be determined by comparing results from evidence-based assessments or strategies at the beginning and at the end of the program. These language assessments or strategies will be named in the subgrant applications.

Prior to the award announcements, the evaluator will meet with the SRCL staff and the SDE Steering Committee to design the implementation evaluation. The evaluation tools and strategies will be explained to subgrantees at the orientation meeting following the award announcements.

Implementation data (e.g., schedules, logs, surveys, observation records, interviews) will be used to determine the degree of increase in time for instruction, in the quality of instruction, and in the effective use of data for instructional decisions. The evaluation will attempt, through interviews, to discern some of the factors that led to project successes and some of the challenges to implementation. The evaluation will include recommendations to sustain program successes and to address program challenges in order to improve the outcomes of SRCL activities.

The major findings and recommendations from the evaluation will be presented to participating schools and early education centers in a Webinar. School-level data will be shared with individual LEAs. Evaluation data and recommendations will be shared with the SDE Steering Committee by the SRCL director. The recommendations will be considered in SDE planning and development for resources and support. The evaluator will meet with the State Literacy Team to share the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

(A.v.) Information on SRCL outcomes will be made available to the public through a variety of data reports on the data Web site to be developed for the SRCL project. These data reports will include growth in student literacy data, disaggregated by subgroups. Online tutorials will be made available to explain data reports. Promising practices that are supported by the outcome data will be shared on the Web site in reports for parents, community leaders, early education providers, and teachers of elementary, middle, and high school students. The State Literacy Team will develop a plan to disseminate information related to SRCL outcomes through local literacy partnerships. This outcome information will be used to improve local literacy programs and activities.

(B) Quality of the State Subgrant Competition

(B.i.) The Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) subgrant competition will be very similar to the subgrant competition for Reading First, with adjustments based on lessons learned from that process. LEAs will be notified in September 2011 of the availability of the SRCL subgrants through a letter to superintendents from Dr. Joseph B. Morton, State Superintendent of Education, explaining the objectives of the SRCL grant, the maximum award amounts for each applicant, and the application and review process.

The number and amount of SRCL awards will be determined based on numbers of students served with approximately \$750 to \$1,000 awarded per student. Early education providers serving children from birth through age five will be awarded between ten to 24 subgrants ranging from \$200,000 to \$450,000, based on numbers of children served. Approximately 20 to 40 subgrants ranging from \$300,000 to \$600,000 per selected school will be awarded to LEAs. These LEA awards will require that

40 percent of the subgrant funds are used for elementary school activities, 20 percent for middle schools, and 20 percent for high schools.

Awards will be funded for a three-year cycle contingent on successful implementation. The first two years will be funded at the full amount of approximately \$750 to \$1,000 per student. The award will be reduced by half for the third year. The funds recovered from this reduction will be used to conduct a new subgrant competition. Subgrantees that do not have a high level of implementation and do not meet program outcomes at the end of Year 1 will continue to have technical assistance support during Year 2 and Year 3, but may not receive additional SRCL funds beyond Year 1.

(B.i.a) The SRCL announcement letter will be followed by a Webinar to further explain eligibility and pre-application requirements. While all LEAs and early education providers will be eligible to apply for SRCL funds, priority for subgrant awards will be given to those applicants with significant numbers of disadvantaged students who have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement a comprehensive grant proposal. Subgrant awards will be based on three priorities: 1) Greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students, 2) A demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the literacy development of disadvantaged students, and 3) A demonstrated record of effectiveness in providing professional development and support for evidence-based literacy instruction. A pre-application rubric, based on data from the 2010-2011 school year, will be provided to all potential applicants (see Sample Pre-application Rubric on page 31). The rubric will provide LEA information about numbers and percentages of students in poverty, of students scoring below proficient on state-required assessments, of LEP enrollments, and of students with disabilities. The rubric will also detail criteria to assess LEA effectiveness with increasing literacy achievement for disadvantaged students and effectiveness with professional development and support. The rubric will allow each potential applicant to rate the strength of their evidence for each of the three priority criteria as High Priority, Moderate Priority, or Low Priority. The priority ratings will be heavily considered in making final subgrant awards. Those LEAs or early education providers who do not have a High or Moderate Priority rating for all three

criteria will be encouraged to request a pre-application conference to discuss the advisability of completing the application process.

There will be a two-day proposal preparation workshop in October for the LEAs and early education providers who choose to write applications. The workshop, consisting of four parts, will provide resources and support to ensure that applicants are aware of all requirements of the SRCL application. Part one of the workshop will be used to introduce the state literacy plan, *Alabama's Action Plan for Literacy: Birth Through Grade 12*. Applicants will review the five essential elements of the plan—a standards-based curriculum, assessments, instruction and intervention, professional development, and collaborative leadership—which contain the components of effective literacy instruction that are listed in the Additional Requirements in the SRCL application. The Needs Assessment process will be introduced. Applicants will learn of a process to assess the current level of implementation of those elements and begin to develop a plan for specific SRCL activities to strengthen those elements as necessary to ensure that every child is successful. Part two will introduce the process for selecting materials and strategies that are supported by the strongest evidence base available. Core reading materials for K-3 will be judged according to the *Expert Review of Core Reading Programs* developed as part of the 2009 reading textbook state adoption. Other materials and strategies will be judged according to reviews from the Florida Center for Reading Research, from the *What Works Clearinghouse* Web site, or from the *Doing What Works* Web site. Part three of the workshop will focus on developing a plan for providing professional development (as described in the SRCL application) and support for implementing evidence-based instruction. Part four will focus on strategies for providing more instructional time to disadvantaged students.

Applications will be due in early January. The application review will be a two-tier process: 1) Expert reviewers will evaluate and score the applications, and 2) The State Literacy Team will make policy recommendations regarding the awards.

(B.i.b) In the first stage of the process, expert reviewers will evaluate each of the applications.

The reviewers will be identified with assistance from Dr. Shari Butler, Director of RMC Research

Corporation-Austin and a member of the National Reading Technical Assistance Center. Reviewers will be selected with specific literacy expertise in early childhood, the elementary grades, and working with adolescents. All expert reviewers will meet the following qualifications:

- Be knowledgeable of evidence-based literacy practices and materials.
- Have experience implementing and training others to implement evidence-based literacy practices
- Have completed an advanced degree in reading and literacy.
- Have published scientifically based research articles and/or contributed to recognized summaries of scientific reading research.

Each application will be read and evaluated by two different reviewers using a scoring rubric that will be provided (see Sample Scoring Rubric on page 33). The rubric will be used to evaluate the extent to which the applicant has proposed a comprehensive literacy program that meets all of the Additional Requirements of the SRCL grant. Each part of the subgrant application will be evaluated and scored separately. Each part must receive a numerical score that falls in the *Meets Standard* or *Exemplary Plan* range in order for the applicant to receive a subgrant award. The total number of points awarded for all questions will be used to further distinguish relative strengths of the applications. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses to each part of the subgrant application.

In the second stage of the review process, the State Literacy Team, familiar with the state context for literacy improvement, will consider each application. The State Literacy Team will be separated into smaller groups to review a subset of applications. Each application and its written reviews will be assigned to one of the groups. The team will take into account the priority ratings for each of the three priorities and the scores and written reviews of the expert reviewers. They will discuss and make preliminary recommendations for awards of funds. Group members will present to the whole group their preliminary findings. The State Literacy Team will reach consensus on the recommendations for awards.

The ARI has 60 regional coaches who have worked with schools in each of the LEAs for several years. This ongoing work with the LEAs affords these coaches a true picture of LEA capacity to carry out a comprehensive proposal. The coaches will participate in each phase of the subgrant process. They will provide information to help develop the eligibility rubric and will work with the LEAs to assess their relative strengths regarding the competitive priorities. Regional coaches will provide support during the proposal workshops and will provide technical assistance to applicants following the workshops. Based on their ongoing work with the schools and LEAs in each region, the coaches will provide valuable information during the second stage of the review process to the State Literacy Team about the capacity and commitment of the LEAs to fully implement the proposed program.

(B.i.b.1) In awarding SRCL subgrants, the SDE will give priority to LEAs or early education providers with:

- The greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students.
- A demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving literacy development of disadvantaged students.
- A demonstrated record of effectiveness in providing professional development in literacy or in early literacy.

In the subgrant application, the LEA or early education provider is asked to give the specific criteria used to identify disadvantaged students (e.g., students living in poverty, LEP students, students with disabilities) and to include the numbers and percentages of students for each of the criteria used in the selection (see Sample Subgrant Application on page 23). Considering all of the schools or early education centers associated with the agency, if the selected setting does not have the highest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students, the applicant is asked to give the rationale for this selection. The applicant is asked to give specific evidence of the selected school's record of effectiveness in improving the literacy development of disadvantaged students. The applicant is asked to give evidence of the school's record of effectiveness in providing professional development in literacy that has had an impact on the achievement of disadvantaged students.

(B.i.b.2) In the subgrant application, the LEA or early education provider is asked to describe the needs assessment process, including the student- and teacher-level data that were considered. The applicant is asked to explain how faculty and staff from the selected school(s) or center(s) were involved in the needs assessment process and how they were involved in the planning process of selecting evidence-based program activities to address the identified needs.

(B.i.b.3) The subgrant applicant is asked to describe the process used to establish a local literacy partnership including families, caregivers, schools, local businesses, organizations, and other community agencies to enhance literacy support in the community. The applicant must describe how these community partnerships will be used to carry out the SRCL activities in support of disadvantaged students.

