Reading Reimagined

Request for Proposals

February 2022

Contents

Who are we at Reading Reimagined?

Reading Reimagined[1] is a research and development (R&D) project that aims to unlock the great reader in every child. We envision an American education system in which all children have the opportunity to become excellent readers who have the tools and the desire to read for whatever purpose they deem necessary, important, or fun. We believe this goal is possible in our lifetimes. To help contribute to this goal, we will partner with researchers, educators, communities, and content developers to build upon and leverage current research and promising solutions to understand reading better, fund innovative teaching approaches , and facilitate collaborative programs and training to develop better curricula that move reading and literacy research into practice.

We are a multi-year inclusive R&D program taking on reading instruction by funding R&D cycles that tackle critical, unanswered questions. Our two main efforts are (1) funding R&D projects that build on, deepen, or contribute to the research base around how Black, Latino, and Native American students, and students experiencing poverty—our priority students—become excellent readers and (2) developing practical, comprehensive, research-based solutions leveraging the findings from those R&D efforts that significantly improve how our priority students experience reading instruction. Our goal is to rapidly translate existing and new research findings directly into groundbreaking, integrated tools for our priority students. We recognize that the challenges we seek to address operate in broader literacy, learning, and social contexts. Through our work, we hope to make a unique contribution that leverages our experience as practitioners and addresses a foundational challenge around research-based materials designed specifically for and with our priority students and communities.

What do we hope to accomplish and why?

Reading Reimagined aims to produce pre-kindergarten through grade eight literacy solutions as part of a four-year project that includes published research, tools, resources, and an openly licensed curriculum, that:
- Incorporates existing and new research findings;
- Develops and improves word recognition, fluency, and comprehension;

[1] Reading Reimagined is an inclusive R&D program under the Advanced Education Research and Development Fund (AERDF). AERDF is a national nonprofit initiative that pursues breakthrough outcomes in student learning, well-being, and opportunity. At the heart of AERDF is its Inclusive R&D model, where each multi-year program run by a visionary program director brings together diverse teams of educators, researchers, and developers to co-create new, practical solutions to real-world problems. Beginning with a powerful hypothesis, each program builds on existing evidence and learning science to translate fundamental insights into more useful practices, approaches, and tools for public school educators. Learn more and read our whitepaper at www.aerdf.org/programs/reading-reimagined.

- Addresses each student's experience,[2] including a student's beliefs, social-emotional skills, executive functioning, sense of belonging, self-efficacy, motivation, and cultural identity and identity as a reader;
- Creates an integrated instructional experience for students, teachers, and caregivers, including core instruction, intervention, assessment, and reporting; and
- Meets the needs of and affirm our priority students.

Across the four years, we aim to examine and support these multiple critical and intersecting areas for our priority students in pre-kindergarten through grade eight. This RFP begins our multi-year project and will be followed by subsequent funding investments, research projects, and tool creation.

We know there is a deep research and practice base to guide us in how to teach reading, so we engaged in several scans of reading and literacy research (Appendix 1). Through those scans, we found the research base concerning foundational literacy skills in younger learners to be the strongest. While some important research exists, there are some clear holes in our understanding of how to help students in grades three through eight develop and improve word recognition and fluency. We want to change that. As such, this RFP is focused on developing and improving word recognition and fluency for our priority students in grades three through eight for a few critical reasons:

- Foundational literacy skills have a tremendous impact on a student's ability to comprehend text.
    - Students, including those through twelfth grade, who are unable to adequately decode texts or demonstrate adequate fluency are unlikely to show evidence of proficient reading comprehension (Kim, 2017; Sabatini et al., 2019).
    - More strikingly, students who are not adequately decoding are unlikely to demonstrate growth in comprehension over time (Wang et al., 2019).
- Foundational literacy skills are a tremendous area of need for older learners.
    - Estimates from the 2018 National Assessment of Educational Progress Oral Reading Fluency study indicate that approximately 30% of students (1.1 million per grade level) may lack sufficient foundational skills to fluently read texts (Sabatini et al., 2019).

---

[2] A student's experience matters to academic outcomes. For our work, the student experience includes a student's beliefs, social-emotional skills, and executive functioning as it relates to literacy. More specifically, we believe that beliefs, social emotional skills, and executive functioning influence a reader's sense of belonging and self-efficacy, including their cultural identity and identity as a reader. We define "self-efficacy" as a person's belief that they can and will be successful at a given task. We define "identity" as how a person understands and perceives themselves and their abilities, generally, as a member of one or more cultures and as a reader.

- ○ Despite massive investments, current data does not suggest that the state of reading has dramatically improved in recent decades. The proportion of Black students testing at proficient and above levels on the NAEP has not improved in over ten years and the proportion of Native American students testing at proficient and above levels has not improved since the first assessment in 1992 (NAEP, 2019).
- While there is some critical research to build on, there is less clarity in research and even less practical tool availability to support this need.
  - ○ Two recent meta-analyses on several decades of reading intervention studies in upper elementary and middle school found only small effects on standardized foundational skills and comprehension outcomes (Donegan & Wanzek, 2021; Scammacca et al., 2015).
  - ○ Research suggests some components of word recognition and fluency interventions may lead to greater impacts on student reading in grades three through eight:
    - ■ Individualized, data-driven instruction (Donegan & Wanzek, 2021; Filderman & Toste, 2021; Solis et al., 2014).
    - ■ Focus on multisyllabic word decoding (when appropriate) (Edmonds et al., 2009; Filderman & Toste, 2021; Toste et al., 2019).
    - ■ Integration of multiple components of reading by integrating decoding instruction into contextualized application in a wide range of texts (Miciak et al., 2018; Vaughn et al., 2019; Wanzek et al., 2020).
  - ○ Though promising, research is needed to identify more effective ways to improve word recognition and fluency to transform students' outcomes at scale.
- There is insufficient integration of a student's full and complete experience in their literacy learning. This is even more profound for students still learning foundational literacy skills in later elementary and middle school.
  - ○ Students of color, particularly Black, Latino, and Native American students, often experience dissonance in the identities they develop inside and outside of school. For example, the school environment can create a disconnect between that environment and literacy practices at home, creating unnecessary barriers for students of color (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
  - ○ Culturally responsive practices, which incorporate students' cultural backgrounds, can improve students' self-efficacy and bridge the students'

home and school identities (Hammond, 2014; Immordino-Yang et al., 2021; Ladson-Billings, 1994) and can help students to become better readers (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
- More research is needed to illuminate the most effective culturally responsive and socio-emotionally engaged literacy teaching practices to connect foundational literacy skills instruction to learnes' identities.

What research are we interested in for this RFP?

As we reviewed the reading and literacy research, we made a hypothesis, which we want to test through the research funded by this RFP: Our priority students in grades three through eight require novel approaches to foundational literacy skills that are vastly more efficient (including a faster pace and different order and combination of skills) and effective (including new instructional practices) to develop and improve word recognition and fluency. We also must pay particular attention to their learning experience, leveraging their unique needs and strengths[3] and addressing their beliefs, social-emotional skills, and executive functioning as it relates to literacy.

For this RFP, we will fund proposed solutions that have strong theoretical and empirical grounds for efficiently and effectively leveraging student assets to teach one or more foundational literacy skills to our priority students in grades three through eight in service of rapidly improving word recognition and fluency while supporting their unique social-emotional needs.

We aim to identify promising approaches that ensure most students who receive the research-based intervention demonstrate rapid growth in the targeted skill(s) beyond growth in the comparison group as determined by a common assessment (see "Measuring Success" for additional information) and improved student experience as determined by researcher selected measures. Additionally, we seek solutions in which most of the students who demonstrate growth retain proficiency of the targeted skill(s) over time. Projects that result in promising approaches will inform our development of additional research questions and/or specific tools and may lead to additional investments.

---

[3] This includes students' language and regional dialect variation and specific learning differences (e.g., dyslexia).

Thus, we seek proposals that incorporate the following into their research with our priority students (and/or a specific population within our prioritized population) across at least two grades in grades three through eight:

1. Address specific foundational literacy skills[4] that contribute to improved word recognition and/or fluency
2. Use and/or create a novel approach with innovations in a) order and/or combination of skills, b) pace, and/or c) teaching practices to teach the identified skills to the target population with the goal of faster, more age-appropriate learning that results in long-term retention
3. Address student experience and leverage student assets

We expect proposals with innovative approaches to build off of known research, including, when appropriate, attending to the above listed components of interventions that may be most effective for readers in grades three through eight. In addition, we anticipate funding innovative ideas that aim to support and sustain learners' unique strengths, such as:

- Affirm and sustain a learner's linguistic knowledge by leveraging the learner's home languages and/or regional language variations to teach foundational literacy skills.
- Explicitly develop and implement practices that address our priority students' experiences with learning to read, focusing on how to leverage and support students' unique beliefs, social-emotional skills, and executive functioning along a rapid trajectory of foundational literacy skills learning.
- Build upon previous learning and bridge gaps between reading and literacy research and research on the student experience within the literacy classroom (e.g., social-emotional learning, identity, motivation, engagement, cognitive science, and child and adolescent psychology) to identify and create strategies that better serve students in grades three through eight as they become proficient readers.