(B.i.c) SRCL applicants are asked to describe the plan to coordinate SRCL activities with all local literacy efforts for children from Birth through Grade 12. Applicants must describe the plan to leverage all existing resources (federal, state, and local) to ensure this coordination. The budget and budget narrative included in the SRCL application must show all leveraged funds that are used to support proposed SRCL activities. At the orientation meeting immediately following the award announcements, subgrantees will begin to develop a sustainability plan to use SRCL funds to repurpose, expand, and strengthen all current resources to continue SRCL activities as SRCL funding is reduced.

(B.i.c.ii) Poverty is one of the criteria used to determine the numbers and percentages of disadvantaged students. Poverty level will be determined by the number or percentage of students eligible for free and/or reduced lunch. For early education providers, poverty will be determined by the poverty level of the corresponding elementary school. The eligibility rubric will be used in the pre-application phase to help applicants determine their poverty ranking relative to other LEAs. Priority will be given to those applicants with the highest numbers or percentages of children receiving free and/or reduced lunches. If LEAs or early education providers select a school or center that does not have the highest percentage of students in poverty for SRCL activities, they are required to justify this choice.

(B.i.c.iii) Parts one and two of the proposal preparation workshop will explain a process for determining which strategies and materials have the strongest evidence base for improving literacy outcomes. The essential elements described in Alabama's state literacy plan are based on a convergence of evidence regarding best literacy practices for children from Birth through Grade 12. Proposed SRCL activities will be selected to strengthen these specific essential elements. Applicants will determine the relative evidence-based strengths of proposed strategies and materials by using the expert reviews that are available from Alabama's *Expert Review of Core Reading Programs* or from the review reports available on the Web sites of the Florida Center for Reading Research, the *What Works Clearinghouse*, or from *Doing What Works*.

The use of technology programs, practices, or strategies will be encouraged in order to address student learning challenges. Today's students are motivated by the use of new technologies. This motivation can help to increase the amount of time that students are engaged in instructional activities. Students are more willing to practice challenging skills with the immediate feedback that is a component of many new technologies. This increase in the amount of guided practice is especially important for disadvantaged students who are often hesitant to practice in a classroom setting. The process for determining which technology programs, practices, and strategies have the strongest evidence base will be shared at the proposal workshop.

(B.i.c.iv) Subgrant reviewers will be selected who are familiar with the expert reviews available from the Florida Center for Reading Research, the *What Works Clearinghouse*, or from *Doing What Works*. In 2007, the Alabama State Department of Education sponsored a documented process to examine the new core reading programs that were offered for adoption in Alabama. A team of teachers, coaches, principals, and higher-education (higher ed) faculty met together for five days to review the core programs that were offered by the major publishers for Grades K-3. Reviewers examined each program's alignment to Alabama's reading standards and to the published findings of the National Reading Panel (NRP). A document, *Expert Review of Core Reading Programs*, was developed showing the relative degree of alignment for each of the programs that were reviewed. The Alabama Reading Initiative

provided a textbook review process for local textbook adoption committees using this instrument. As a result of this work, over 90 percent of the LEAs in the state chose one of the two core reading programs that were most closely aligned with state standards and with the NRP research. The evidence base for any materials selected for SRCL activities will be judged using one or more of these available resources.

A sample subgrant application is included to further demonstrate Alabama's commitment to a rigorous, high-quality competition for subgrants.

Sample Subgrant Application

Goals:

The goal of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) grant program is to advance literacy skills (including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing) for students from Birth through Grade 12, including limited-English-proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities. Alabama's subgrant competition will identify selected LEAs and early education providers who demonstrate the capacity and commitment to target SRCL funds in order to:

- Significantly increase the amount of time that disadvantaged students are engaged in literacy instruction and intervention.
- Significantly increase the quality of literacy instruction for all students through professional development and ongoing support for teachers.
- Collect, analyze, and use high-quality data to make timely decisions in order to improve instructional practices and student literacy outcomes.

Outcomes: As a result of high-quality implementation of all proposed SRCL activities:

- More disadvantaged students will enter kindergarten with the early literacy skills needed to be successful learners as evidenced by significant gains by participating four-year-old children in oral language skills.

- All students, including disadvantaged students, will have more high-quality literacy instruction and intervention so that they stay on track to graduate college- and/or career-ready as evidenced by:
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating Grade 5 and Grade 8 students who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on the *Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test*.
 - A significant increase in the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the language and reading portions of the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam*.
- Teachers will have professional development, materials, and ongoing support to deliver more high-quality instruction and intervention as evidenced by implementation data.
- Literacy stakeholders will collaborate to provide coordinated high-quality literacy experiences for all learners from Birth through Grade 12 as evidenced by implementation data.

Eligibility: In awarding SRCL subgrants, the SDE must give priority to:

1. LEAs serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged* students.
2. Early education providers with:
 - Greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students.
 - A demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving literacy development of children from Birth through Kindergarten entry.
 - A demonstrated record of effectiveness in providing professional development in early literacy.

**Disadvantaged students* is defined in the SRCL application as children and students at risk of educational failure, such as children and students who are living in poverty, who are limited-English-proficient, who are far below grade level, who are not on track to becoming college- or career-ready by graduation, who have left school before receiving a regular high school diploma, who are at risk of not graduating with a diploma on time, who are homeless, who are in foster care, who are pregnant or parenting teenagers, who have been incarcerated, who are new immigrants, who are migrant, or who have disabilities.

The SDE must ensure that at least:

- 15 percent of its SRCL subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age five.
- 40 percent of its subgranted funds are used to serve students in Kindergarten through Grade 5.
- 40 percent of its subgranted funds are used to serve students in middle and high schools with an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools.

Subgrant Part A: Considering these eligibility requirements, provide the following information for either the early education center(s) or school(s) that has been selected for SRCL funding. (10 points)

1. List the early education center(s) associated with your agency that has been selected to receive SRCL funds.
 - For this center, give the specific criteria used to identify disadvantaged students (e.g., students living in poverty, LEP students, students with disabilities). Include the numbers and percentages of students for each of the criteria used in the selection. Considering all of the early education centers associated with your agency, if this center does not have the highest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students, give your rationale for selecting this center.
 - Give evidence of this center's record of effectiveness in improving the literacy development of children from Birth through Kindergarten entry.
 - Give evidence of this center's record of effectiveness in providing professional development in early literacy.
2. List the school(s) and grade levels in your LEA that have been selected to receive SRCL funds.
 - Give the specific criteria used to identify disadvantaged students (e.g., students receiving free or reduced lunch, LEP students, Special Education students). Include the numbers and percentages of students for each criteria used in the selection. If this school does not have the highest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students in your LEA, give your rationale for selecting this school.

- Give evidence of this school’s record of effectiveness in improving the literacy development of students.
- Give evidence of this school’s record of effectiveness in providing professional development in literacy.

3. **A competitive edge (10 points)** will be given to those LEAs that commit to using SRCL funds to design and implement a comprehensive and coherent literacy program that serves students from Birth through Grade 12. An example would be the selection of a feeder pattern that includes an early childhood center, an elementary school, a middle school, and a high school.

- If you have selected centers and schools in a feeder pattern to receive SRCL funds, describe your collaborative process for planning and coordinating a comprehensive literacy program in these different settings.
- Describe your process to establish a community literacy partnership to coordinate local resources in order to enhance literacy support in the community.
- Describe your process to provide common learning opportunities for all local literacy stakeholders, including parents of limited-English-proficient students, to ensure supportive transitions from one literacy setting to the next.
- Describe your process to ensure that assessment results are available when students transition from one literacy setting to the next.
- Describe your process to identify children who are likely to need intervention services when they transition from one literacy setting to the next.

Subgrant Part B–Program Description (10 points)

Write a concise summary describing your proposal to improve the language and literacy development of disadvantaged students in your school or early education center.

- Include specific details about how you will significantly increase the amount of instructional time for disadvantaged students. Cite the evidence base for the activities you have selected.

- Include specific details about how you will ensure that the quality of instruction for disadvantaged students is increased. Cite the evidence base for the activities you have selected.
- Include specific details about your process to equip educators and other stakeholders to collect, analyze, and use high-quality data to improve instructional practices and student literacy outcomes. Cite the evidence base for the activities you have selected.

Subgrant Part C–Improving Learning Outcomes (50 points maximum)

Improving the language and literacy development of disadvantaged students is essential to improving academic achievement for these students in all content areas. Meeting the language and literacy needs of disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, is a particular focus of the SRCL program.

1. Needs Assessment (5 points)
 - Describe your needs assessment process.
 - Describe the student- and teacher-level data that were considered.
 - List, by grade level, the needs revealed by these data.
 - Explain how faculty and staff from the selected school(s) or center(s) were involved in the needs assessment process.
 - Explain how faculty and staff from the selected school(s) or center(s) were involved in the planning process to select evidence-based program materials and activities to address the identified needs.
2. Describe how SRCL funds will be used to significantly increase the amount of instructional time for disadvantaged students. (4 points)
3. Professional Development (4 points)
 - Explain how funds will be used to provide effective professional development (PD) in literacy to early learning teachers, to teachers of reading and English language arts, and to content area teachers in order to increase the quality of literacy instruction for disadvantaged students. Include

specific details that address the SRCL definition of professional development that is included in Appendix A of this subgrant application.

- Describe how you will use specific technology tools and strategies to enhance professional development opportunities.
- Explain the process to monitor and document the effectiveness of professional development activities.

4. Curriculum and Instructional Materials (4 points)

- Explain your process for developing a comprehensive scope and sequence that is aligned with state standards.
- Explain how you will incorporate the components of effective literacy instruction (Appendix A) in order to support children and youth with diverse learning needs.
- Describe the curriculum and instructional materials that will be used in the implementation of your SRCL grant. Cite the evidence base for all materials.
- Explain the process you will use to ensure the effective use of technology as an instructional tool or strategy.