We also encourage other innovative ideas and may fund projects in which proposers identify approaches not listed above but have strong theoretical and empirical grounds for efficiently and effectively improving word recognition and fluency for our prioritized populations while supporting older learners' unique socio-emotional needs.

Characteristics of Successful Teams and Projects

Given our research interests for this RFP, we aim to fund a portfolio of research projects.There may not always be positive or meaningful results at the end of a project, but we expect all projects to have well-designed research that is implemented with

---

[4] Skills necessary for automatic and accurate word recognition and fluency, including print concepts, alphabet knowledge, phonemic awareness, sound-spelling knowledge, decoding skills, and morphological awareness.

fidelity, even as projects pivot and learn how to iterate toward more meaningful outcomes. We are open to proposals based on a theoretical and empirical rationale that supports our research goals. These proposals may vary in terms of the scope of the proposal, the size of the proposal, and the cost associated with the proposal, but they must meet deliverable and measurement requirements as outlined in this RFP.

Successful teams must work directly with students and their caretakers, including involving them throughout the R&D process. Successful teams are likely to include researchers, educators, community members, and content developers working collaboratively as a study team. We welcome a diverse set of proposers and awardees including researchers, practitioners, and developers who may or may not have previous experience with similar kinds of research initiatives to apply for funding. We encourage diversity in applicants and team structures as well as unique approaches to examining and testing their research hypotheses. All teams including multiple stakeholders or organizations must identify the lead organization and/or principal investigator. Research projects must last no longer than sixteen months from the project start date[5], although they may be shorter. Given our focus on accelerating learning, we encourage projects that include iterative cycles of learning and improving the proposed intervention. For example, teams may propose to conduct during the project window a novel intervention to support multisyllabic word recognition in six weeks that they intend to adjust and improve over three rounds of implementation within the sixteen-month period.

Our education systems must be designed with our priority students so as to meet their needs daily. Thus we believe that inclusive R&D must center the experiences and needs of our priority students: Black, Latino, and Native American students and students experiencing poverty in grades three through eight, who are not yet proficient readers. We seek to support teams with research knowledge and expertise in the subject matter as well as experience in and a deep commitment to this type of community-centered, inclusive research. Our priority students, their caregivers, and their educators should play central roles in identifying their needs in practice, ensuring the intervention matches their needs in practice, and discussing and sharing the results, implications, and potential next steps. Successful proposers will likewise describe their experience with inclusive research and development and their approach to this project. We are committed to:
- Funding teams with research knowledge and expertise in the subject matter as well as experience in, a deep commitment, and a thoughtful approach to community-centered research as described above.
- Funding teams that represent the racial, ethnic, and gender balance of the students we aim to serve.

---

[5] Project start date is defined as the date of your first payment from Reading Reimagined.

- Collaboratively engaging a range of researchers, educators, technology professionals, and community advocates in ways that build upon our collective expertise.
- Holding all funded teams accountable to the principles of targeted universalism,[6] which designs strategies for specific groups of students to achieve universal goals, in their development and evaluation.

We expect to fund proposals valued between $50,000 to $400,000. We are open to supporting study teams of varying sizes. By the end of the project, funded proposals will be expected to have completed at least one research study that maintained tight alignment[7] throughout and to have produced valid, reliable, and generalizable[8] results.

Teams should use a research design that is appropriate for their proposed intervention, the outcomes they wish to measure, and the students they wish to include in the research. Teams must deliberately and thoughtfully identify their population, select their sample, and assign groups. The study design should consider sample size (see below for additional details), though teams are not expected to conduct large-scale efficacy studies. We seek proposals with a research design that incorporates the following elements:

- Teams must have strong theoretical and empirical evidence to support their proposed hypotheses and demonstrate how their study will build off existing knowledge about foundational literacy development and instruction for their sample students.
- Teams must demonstrate how they will engage the students and communities in the research and how they will keep the experiences and needs of students and communities at the center of the research process, approach, and analysis of results.
- Teams must conduct research with a population that is at least 80% Black, Latino, and/or Native American students, and/or students experiencing poverty and include a minimum of thirty students in the intervention group.
- Teams must conduct research with students in grades three through eight and may work with a specific age group, but must have at least two grades represented (e.g., grades three through four, grades three through five, grades six through eight, grades five and eight, etc.).
- Teams may additionally conduct research with a specific student group including but not limited to:

---

[6] Learn more about targeted universalism through the Othering & Belonging Institute.
[7] We define "alignment" as congruency and consistency among all components of the study.
[8] We use the following definitions:
   1. Valid research tests what is indicated will be tested without undue outside influence.
   2. Reliable research demonstrates stability and consistency in methods, measurement, and results.
   3. Generalizable research can be scaled with our priority students to achieve similar results.

- - Students with dyslexia
    - Students who are multilingual learners
    - Students who have a dialect commonly represented within the communities of one or more of the priority populations
- Teams must incorporate a comparison group in their research design that does not receive the intervention. If the research team is unable to execute random assignments for students, the team should ensure they collect data on both groups.
- Teams must administer the Word Recognition & Decoding, Vocabulary, Morphology, Sentence Processing, and Reading Efficiency subtests of the [Capti Assess](#).
- Teams must define, monitor, and measure the impact of the intervention on the student experience using an approach and associated measures defined by the research team.
- Teams must commit to the terms of AERDF's [Global Access Policy](#) and the [Model Contract](#).

Measuring Success

We define projects funded under this RFP as successful if the research is well-designed and implemented with fidelity to produce valid, reliable, and generalizable results. We will evaluate progress throughout the project, using interim benchmarks on both research design and outcome measures. We will use this information to support our engagement with funded projects (see "How Will We Work Together?"). At the beginning of the project period, Reading Reimagined staff will work with each awarded team to review and possibly revise benchmarks and project milestones that teams identify in their proposal to ensure they align with each proposed research project.

For student outcome measures, teams will be required to administer the Word Recognition & Decoding, Vocabulary, Morphology, Sentence Processing, and Reading Efficiency subtests of the [Capti Assess](#) as a baseline, at the end of each treatment cycle, and then three months post-intervention to both treatment (intervention) and comparison groups. A one-year assessment license for both treatment and comparison groups for Capti Assess will be provided at no cost to awarded proposers; however, teams are responsible for administering the assessment and those associated costs. Administration requires a computer or tablet, high-speed, reliable internet, and, depending on the number of administered subtests during one assessment session, the time allotted could range from nine minutes to one hour per student. The assessment does not require individual proctors.

Teams must analyze data from individual subtests as they relate to their research questions. At a minimum, teams should report changes from pretest, posttest, and

11

lagged posttest on individual subtests. Statistical analyses for the project should be appropriate for the quantity and type of data collected, the sample size, and the research questions being addressed. Teams may also choose to administer the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Capti Assess if it is helpful for their research questions. Teams can also opt to administer any subtest more frequently, as the assessment can be reliably administered with any frequency; however, we do not recommend administering any given subtest more than four times in a three-month period.

Since the student experience is important to students achieving improved outcomes, teams must also measure and report on the impact of the intervention on the student experience. As part of the research design, teams must decide how they will measure the student experience during the intervention. We will convene learning labs at various times throughout the sixteen-month projects for teams to share how they are measuring the student experience and what they are learning.

What are the deliverables for funded projects?

By the end of the project, study teams will be expected to provide:
1. Demonstrated student improvement as a result of a successful implementation of foundational literacy skill(s) research detailed in a final research report with the following sections:
   a. A description of the theoretical and empirical rationale explaining how the targeted foundational literacy skill(s) and approach may impact word recognition and fluency for our priority students in grades three through eight. This rationale should also include clear research questions and hypotheses. This final theoretical rationale may be similar to the one submitted with the initial proposal (see "Submitting a Proposal"), but the final product should include any revisions to the rationale and/or theory of change that came about as a result of the study.
   b. A description of the foundational literacy skills,[9] instructional approach, and component(s) of student experience studied over the course of the project.
   c. A detailed, de-identified description of the context, including the population of students from whom the sample was drawn, the sample of students included in the research in both the intervention and comparison groups, and the setting (e.g., district and/or schools). Enough information

---

[9] Skills necessary for automatic and accurate word recognition, including print concepts, alphabet knowledge, phonemic awareness, sound-spelling knowledge, decoding skills, and morphological awareness.

should be provided so that districts and schools would be able to determine if the research was conducted in a context similar to their own.