5. Assessment System (4 points)

- Describe your assessment system including which measures or strategies will be used for screening, diagnosing student difficulties, and progress monitoring.
- Explain your process to ensure that these assessments are aligned to state standards and assessments.
- Describe any assessment accommodations necessary for the reliable and accurate assessment of disadvantaged students.
- Describe the process that you will use to ensure that assessment data are used to inform instruction, interventions, professional development, and continuous program improvement.

- Explain the structures that you will have in place (e.g., problem solving teams, meeting schedules, data-analysis protocols, reporting procedures) to support the effective and timely use of data by all stakeholders.
6. Intervention (5 points)
- Describe your intervention plan, including the intervention schedule, intervention providers, and the intervention materials and/or strategies that will be used for students who are struggling with the material.
 - Describe the intervention/enrichment materials and strategies that will be used for students who have mastered the material ahead of their peers.
 - Describe the process for selecting the teachers who will deliver the intervention instruction. Include the data that demonstrate the effectiveness of the selected teachers.
 - Describe the professional development that is provided to intervention teachers for all evidence-based materials and strategies used to provide intervention instruction.
 - Explain the process for monitoring the progress of students receiving intervention instruction.
 - Explain the process for monitoring the implementation of the intervention plan.
7. Environment (4 points)
- Describe your plan to establish and support language- and text-rich learning environments.
 - Tell how you will ensure that students, especially disadvantaged students, are engaged throughout the day in speaking, listening, reading, and writing.
8. Monitoring and Evaluation (4 points)
- Describe how you will monitor program implementation and outcomes.
 - Explain how you will use implementation and outcome data from the school, classroom, and student levels to inform continuous improvement.
 - Explain how you will use implementation and outcome data to document the effectiveness of the SRCL activities in order to improve instruction across all literacy settings.

- Explain how you will report evaluation data and plans for improvement to all stakeholders, including parents of limited-English-proficient students.
9. Describe your plan to coordinate proposed SRCL activities with all local literacy efforts. Explain how you will leverage existing resources (federal, state, and local) to ensure this coordination. Include all leveraged resources in the Budget Summary and Budget Narrative. (8 points)
 10. Describe your process to strengthen community literacy partnerships in support of disadvantaged students through planning and implementing SRCL activities that involve all literacy stakeholders, including families, caregivers, local businesses, organizations and other community agencies. (8 points)

Part D–Lessons Learned (10 points)

Write a brief summary describing any previous literacy programs or initiatives that have been implemented in the past five years. Include in this summary:

- A brief description of the activities involved.
- The most positive outcomes of the program(s) and the factors that led to those outcomes.
- The steps that you have taken to sustain the positive outcomes.
- The greatest challenges to full implementation of the previous program(s).
- Lessons learned from the previous program(s) that can impact your success in achieving the outcomes of the SRCL program. Include lessons learned specifically related to improving learning outcomes for disadvantaged students.

Part E–Program Budget and Budget Narrative (20 Points)

- Subgrant funds must be used to implement a comprehensive and coherent literacy program that addresses each of the parts described in this subgrant application. The Budget Summary (Appendix B) should include all projected implementation costs for personnel (salaries and benefits), professional development, materials, equipment, and supplies. It should also include any other costs associated with activities that are conducted outside school hours such as transportation, janitorial support, etc.

- Provide a budget narrative detailing the justification for each budget item requiring funding. Provide sufficient detail to give the reviewers a clear understanding of how SRCL funds will be used and the relationship between the requested funds and project activities and outcomes. Include the use of all leveraged funds or other leveraged resources that will be used to support SRCL activities.
- Provide a program budget summary and budget narrative for Year 3 that reflects the reduction in SRCL funds.
- In the budget narrative for Year 3, show the local, state, or other federal funds that will be leveraged to continue SRCL activities.

Appendix A–Definitions

The complete appendix will include the definitions given in the SRCL discretionary grant application for effective literacy instruction and professional development.

Sample Appendix B–Budget Summary

| Sample Budget Summary for Each Selected School or Early Education Center | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Category | Description | SRCL Funds Requested | Leveraged Funds |
| Personnel | Salaries and fringe benefits for all participating personnel including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Teachers • Intervention Teachers • Para-professionals | List the amount of funding requested from SRCL funds. | List the amount and source of funding to be provided through other sources (federal, state, or local) for implementation of SRCL activities. |
| Professional Development | List the costs of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants • Substitutes • Stipends • Equipment • Materials and Supplies | | |
| Materials and Supplies | List the costs of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Materials • Library Materials • Assessment Materials • Supplies | | |
| Equipment | List the costs of specific equipment required to implement SRCL activities. | | |
| Other | List other specific costs such as those that might be associated with activities outside of school hours such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Transportation • Janitorial Supplies and Services • Additional Utility Costs | | |

Sample Pre-Application Rubric

A complete pre-application rubric similar to the sample below will be completed by each potential applicant. The three tables that will be provided with this rubric will allow applicants to determine whether they are considered to have High Priority, Moderate Priority, or Low Priority for receiving a subgrant award.

| LEA Name _____ School Name _____ | High Priority | Moderate Priority | Low Priority |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students. | | | |
| 2. Effectiveness in improving literacy outcomes for disadvantaged students. | | | |
| 3. Effectiveness in providing professional development and support. | | | |

The first award priority, numbers of disadvantaged students, will be listed in a complete table similar to the sample table (see page33). This complete table will display the 2011-2012 data for all LEAs and schools within each LEA. Additional criteria will be included for the numbers and percentages of students who are limited-English proficient (LEP) and for students with disabilities. From this table, applicants will determine the schools with the highest numbers and percentages of disadvantaged students, and each LEA will determine its priority ranking as High, Moderate, or Low Priority. Early education providers will use the data from the elementary school that will serve the majority of the children involved in the early education center.

| LEA Name | School Name | Grades Served | Total # Students Served | # Eligible Free or Reduced Lunch | % Eligible Free or Reduced Lunch | # Scoring Below Proficient | % Scoring Below Proficient |
|----------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| County A | ABC Elem | K-5 | 400 | 300 | 75 | 180 | 45 |
| | DEF Elem | K-5 | 400 | 225 | 56 | 220 | 55 |
| | HIJ Middle | 6-8 | 750 | 560 | 75 | 466 | 62 |
| | KLM High | 9-12 | 750 | 495 | 66 | 482 | 64 |
| County B | Smith Elem | K-6 | 500 | 130 | 26 | 97 | 19 |
| | Jones High | 7-12 | 500 | 116 | 23 | 132 | 26 |

The second award priority, effectiveness in improving student literacy outcomes, will be determined through a second table similar to the sample below. Using an identifying code instead of names, this table will show the increase in numbers and percentages of students proficient in reading on statewide assessments over the past five years for all students, for students receiving free and/or reduced lunch, for LEP students, and for students with disabilities. Each individual LEA will use its identifying code to determine its priority ranking as High, Moderate, or Low Priority. Early education providers will use the data from the elementary school that will serve the majority of the children involved in the early education center.

| LEA Code | School Code | Year | All Students | | Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch | | LEP Students |
|----------|-------------|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | # Scoring Below Proficient | % Scoring Below Proficient | # Scoring Below Proficient | % Scoring Below Proficient | # Scoring Below Proficient |
| County 1 | 101 Elem | 2007 | | | | | |
| | | 2008 | | | | | |
| | | 2009 | | | | | |
| | | 2010 | | | | | |
| | | 2011 | | | | | |
| | 102 Elem | 2007 | | | | | |
| | | 2008 | | | | | |
| | | 2009 | | | | | |
| | | 2010 | | | | | |
| | | 2011 | | | | | |

The third award priority—effectiveness with professional development—will require applicants to assess the structures and/or practices currently in place to support professional development. A third table

will be made available that includes a sample listing of structures and practices such as an active school literacy team, peer coaching, common planning times for grade levels or content areas, regularly scheduled data meetings, professional learning communities, etc.

Sample Scoring Rubric for the Subgrant Application

Evaluate each of the questions separately. Indicate whether the proposal Does Not Meet Standard, Meets Standard, or describes an Exemplary Plan. Give each question a total number of points that reflects the evaluation. In bullet form, list the strengths and weaknesses of each answer. In order to be eligible for an award, each of the questions must receive a numerical score within the Meets Standard category or the Exemplary category.

Subgrant Part A–Eligibility (10 points maximum)

The applicant:

- Gives evidence of effectiveness at improving literacy outcomes.
- Gives evidence of providing professional development in literacy.
- Has selected the setting(s) with the highest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged students (according to the SRCL definition).

| Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exemplary Plan | Total Points |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 0-2 | 3-8 | 9-10 | |

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

A complete scoring rubric will be provided to the expert reviewers. The complete scoring rubric will follow this format for each part of the subgrant application: bulleted items that must be addressed for each question; a table with the numerical ranges for each category (Does Not Meet Standard, Meets Standard, and Exemplary Plan) for each question; and Strengths and Weaknesses for each question.

C. Project Management

(C.i) The SRCL program in Alabama will be managed jointly by the State Literacy Team, the SDE Steering Committee and the SRCL staff. The State Literacy team will provide policy direction and will serve as the vital link to local literacy partnerships to support implementation of the state literacy plan and of SRCL activities. The SDE Steering Committee—made up of the directors and coordinators of each of the sections in the Instructional Services Division of the Alabama State Department of Education—will serve as the SDE management team. The Steering Committee will ensure coordination between SRCL activities and other statewide literacy efforts such as implementation of new College- and Career-Ready Standards for English Language Arts. The SRCL staff will consist of a project director and four staff members—an early childhood specialist, an elementary specialist, a secondary specialist, and a technology specialist—recommended by the state literacy team. Each of these specialists will work half-time in the development of SRCL activities and resources and continue to work half-time in their areas of expertise. The dual role will ensure that SRCL activities and resources meet the needs of students from Birth through Grade 12.

Mrs. Reeda Betts, a member of the ARI staff, will serve as the SRCL project director. The project director will serve as the liaison between the State Literacy Team, the SDE Steering Committee, the SRCL staff, and LEA subgrantees. Mrs. Betts' major responsibilities will be:

- Facilitating meetings of the State Literacy Team.
- Reporting regularly to the SDE Steering Committee.
- Working with the SRCL program specialists to develop evidence-based professional development (PD) resources and activities.
- Working with the Web designer to ensure a high-quality literacy Web site.
- Ensuring that the subgrants made by the SDE meet the requirements of the SRCL grant.
- Approving all expenditures and monitoring adherence to the budget.
- Ensuring compliance to project schedules and quality assurance standards.

- Assessing LEA activities on a regular basis to determine whether they have been effective in achieving the purposes of the SRCL grant.
- Overseeing the evaluation activities of the SRCL program.

The responsibilities of the three literacy specialists will be:

- Developing evidence-based professional development that aligns with the complete definition in the SRCL application.
- Working with the other SRCL specialists to plan and develop literacy resources appropriate to the needs of all learners from Birth through Grade 12.
- Working with the Web designer to identify and develop technology-based resources for students, parents, and literacy partners.
- Working with subgrantees to ensure effective implementation of all SRCL activities.
- Working with local literacy partnerships to implement the state literacy plan.

The responsibilities of the technology specialist will be:

- Working with the State Literacy Team and the SRCL staff to plan the literacy Web site.
- Designing and creating the literacy Web site.
- Designing and creating the data reporting site.
- Managing the Web site.
- Working with the other SRCL specialists to design technology resources.
- Working with the other SRCL specialists to develop and deliver technology-based professional development.
- Providing technical assistance to subgrantees regarding technology questions.

Timeline for SRCL Activities

| Month | Activity | Person(s) Responsible |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2011 | | |
| May | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with the State Literacy Team to develop a plan for a statewide campaign to disseminate the state literacy plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team/ARI |
| June to August | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disseminate the state literacy plan • Establish local literacy partnerships | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team/ARI |
| September | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announce the Subgrant Competition. • Solicit recommendations for SRCL specialists • Conduct the proposal Webinar • Schedule the proposal workshop • Prepare materials for the proposal workshop | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Superintendent • SRCL Director • SRCL Director/ARI • SRCL Director • SRCL Director / ARI |
| October | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire SRCL specialists • Conduct proposal workshop • Begin Web site development • Meet with higher education partners (Higher ED) to begin resource development • Begin development of professional development (PD) modules | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee • SRCL Director/ARI • Technology specialist • SRCL staff • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| November | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct pre-application conferences with LEAs • Provide technical assistance to applicants • Continue development of resources and PD • Secure expert reviewers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Higher ED • SRCL Director/Steering Committee |

| | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| December | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with State Literacy Team for progress updates regarding implementation of the state literacy plan • Planning meeting with evaluator • Provide technical assistance to applicants • Complete PD materials for Phase 1 • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • SRCL Staff/Steering Committee/Evaluator • SRCL Staff/ARI • Higher ED Partners • ARI |
| 2012 | | |
| January | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subgrant applications due • Review subgrant applications • Web site opened • Begin development of data site • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants • Expert Reviewers • Technology Specialist • Technology Specialist • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| February | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with State Literacy Team to make award decisions • Announce awards • Prepare materials for orientation meeting. • Continue development of resources and PD • Continue development of data site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/State Literacy Team/ARI • SRCL Director • SRCL Staff • SRCL Staff/Higher ED • Technology Specialist |
| March | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint orientation meeting with SRCL subgrantees and State Literacy Team to introduce the implementation evaluation and to begin sustainability plans • Complete PD materials for Phase 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team/Evaluator • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |

| | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue development of resources and PD • Continue development of data site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/Higher ED • Technology Specialist |
| April & May | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning meeting with Evaluator • Provide technical assistance to complete sustainability plans • Continue development of resources and PD • Data site opened | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ Evaluator • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Higher ED Partners • Technology Specialist |
| June & July | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for overview of summer PD • Professional development sessions with subgrantees • Complete PD materials for Phase 3 • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • SRCL Staff/Subgrantees/Consultants • SRCL Staff/Higher ED • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| August & September | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin implementation • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance • Begin evaluation activities • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subgrantees • SRCL Staff/ARI • Evaluator • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| October | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for quarterly progress reports and planning • ARI statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| November & December | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| 2013 | | |
| January & February | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for quarterly progress reports and planning • Mid-year data meetings to consider adding additional schools/centers in Cohort 2 • ARI statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance • Conduct mid-year evaluation activities • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • Subgrantees/SRCL Staff • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI • Evaluator • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| March to May | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance • Select Cohort 2 schools/centers for implementation • Complete evaluation activities • Continue development of resources and PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Steering Committee • Evaluator • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| June & July | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for quarterly progress reports and planning • Professional development sessions with Cohort 2 • Provide PD to equip LEA literacy specialists to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • SRCL Staff/Consultants • SRCL Staff/ARI/LEA Literacy |

| | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>monitor and provide technical assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide PD and technical assistance to Cohort 1 schools/centers to implement sustainability plans • Continue development of resources and PD | <p>Specialists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Higher ED |
| August September | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin implementation for Cohort 2 • Provide PD and technical assistance to Cohort 2 schools/centers as requested • Provide local technical assistance to Cohort 1 schools/centers • Meet with evaluator to complete Year 1 evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cohort 2 schools • SRCL Staff/ARI/LEA Literacy Specialists • LEA Literacy Specialists • SRCL Staff/Evaluator |
| October | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for Year 1 Evaluation Report • ARI Statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance to Cohort 2 schools/centers • Monitor Cohort 1 sustainability plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team/Evaluator • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI |
| November & December | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance to Cohort 2 schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI • SRCL Staff/ARI/LEA Literacy Specialists |
| 2014 | | |
| January to March | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Literacy Team meeting for quarterly progress reports and planning • Mid-year data meetings for Cohorts 1 & 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI/State Literacy Team • SRCL Staff/ARI/Cohort |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARI statewide PD • Monitor implementation and provide technical assistance to Cohort 2 schools • Conduct mid-year evaluation activities for Cohorts 1 & 2 • Monitor sustainability plans for Cohort 1 • Review progress and determine whether to conduct a new subgrant competition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 & 2 Schools • SRCL Staff/ARI/LEA Literacy Specialists • Evaluator • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff/Steering Committee |
| April to August | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD for LEA Literacy Specialists • Prepare for subgrant competition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRCL Staff/ARI • SRCL Staff |
| September to May 2014 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue cycle of support to Cohorts 1 & 2 • Begin a new cycle of subgrant competition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA Literacy Specialists • SRCL Staff/ARI |

(C.ii) The project director, Mrs. Reeda Betts, is an administrator with the Alabama Reading Initiative. Before joining the ARI state staff in 2005, she served as a regional coach for four years. She helped to develop the Alabama Reading Initiative-Project for Adolescent Literacy (ARI-PAL), a nationally recognized literacy initiative for adolescent learners. As the coordinator for ARI-PAL, she managed a regional secondary staff of ten members and had oversight of the development and delivery of professional development and support to project schools. Mrs. Betts currently has primary responsibility for ARI statewide professional development. Prior to her work with the ARI, she worked for six years as a high school English teacher for Grades 7-12. She holds a M.S. degree in Secondary English Education from Troy University.

The four specialists—three literacy specialists and one technology specialist—will be recommended by the State Literacy Team and selected by members of the SDE Steering Committee. In order to be considered, the three literacy specialists will have the following qualifications:

- Knowledge and experience with evidence-based literacy practices and materials.
- Experience implementing and training others to implement evidence-based literacy practices.
- An advanced degree in reading and literacy.
- Five years of teaching or administrative experience in one of the targeted levels—birth to age five, Kindergarten to Grade 5, Middle School, or High School.
- Knowledge and experience with the development and facilitation of adult learning.
- Strong communication and interpersonal skills.
- Strong organizational and management skills.

The technology specialist will have the following qualifications:

- Knowledge and experience with designing and utilizing databases.
- Knowledge and experience with video podcast development and Web-hosting.
- Web site development skills.
- Knowledge and experience with managing of digital content using accessible platforms.
- Knowledge of evidence-based technology programs, practices, and strategies.
- An advanced degree in technology.
- Strong communication and interpersonal skills.

(C.iii) The involvement of the State Literacy Team in the design and implementation of the SRCL program ensures diversity in perspectives. The State Literacy Team developed the state literacy plan which is the basis for the SRCL grant proposal. This team will consider the scoring and comments from the expert reviewers and make final subgrant award decisions. The State Literacy Team will meet with the SRCL subgrantees at the orientation meeting in March. Following the orientation meeting, the State Literacy Team will continue to meet quarterly to review progress and to offer guidance for strengthening implementation of the subgrant proposals. This team represents a wide range of experience and interests. Members of the State Literacy Team include appointees from the Alabama State Department of Education, the Department of Children’s Affairs, the Alabama Commission on Higher

Education, the state legislature, the State Board of Education, the state Teacher's Association, the state Reading Association, the state Association of School Boards, the state Association of School Superintendents, and the state Principals' Association. Other members from the education community include a local superintendent, a high school principal, an elementary reading coach, and a university professor of special education. There are also members from the research community and from community and local foundations.

The SRCL staff will be made up of a director with expertise in managing a statewide reading initiative and four specialists representing expertise in educational technology, in early childhood education, and in elementary and secondary education. These staff members will continue to work half-time in their particular areas of expertise to ensure that SRCL activities are appropriate for students from Birth through Grade 12.

D. Adequacy of Resources

(D.ii) The required SRCL funding allocations—at least 15 percent to serve children from birth through age five, at least 40 percent to serve students in Kindergarten through Grade 5, and at least 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school—will be ensured through the subgrant process and through the financial procedures required by the Alabama State Department of Education (SDE).

The letter to eligible applicants announcing the SRCL subgrant will include the requirements for allocations for SRCL funding. The allocation requirements will be clarified in an eligibility Webinar and in the subsequent proposal workshop. The subgrant application requires that LEAs or early education providers identify the schools or centers selected to receive SRCL funds and identify the grade levels or ages of students to be served in the selected schools or centers. The subgrant application requires that a proposed budget summary and budget narrative be submitted for each selected school or center.

Following the subgrant awards, any LEA or early education provider receiving a SRCL subgrant award will be required to submit a separate budget application to the SDE for each participating school or center before any SRCL funds are expended. This budget application must be reviewed by the SRCL director to verify allowable program requests and by the designated SDE financial officer to verify

availability of funding. The SRCL director will verify that the budget applications are reflective of the allocation requirements. Any funding request for activities other than those approved in the budget applications will require a budget amendment that must be approved by the SRCL director and the designated financial officer.

(D.iii) The primary goals of the SRCL program—increasing the amount of instructional time, increasing the quality of instruction, and making more effective use of data—are activities that will require ongoing commitment of all available resources. At the orientation meeting immediately following award announcements, subgrantees will begin to develop sustainability plans based on the sustainability resources developed by the National Reading Technical Assistance Center and the National Implementation Research Network. The sustainability plans will focus SRCL funds over three years to repurpose, expand, and strengthen all currently available material and human resources in order to accomplish SRCL literacy goals. These resources which are provided through other local, state, and federal funds will be available to support the ongoing commitment to advance literacy skills as SRCL funding is reduced.

At the end of Year 1, subgrantees that meet SRCL outcomes will have the option to use SRCL funds to support the sustainability plans in the Cohort 1 schools and to implement SRCL activities in Cohort 2 schools or centers. Subgrantees that do not meet outcomes will continue to have technical assistance support for sustainability plans but may not receive additional SRCL funding for Year 2.

At the end of Year 2, subgrantees that continue to be successful in meeting SRCL outcomes will receive a reduced amount of SRCL funds to support sustainability plans. A new subgrant competition will be held.

(D.iv) In order to ensure that significant numbers of disadvantaged students are served through the SRCL program, one of the eligibility priorities for subgrant applicants is the number or percentage of disadvantaged students to be served in the selected schools or early education centers. The documents that will be used for the pre-application Webinar (see Pre-application Rubric on page 31) will identify

those LEAs and early education providers that serve the largest numbers of high-needs students. This will help to ensure that SRCL funds are targeted to the greatest needs.

In order to ensure that subgrant awards are of sufficient size to support proposed activities, subgrant awards will be based on the numbers of students served in the schools or early education centers. Awards of approximately \$750 to \$1,000 per student for two years will be made available to purchase instructional materials and to fund professional development to equip and support more teachers and leaders to deliver high-quality literacy instruction. Subgrants will be funded at a reduced amount in Year 3.

Project Narrative

Other Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1237-AL_Resume_Betts.pdf**

Attachment 2:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1238-AL_Resume_Butler.pdf**

Attachment 3:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1239-AL_Resume_Moscovitch.pdf**

Reeda Henderson Betts

Education-Troy State University, B.S. 1994-English-Magna Cum Laude

Troy State University, M.S.1996-Secondary English Education-
Summa Cum Laude

Alabama State University 2004-Education Administration
Certificate

Employment-Troy City Schools – 1996-1998-English Teacher- Taught 7th
grade English, served on intervention team

Crenshaw County Schools- 1998-2002- English Teacher-
Taught 7th-12th English, 7th Reading, sponsored BETA Club,
Miss HHS pageant, graduation, chairperson for SACS,
member of hiring committee

Alabama Reading Initiative -2002-2006- Regional
Secondary Reading Coach-Develop and provide professional
development for reading coaches and teachers

Alabama Reading Initiative-2006-Present-Education
Administrator with responsibility for development of statewide
professional development

Accomplishments-Published in *Alabama English*-“Carpet Time”

National Board Certified in Adolescent/Early Adult
Language Arts

Presenter for various state and regional reading and writing
conferences (ARA, SERVE, IRA Regional, Gulf Coast
Writing Conference)

Shari Levy Butler

(b)(6)

Education

University of Texas
Ph.D. Special Education, 2000

University of New Mexico
M.A. Special Education, E/BD, 1996

Texas A&M University
B.A. Psychology, 1992

Experience

RMC Research Corporation-Austin
Director, Sept. 2006-Present

The University of Texas
Special Education Department
Research Assistant Professor, Jan. 2004 - Sept. 2006
Lecturer: Reading Difficulties, SED378T, Fall 2002
Lecturer: Behavior Management, SED366, Fall 2000
Teaching Assistant, Aug. 1997 - Dec. 1997

The University of Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts
Associate Director, Jan. 2004 – Sept. 2006
Program Manager, Feb. 2002 – Jan. 2004
Research Associate, Aug. 2000 - Jan. 2002
Graduate Research Assistant, Jan. 1998 - Aug. 2000

Memorial Psychiatric Hospital
Special Education Teacher/Researcher, 1994 - 1997

The Briarwood School
Special Education Teacher, 1992 - 1994

Professional Organizations

Council for Exceptional Children (Divisions: Early Childhood, Behavior Disorders, Research)
American Educational Research Association
Kappa Delta Pi

Publications

Swanson, E. & Butler, S. (in review). Students with Behavior Disorders: Improving Outcomes Through Professional Development in Reading and Behavior. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders.

Levy, S., Kim, A. & Olive, M. (2006). Interventions for Young Children with Autism: A Synthesis of the Literature. Focus on Autism and Developmental Disorders.

Levy, S., Coleman, M. & Alsmann, B. (2002). Reading instruction for elementary students with emotional/behavioral disorders: What's a teacher to do? Beyond Behavior.

Levy, S. & Vaughn, S. (2002). An observational study of reading instruction of teachers for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders.

Vaughn, S., Levy, S., Coleman, M., & Bos, C. (2002). Reading instruction for students with LD and EBD: A synthesis of observation studies. Journal of Special Education.

Levy, S. & Chard, D. J. (2001). Reading and students with behavior disorders: Research & practice. International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 48 (4), 429-444.

Proposals Funded

Central Regional Center for Reading First Technical Assistance (2005-2006). U.S. Department of Education & RMC Research Corporation, \$1,928,170, Principal Investigator.

Central Regional Center for Reading First Technical Assistance (2004-2005). U.S. Department of Education & RMC Research Corporation, \$1,665,143, Deputy Director.

Central Regional Center for Reading First Technical Assistance (2003-2004). U.S. Department of Education & RMC Research Corporation, \$1,665,143, Deputy Director.

Reading First Teacher Preparation Initiative (2003-2006). U.S. Department of Education & National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, \$1,890,019, Principal Investigator.

Reading First: Higher Education Collaborative (2003-2008). Texas Education Agency, \$ 993,537, Co-Principal Investigator.

Higher Education Collaborative: Scientifically Based Reading Research in Teacher Preparation Programs (2003). U.S. Department of Education, OSERS, \$394,255, Co-Principal Investigator.

A Three-tiered model for preventing Reading Difficulties: A How-To Manual (2002-2003). Texas Education Agency, \$215,441, Co-Principal Investigator.

Higher Education Collaborative: TEKS in Teacher Preparation Programs (2002-2003). Texas Education Agency, \$749,148, Co-Principal Investigator.

Higher Education Collaborative: TEKS in Teacher Preparation Programs (2001-2002). Texas Education Agency, \$256,851, Co-Principal Investigator.

Higher Education Collaborative: TEKS in Teacher Preparation Programs for Special Educators (2001-2002). Texas Education Agency, \$149,957, Co-Principal Investigator.

Second Grade Teacher Reading Academy for Pre-service Teachers (2001-2002). Texas Education Agency, \$70,725, Co-Principal Investigator.

Reports/Training Manuals

Butler, S., Urrutia, K., Buenger, A., & Hunt, M. (2010). A Review of the Current Research on Vocabulary Instruction. Austin, TX: RMC Research Corporation.

Butler, S., Urrutia, K., Buenger, A., & Hunt, M. (2009). A Review of the Current Research on Comprehension Instruction. Austin, TX: RMC Research Corporation.

- Butler, S. & Gonzalas, N. (2009). Conditions for Success: Reading Instruction for English Language Learners. Austin, TX: RMC Research Corporation.
- Lincke, D., & Butler, S., & Urrutia, K. (2008). Five year report of the National Reading First Technical Assistance Center. Austin, TX: RMC Research Corporation.
- Levy, S. (2003). The Higher Education Collaborative Report. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bramblett, E., Cavanaugh, C., Dickey, M., Kim, A., Krezmien, M., Levy, S. Twiddy, K., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., Wood, K. (2003). 3-Tier Reading Model: Reducing Reading Difficulties for Kindergarten Through Third Grade Students. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Levy, S. (2002). The Higher Education Collaborative Report. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Levy, S. (2001). The Higher Education Collaborative Report. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bell, K., Bos, C., Bryant, D., Ui-Jung, K., Levy, S., Muoneke, A., Ugel, N., & Vaughn, S. (2000). Teaching the Viewing and Representing Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills in the English Language Arts Classroom - Special Ed. Adaptation Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bell, K., Bos, C., Bryant, D., Ui-Jung, K., Levy, S., Muoneke, A., Ugel, N., & Vaughn, S. (2000). Enhancing Writing Instruction for Secondary Students - Special Ed. Adaptation. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bell, K., Bos, C., Bryant, D., Ui-Jung, K., Levy, S., Muoneke, A., Ugel, N., & Vaughn, S. (2000). Reading Fluency: Principles for Instruction and Progress Monitoring - Special Ed. Adaptation. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bell, K., Bos, C., Bryant, D., Ui-Jung, K., Levy, S., Muoneke, A., Ugel, N., & Vaughn, S. (2000). Enhancing Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension for Secondary Students – Special Ed. Adaptation. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Bell, K., Bos, C., Bryant, D., Ui-Jung, K., Levy, S., Muoneke, A., Ugel, N., & Vaughn, S. (2000). Phonological Awareness: Principles for Instruction and Progress Monitoring – Special Ed. Adaptation. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Chard, D. J., Levy, S., Prestidge, L., Brant, A., & Coleman, M. (1999). An Evaluation of the Texas Reading Academics Program. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.
- Levy, S., & Chard, D. J. (1998). Phonological Awareness: Principles for Instruction and Progress Monitoring. Austin, TX: Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts.

National Conference Presentations

- Butler, S. (2010, July). Vocabulary: A Review of the Research Since the NRP Report. 2010 Department of Education Reading Institute, Anaheim, California.

- Butler, S (2010, June). Vocabulary: A Review of the Research. NRTAC Regional Conference. Dallas, Texas.
- Butler, S. (2009, July). Comprehension: A Review of the Research. 2009 Department of Education Reading Institute. Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Butler, S. (2008, July). Response to Intervention. 5th Annual National Reading First Conference. Nashville, Tennessee.
- Butler, S. (2007, July). Continuing the Commitment: Sustaining Reading First Outcomes. 4th Annual National Reading First Conference. St. Louis, Missouri.
- Butler, S. (2006, July). Response to Intervention, 3rd Annual National Reading First Conference, Reno, Nevada.
- Levy, S., & Wood, K. (2005, July). Introduction to the 3-Tier Reading Model. 2nd Annual National Reading First Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Levy, S., Krezmien, M., & Swanson, E. (2004, April). Effective Reading Instruction for Teachers of Students with Emotional and/or Behavioral Disorders. Council for Exceptional Children, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Levy, S. (2004, February). Students with Emotional and/or Behavioral Disorders: Improving Outcomes Through Effective Reading Instruction. Pacific Coast Reading Conference, San Diego, California.
- Levy, S., Wood, K. (2003, October). 3-Tier Reading Model: Differentiating Instruction and Early Intervention. Council for Learning Disabilities, Seattle, Washington.
- Levy, S., Krezmien, M., & Swanson, E. (2003, October). Effective Reading Instruction for Teachers of Students with Emotional and/or Behavioral Disorders. Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Levy, S. & Wood, K. (2003, January). 3-Tier Reading Model: Differentiating Instruction and Early Intervention. Administrators' Midwinter Conference on Education, Austin, Texas.
- Levy, S. & Krezmian, M. (2003, January). Effective Reading Instruction for Students with EBD. Administrators' Midwinter Conference on Education, Austin, Texas.
- Levy, S. & Vaughn, S. (2003, February). Providing teachers of students with EBD professional development in scientifically based reading research: Does it improve reading outcomes? Pacific Coast Research Conference, La Jolla, California.
- Levy, S., Vaughn, S., & Coleman, M. (2002, April). Emotional/Behavioral disorders and reading: What we know and need to know. Annual Council for Exceptional Children conference, New York City, New York.
- Levy, S., Coleman, M., & Bryant, D. (2001, April). Effective resource room teachers and reading instruction. Annual Council for Exceptional Children conference, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Chard, D. J., & Levy, S. (2001, February). Meeting the needs of students with EBD: What are we doing vs. what we should be doing. Midwest Symposium for Leadership in Behavior Disorders, Kansas City, Missouri.

Levy, S. (2000, April). Reading instruction for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Annual Council for Exceptional Children conference, Vancouver, Canada.

Levy, S., Cass, R., & Chard, D. J. (1999, April). Considerations in providing access to the general education curriculum: Potential harmful effects. Annual Council for Exceptional Children conference, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Levy, S. (1999, February). Behavioral support and IDEA. Council for Exceptional Children Student Chapter, Austin, Texas.

Levy, S. (1998). Academic achievement and behavioral support for students with behavioral challenges. Annual Texas Council for Exceptional Children conference, Houston, Texas.

Levy, S., & Stuart, S. (1995). Strategies for teaching students with dual diagnosis. Annual conference of the New Mexico Learning Disabilities Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

State and Local Workshops/Presentations

- Literacy Centers, Bismarck, North Dakota, 2010
- Comprehension Instruction, Bismarck, North Dakota, June 2010
- Response to Intervention, Bismarck, North Dakota, June 2006
- 1st Grade Teacher Reading Academy Training, Bismarck, North Dakota, June 2005
- A Three-tiered model for preventing Reading Difficulties, Indianapolis, IN., June 2004
- 2nd Teacher Reading Academy Training, Bismarck, North Dakota, July 2004
- K Teacher Reading Academy Training, Bismarck, North Dakota, June 2004
- Teacher Reading Academy Training, Bismarck, North Dakota, August 2003.
- A Three-tiered model for preventing Reading Difficulties, Dallas, Texas, September 2003.
- A Three-tiered model for preventing Reading Difficulties, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 2003.
- Kindergarten Teacher Reading Academy, Master trainer, Birmingham, Alabama, March 2003.
- Aligning Teacher Preparation with Research-Based Practices in Reading to Meet National Certification Standards, Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi, March 2002.
- Bayley Infant Neurodevelopment Screener and Preschool Language Scale-III (PLS-III), Advocacy Outreach, November 2001.
- Effective Practices in Reading Instruction, Advocacy Outreach, Elgin, Texas, November 2001.
- Enhancing Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension for Secondary Students, Region IV Education Service Center, Houston, Texas, April 2001.
- Phonological Awareness, Region XIX Education Service Center, El Paso, Texas, December 2000.
- Cooperative Teaching, Region XIX Education Service Center, El Paso, Texas, December 2000.

Academic Service

- Consultant to Louisiana Department of Education, Reading First implementation, May 2003.
- University of Texas Charter School, CEO, 2002-2003.
- Consultant to New Mexico Department of Education, Expert Review Team and Analysis of Reading Courses and Programs, 2002.
- Consultant to Jackson State University, Reading First Grant, 2002.
- Consultant to Alabama Department of Education, Reading First Grant, 2002.
- Consultant to Georgia Department of Education, Reading Excellence Act Grant Review, 2002.

- Committee Member for Dyslexia Teacher Academy Training, Region X Education Service Center, Dallas, Texas, 2002.
- Guest Lecturer, “Dyslexia, Reading, and IDEA,” Educational Administration, Tarleton State University, Killeen, Texas, February 2002.
- Guest Lecturer, “Early Childhood Screening, Assessment, and Progress Monitoring,” Human Ecology, University of Texas, February 2002.
- Guest Lecturer, “Classroom and Behavioral Management,” ALD 322 Individual Differences, University of Texas, March 2000.
- Guest Lecturer, “Using Classroom Data to Guide Decision-Making for Students with Special Needs: Functional Assessment,” SED 366 Behavior Management, University of Texas, February 2000.
- Guest Lecturer, “Functional Assessment vs. Functional Analysis,” ALD 322 Individual Differences, University of Texas, Spring, 1999.
- Guest Lecturer, “IDEA” SED 366 Behavior Management, University of Texas, Spring, 1999.
- Guest Lecturer, “Positive Reinforcement,” SED 366 Behavior Management, University of Texas, Spring, 1999.

Community Service

- Board of Directors, CASA, 2006-2010
- Board of Directors, Vice President for Financial Development, Junior League of Austin, 2007-2008
- Coats for Kids Chair, Junior League of Austin, 2006-2007
- Coats for Kids Chair Elect, Junior League of Austin, 2005-2006
- Auction Chair, A Christmas Affair, Junior League of Austin 2004-2005
- Coats for Kids Committee- Celebrity Coat Chair, Junior League of Austin, 2003-2004
- Coats for Kids Committee –Public Relations Chair, Junior League of Austin, 2002-2003
- Junior League 1995-Present
- Children’s Advocacy Center 1998-Present
- Austin Smiles—medical mission to San Salvador, June, 1999
- CASA of Travis county, Guardian ad Litem, 1997-1999
- Board of Directors, Family and Children's Services, Inc., Albuquerque, NM 1995-1997

CAPE ANN ECONOMICS

(b)(6)

Biographical Sketch

Edward Moscovitch

Current Positions

- **Chairman:** Bay State Reading Institute

- **President, Cape Ann Economics:** Consulting on Regional Economics and Public Policy. Clients include FleetBoston Bank, the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation, MIT, the Massachusetts Council of Community Hospitals, the Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education, the Alabama Department of Education, the Agency for Strategic Planning (Republic of Kazakhstan), the National Education Association, the Delaware Department of Finance, the Trust for Public Lands, the Massachusetts Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, the National Education Association, the Massachusetts Housing Partnership, the Massachusetts Bankers Association, Gloucester Public Schools, the New England Council, the Energy Foundation, and the University of Alabama. Recent work includes evaluations of the Alabama Reading Initiative, an in-depth analysis of the economic health of community hospitals in Massachusetts and across the country, a comprehensive evaluation of primary, secondary, and higher education in Kazakhstan, analysis of Massachusetts standardized test results that take into account student demographics, projections of Adequate Yearly Progress results for Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, Massachusetts and Delaware economic forecasts, an analysis of all businesses started by MIT graduates, and a study of the long-term growth prospects for Massachusetts. Also, a study of the impact of open space on values of near-by real estate, a comparative study of nursing home and other Medicaid costs between Massachusetts and other states, a study of the impact of university research on the Alabama economy, preparation of the initial draft of the finance portions of the 1993 Massachusetts school reform statute, a study of adverse selection amongst insured employees choosing HMOs, a comprehensive review of special education programs in Gloucester, and a review of children's health and school nursing for the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

Education

- B.A. Oberlin College, 1962
- Ph.D. (Economics), MIT, 1966

Previous Positions

- Executive Director, Massachusetts Municipal Association
- Deputy Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs, Massachusetts Dept of Administration and Finance
- Vice President, Data Resources, Inc.
- Vice President, Charles River Associates

Writings

- **Closing the Gap – Raising Skills to Raise Wages,** Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth, 1998
- **The New Economic Reality - Massachusetts Prospects for Long-Term Growth,** jointly with Craig Moore, The School of Management, UMass, Amherst
- **Special Education - Good Intentions Gone Awry,** the Pioneer Institute, 1994
- **Mental Retardation, How Does Massachusetts Compare?,** the Pioneer Institute
- Occasional Columns for the Boston *Herald*
- **Closing the Gap – Raising Skills to Raise Wages,** Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth, 1997

Budget Narrative

Budget Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1236-AL_SRCL_Budget_Narrative.pdf**

Alabama Budget Narrative

Section A Budget Summary

Project Year 1

| 1. Personnel | | \$240,000 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| <p>• <u>Project Director:</u> Mrs. Reeda Betts (resumé attached) is proposed for this position.</p> <p>Duties will be facilitating meetings of the State Literacy Team, reporting regularly to the Alabama State Department of Education (SDE) Steering Committee, working with the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) program specialists to develop evidence-based professional development resources and activities, working with the Web designer to ensure a high-quality literacy Web site, ensuring that the subgrants made by the SDE meet the requirements of the SRCL grant, approving all expenditures and monitoring adherence to the budget, ensuring compliance to project schedules and quality assurance standards, assessing on a regular basis local education agency (LEA) activities to determine whether they have been effective in achieving the purposes of the SRCL grant, and overseeing the evaluation activities of the SRCL program.</p> <p>The salary will be approximately \$(b)(4) annually. (b)(4) of the salary will be paid with SRCL funds and (b)(4) continue to be paid by the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI).</p> <p>The project director will work (b)(4) percent of the time on SRCL activities and (b)(4) percent of the time on Alabama Reading Initiative activities.</p> | \$ (b)(4) | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>The project director is a necessary position to ensure that all state- and LEA-level activities are carried out as proposed. The project director will ensure that SRCL activities are coordinated with other state-level literacy activities.</p> <p>The salary estimate is based on Mrs. Reeda Betts' current salary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Three SRCL specialists</u> will be recommended by the State Literacy Team. <p>Duties will be developing evidence-based professional development that aligns with the complete definition included in the SRCL application; working with the other SRCL specialists to plan and develop literacy resources appropriate to the needs of all learners from Birth through Grade 12; working with the web designer to identify and develop technology-based resources for students, parents, and literacy partners; working with subgrantees to ensure effective implementation of all SRCL activities; and working with local literacy partnerships to implement the state literacy plan.</p> <p>The salary will be approximately \$(b)(4) annually for each specialist. (b)(4) of the salary will be paid with SRCL funds and (b)(4) will continue to be paid by current employers.</p> <p>(b)(4) of the salary for three specialist positions (b)(4)</p> | | |
| <p>The specialists will work (b)(4) percent of the time on SRCL activities and continue to work (b)(4) percent in their current positions.</p> <p>The three specialist positions are necessary to ensure that the professional development resources are appropriate to the needs of teachers of children in each of the age spans (Birth through Grade 12,</p> | | |

elementary, or adolescent). The specialists will continue to work (b)(4)

time in their current positions in order to ensure coordination between the SRCL program and programs for each of the three age spans.

The salaries are **based on the average** of current ARI annual salaries.

- A technology specialist will work (b)(4) time with SRCL and (b)(4) time in the current job.

The **duties** of the technology specialist are working with the State Literacy Team and the SRCL staff to plan the literacy Web site, designing and creating the literacy Web site, designing and creating the data reporting site, managing the Web site, working with the SRCL specialists to design technology resources, working with the other SRCL specialists to develop and deliver technology-based professional development, and providing technical assistance to subgrantees regarding technology needs.

The **salary** of the technology specialist will be approximately \$ (b)(4)

(b)(4) of the salary will be paid through SRCL grant and (b)(4) will continue to be paid by the current employer.

(b)(4)

The technology specialist will work (b)(4) **percent of the time** on SRCL activities and (b)(4) percent of the time in the current position.

The technology specialist is **necessary to the SRCL project** to develop and maintain the literacy Web site which will be a major source of public information and literacy resources. The technology specialist will also be involved in managing the professional development resources that are developed for each age group.

The salary for the technology specialist is **based on the average**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <p>current salaries of the ARI staff.</p> <p>One <u>clerical staff position</u> will be needed.</p> <p>The duties of the clerical staff member will be assisting in managing the SRCL office in the absence of the project director; performing general administrative responsibilities such as distributing mail, preparing correspondence, requisitions, travel and various forms; working accurately within databases to manage massive amounts of information; communicating in person, by telephone, and via e-mail with the SRCL staff and with public and private constituents; proofreading and editing various documents such as correspondence, professional articles, and training modules for final publication.</p> <p>The salary for the SRCL clerical position will be \$40,000 annually.</p> <p>The SRCL clerical staff member will work 100 percent of the time on SRCL activities.</p> <p>The clerical position will be necessary to ensure that someone is available at all times to handle day-to-day SRCL activities. With the professional staff working half-time on SRCL activities, there may be times when none of them are present in the office. The clerical staff member will be able to direct any questions or requests for information to the appropriate professional staff member to keep SRCL activities moving forward.</p> <p>The salary for the clerical staff member is based on the average clerical salary for ARI clerical staff.</p> | <p>\$40,000</p> | |
| <p>2. Fringe Benefits</p> | | <p>(b)(4)</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fringe benefits for all proposed staff members are (b)(4) percent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (b)(4) percent F. I. C. A. ○ (b)(4) percent retirement ○ (b)(4) percent group health insurance • The fringe benefits are based on the proposed salaries of all personnel. | | |
| <p>3. Travel</p> | | \$269,910 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out-of-state travel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All SRCL staff members will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. 5 staff members @ \$750 transportation and airfare , \$600 hotel, \$150 meals= ○ Two individuals from each subgrantee school or center will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. 2 individuals X 80 schools @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$600 hotel, \$150 meals = • In-state travel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SRCL staff members will work ten days per month on SRCL activities; four days per month will not require travel. These activities will require travel from their home bases to the office to meet with other staff members, and to various locations across the state to meet with the State Literacy Team, with literacy partners, or with subgrantees to carry out SRCL activities. The average trip will be approximately 100 miles roundtrip. 5 staff members X 6 days per month X 12 months X an average of | <p style="text-align: right;">\$7,500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$240,000</p> | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| 100 roundtrip miles per day X \$.51 per mile = | \$18,360 | |
| 5 staff members X 6 days per month X 12 months X \$11.25 per diem = | \$4,050 | |
| 4. Equipment | | \$129,470 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laptop computer and printer will be purchased for each SRCL staff member <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Laptop computer-\$1,600 and printer-\$399 = \$1,999 5 staff members X \$1,999 = | \$9,995 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A computer and printer will be purchased for the SRCL clerical staff member. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Computer-\$875, monitor-\$201, and printer-\$399 = | \$1,475 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A computer and printer will be purchased for each of the 80 online course facilitators. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 facilitators X \$1,475 = • Cost estimates are based on current state bid prices. | \$118,000 | |
| 5. Supplies | | \$42,480 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General office supplies, duplicating supplies, data processing supplies, audio and video supplies. • These supplies are needed to produce correspondence, professional development materials, and publications in order to carry out all proposed SRCL activities. • Supplies: 6 staff members X \$590 per month X 12 months = • Cost estimates are based on the average monthly cost of supplies per staff member for the Alabama Reading Initiative. | \$42,480 | |
| 6. Contractual | | \$379,400 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert reviewers will be required for the Subgrant Competition. <p>Expert reviewers will be recommended by Dr. Shari Butler at RMC-Austin (vita is attached).</p> <p>Expert review: 2 reviews for each subgrant X 80 subgrants X \$200 =</p> <p><u>Online courses will be developed</u> to provide professional development to teachers and caregivers. A total of 19 different six-week online will be developed: three Language Essentials for teachers (for age spans—pre-school, elementary, adolescent), two Language Essentials for parents and caregivers (pre-school and elementary), four Intervention courses for teachers (pre-school, elementary, middle school, high school), three Intervention courses for parents (pre-school, elementary, adolescent), four Language Enrichment courses for teachers (pre-school, elementary, middle school, high school), and three Language Enrichment for parents (pre-school, elementary, and adolescent). Each of the courses will be developed by a two-member team made up of a teacher from the age span and a higher-education faculty member from a college or university. The <u>cost of developing</u> each of the courses is \$6,000 (\$3,000 per course X 2 team members). Course development: \$6,000 per course X 19 courses =</p> <p><u>Facilitators for online courses</u> will be required. Eighty facilitators will be trained (1 per subgrantee school or center). Online courses will be offered three times each year in February, June, and October. A teacher or parent could take all three courses (Language Essentials, Intervention, and Language Enrichment for one of the age spans) in a year.</p> | <p>\$32,000</p> <p>\$114,000</p> | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <p>Facilitator training: \$1,500 X 80 facilitators =</p> <p>Stipends for facilitators: 80 facilitators X \$750 per course X 3 courses per year =</p> <p>The cost of developing online courses is based on information provided by Dr. Tom Dreilinger, project manager for the E-Learning Project in Alabama. This joint project of the Alabama State Department of Education and Alabama Public Television provides free online courses on a variety of subjects to Alabama teachers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An <u>outside evaluation</u> of the SRCL project will be conducted. For the purposes of describing the evaluation and estimating the cost, the proposed evaluator is Dr. Edward Moscovitch (see attached vita). Dr. Moscovitch conducted the evaluation for Alabama's Reading First program and is very familiar with current state literacy efforts. The actual Evaluation Contract process will follow the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Part 74.44. <p>The projected cost of an outside evaluation is based on the cost of the latest evaluation =</p> <p>Dr. Moscovitch will make three trips to Alabama (beginning, mid-point, and end) to meet with the SRCL management team and with the State Literacy Team.</p> <p>The travel costs for these two-day trips will be: Three trips @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$400 hotel, and \$150 meals =</p> | <p>\$120,000</p> <p>\$180,000</p> <p>\$37,500</p> <p>\$3,900</p> | |
| <p>7. Construction</p> | | <p>Not applicable</p> |
| <p>8. Other</p> | | <p>\$55,930</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building rental: 6 staff members X \$592 per month X 12 months = • Utilities and communications: 6 staff members X \$167 per month X 12 months = • Data processing: 6 staff members X \$107 per month X 12 months = • These costs are necessary to maintaining office space in the Gordon Persons Building which houses the Alabama State Department of Education (SDE). The office space will allow the SRCL staff to work closely with other sections in the SDE to help coordinate all statewide literacy efforts. • The costs are based on the current average cost per person for these items for the Alabama Reading Initiative staff. | <p>\$42,624</p> <p>\$12,024</p> <p>\$1,282</p> | |
| 9. Total Direct Costs | | (b)(4) |
| 10. Indirect Costs (17.4%) | | |
| 11. Training Stipends | | |
| 12. Total Costs | | |

Alabama Budget Narrative
Section B Non-Federal Funds
Project Years 1-5

(b)(4)

Alabama Budget Narrative

Section A Budget Summary

Project Year 2

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <p>1. Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1. | | (b)(4) |
| <p>2. Fringe Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fringe benefits costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1. | | |
| <p>3. Travel</p> | | \$329,910 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-state travel costs should remain approximately the same as for Year 1. Out-of-state travel will increase is subgrantees add additional schools/centers in Year 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All <u>SRCL staff members</u> will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. 5 staff members @ \$750 transportation and airfare , \$600 hotel, \$150 meals = Two individuals from each subgrantee school or center will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. 2 individuals X 100 schools @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$600 hotel, \$150 meals = | <p style="text-align: right;">\$22,410</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$7,500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$300,000</p> | |
| <p>4. Equipment</p> | | \$59,000 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| and end) to meet with the SRCL management team and with the State Literacy Team. These two-day trips will cost: Three two-day trips @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$400 hotel, and \$150 meals = | \$3,900 | |
| 7. Construction | | Not applicable |
| 8. Other • Other costs associated with office space will remain approximately the same as in Year 1. | | \$55,930 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs | | (b)(4) |
| 10. Indirect Costs (17.4%) | | |
| 11. Training Stipend | | |
| 12. Total Costs | | |
| | | |

Alabama Budget Narrative

Section A Budget Summary

Project Year 3

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1. Personnel</p> <p>Personnel costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1.</p> | <p>(b)(4)</p> | |
| <p>2. Fringe Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fringe benefits costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1. | | |
| <p>3. Travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both out-of-state and in-state travel costs should remain approximately the same as for Year 2. | <p>\$329,910</p> | <p>\$329,910</p> |
| <p>4. Equipment</p> | | <p>0</p> |
| <p>5. Supplies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost of supplies should remain approximately the same as in Year 1. | <p>\$42,480</p> | <p>\$42,480</p> |
| <p>6. Contractual</p> | | <p>\$457,400</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert reviewers will be required for the new Subgrant Competition. Expert reviewers will be recommended by Dr. Shari Butler at RMC-Austin (vita is attached). Expert review: 2 reviews for each subgrant X 80 subgrants X \$200 = New <u>online courses will be developed</u> to provide professional development to teachers and caregivers. The content of the new courses will be determined by the data from Year 1. Each of the courses will be developed by a two-member team made up | <p>\$32,000</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <p>of a teacher from the age span and a higher-education faculty member from a college or university. The <u>cost of developing</u> each of the courses is \$6,000 (\$3,000 per course X 2 team members). Course development: \$6,000 per course X 19 courses =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Facilitators for online courses</u> will be required. Online courses will be offered three times each year in February, June, and October. Stipends for facilitators: 120 facilitators X \$750 per course X 3 courses per year = • An <u>outside evaluation</u> of the SRCL project will be conducted in Year 3. The projected cost of an outside evaluation is based on the cost of the latest evaluation = Dr. Moscovitch will make three trips to Alabama (beginning, mid-point, and end) to meet with the SRCL management team and with the State Literacy Team. These two-day trips will cost: Three trips @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$400 hotel, and \$150 meals = | <p>\$114,000</p> <p>\$270,000</p> <p>\$37,500</p> <p>\$3,900</p> | |
| <p>7. Construction</p> | | <p>Not applicable</p> |
| <p>8. Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other costs associated with office space will remain approximately the same as in Year 1. | <p>\$55,930</p> | <p>\$55,930</p> |
| <p>9. Total Direct Costs</p> | | <p>(b)(4)</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|
| 10. Indirect Costs (17.4%) | | (b)(4) |
| 11. Training Stipends | | |
| 12. Total Costs | | |

Alabama Budget Narrative

Section A Budget Summary

Project Years 4 & 5

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel • Personnel costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1. | (b)(4) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fringe Benefits Fringe benefits costs will be approximately the same as for Year 1. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel | | \$389,910 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out-of-state travel costs will be increased if new schools/centers are added. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All <u>SRCL staff members</u> will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. 5 staff members @ \$750 transportation and airfare , \$600 hotel, \$150 meals = ○ Two individuals from each subgrantee school or center will travel to Washington, D. C. for a two-day technical assistance meeting annually. • 2 individuals X 120 schools @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$600 hotel, \$150 meals = • In-state travel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SRCL staff members will work ten days per month on SRCL activities. These activities will require travel from their home bases to the office to meet with other staff | <p align="right">\$7,500</p> <p align="right">\$360,000</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| <p>members, and to various locations across the state to meet with the State Literacy Team, with literacy partners, or with subgrantees to carry out SRCL activities. The average trip will be approximately 100 miles roundtrip.</p> <p>5 staff members X 6 days per month X 12 months X an average of 100 roundtrip miles per day X \$.51 per mile =</p> <p>5 staff members X 6 days per month X 12 months X \$ 11.25 per diem =</p> | <p>\$18,360</p> <p>\$4,050</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment Year 4 Year 5 | | <p>\$118,000</p> <p>\$59,000</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace laptops and printers for online facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Computer-\$875, monitor-\$201, and printer-\$399 = Year 4-80 original facilitators X \$1,475 = Year 5-40 additional facilitators (added in Year 2) X \$1,475 = • Laptop replacement will be necessary to continue the online courses for professional development. The facilitators must be able to communicate via computer with teachers and parents who are participating in the online courses. According to our information services technicians, three years is the estimated “life” of a laptop that is used heavily. Year 4 will replace the original laptops and Year 5 will replace those purchased in Year 2. | <p>\$118,000</p> <p>\$59,000</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplies • The cost of supplies should remain approximately the same as | | <p>\$42,480</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| in Year 1. | \$42,480 | |
| • Contractual | | \$347,400 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New <u>online courses will be developed</u> to provide professional development to teachers and caregivers. The content of the new courses will be determined by the data from Year 1. Each of the courses will be developed by a two-member team made up of a teacher from the age span and a higher-education faculty member from a college or university. The <u>cost of developing</u> each of the courses is \$6,000 (\$3,000 per course X 2 team members). Course development: \$6,000 per course X 6 courses = | \$36,000 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Facilitators for online courses</u> will be required. Online courses will be offered three times each year in February, June, and October. Stipends for facilitators: 120 facilitators X \$750 per course X 3 courses per year = | \$270,000 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An <u>outside evaluation</u> of the SRCL project will be conducted in Years 4 & 5. The projected cost of an outside evaluation is based on the cost of the latest evaluation = | \$37,500 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Moscovitch will make three trips to Alabama (beginning, mid-point, and end) to meet with the SRCL management team and with the State Literacy Team. These two-day trips will cost Three trips @ \$750 transportation and airfare, \$400 hotel, and \$150 meals = | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| | \$3,900 | |
| • Construction | | Not applicable |
| • Other Other costs associated with office space will remain approximately the same as in Year 1. | \$55,930 | \$55,930 |
| • Total Direct Costs Year 4 Year 5 | | (b)(4) |
| • Indirect Costs (17.4%) | Year 4 Year 5 | |
| • Training Stipends | | |
| • Total Costs | Year 4 Year 5 | |
| | | |