   d. A description of the research methods, including:

      i.   The research design (e.g., correlational study, multi-group study, single-case design), why that design was chosen, and how this design will validly answer research questions;

      ii.   A description of the group assignment mechanism;

      iii. A detailed description of the activities that the study group and comparison groups engaged in, including, a description of students' "business-as-usual" reading or literacy curriculum and/or reading or literacy interventions in school;

      iv. Student and teacher web-based surveys, classroom observations, student and teacher interviews, etc.;

      v.   The student experience measures that were included in the research including descriptions of the measures, examples of items, demographic variables, and psychometric properties;

      vi. A description of the data collection procedures; and

      vii. A data analysis plan that includes enough detailed information that a researcher could replicate the study.

   e. A report on the results of the research, including, but not limited to, any statistically significant or insignificant results on the Capti Assess and the student experience measure. This report should include a description of how the research plan was executed to generate a valid result and a rationale for how it contributes to the field's understanding of literacy, even if the results are not positive or statistically significant.

   f. A report on the impact of the intervention on students' experience as measured by the team.

   g. A description of how the results of this research are consistent or inconsistent with previous research on foundational literacy skills for students in grades three through eight and with research on foundational literacy skills for students in grades pre-kindergarten through grade two.

   h. A description of how the research process ensured our priority students, their caregivers, and their educators played a central role in the identification, intervention matching, and finalization of the results, implications, and future research opportunities.

   i. A description of the rate under which mastery of the measurable skills and overall results are achieved, including information about the amount of time each child is spending in the intervention, attached to the results.

j.   A description of the costs of implementing the intervention. Costs are defined as money, time, and needed resources, either people or materials.

2.   Digital copies of the materials used in the intervention for ongoing learning and research purposes; materials may include lessons, texts, videos, and/or handouts that were used and any implementation procedures or structures.

3.   De-identified raw data answering all research questions. This includes all of the subtests of the Capti Assess, student experience measures, and other outcome data. Data should be de-identified by assigning each student a unique ID number to connect individual records across time and measures, including the team's student experience measure. Study teams are responsible for securely housing the key that can reidentify students.

   a.   Demographic data for students and any data used to identify group assignments in multi-group designs should also be included.

   b.   Study teams must also provide fidelity data and data relating to classrooms or teachers, including interviews, observations, and surveys, as described in their research questions.

4.   A final cost worksheet reflecting expenses for your project as well as any additional documents or artifacts that should be included as part of your project that will aid in our efforts of contract reporting, dissemination of findings, or connecting your work to future projects and funding opportunities.

5.   A full bibliography of all of the dissemination activities that have occurred as a result of this project. Examples include publications, conference presentations, reports, webinars, etc.

6.   A completed survey reflecting on how Reading Reimagined worked with you and your study team through the life of this project. In what ways has our support and collaboration been beneficial in helping you meet your project goals? In what ways could we have been more supportive of the work of your study team?

Intellectual Property

AERDF's Global Access Policy applies to any contract awarded as a result of this RFP. It is anticipated that intellectual property developed under an award (i.e., Funded Development) as well as any Essential Background Technology necessary to the functioning of any ultimate deliverable (i.e., Funded Development) under Reading Reimagined, will be openly licensed, as negotiated under the terms of the award. Full proposals must include a description of any non-essential background intellectual property that the submitter does not intend to license openly using the form provided at Appendix 6. For more specifics regarding AERDF Intellectual Property requirements, see the Model Contract. Should Reading Reimagined agree with a proposer that

certain intellectual property need not be licensed openly, at a minimum AERDF's Global Access Policy will apply to all Funded Developments and Essential Background Technology, as defined therein.

Human Subjects Research

Projects under Reading Reimagined will involve human subjects research. Proposals must include a description of any effort that will require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the name of the IRB, and the anticipated IRB approval schedule. A list of external IRBs can be found [here](#). All funded projects must apply for IRB approval within forty-five days of award. Any funded project in need of support with securing an IRB should reach out to Reading Reimagined. Any funded project that neglects to secure IRB approval before beginning research activities with participants will be discontinued earlier than their contract end date. Research teams must include Reading Reimagined in their IRB approvals as subprocessors of de-identified data. See Data-Sharing below for more details.

All funded projects must also pre-register[10] their studies, methods, and hypotheses following selection.

Data-Sharing

AERDF places the highest priority on the ethical treatment of student information and conformance to legal obligations and ethical practices. Recipients of AERDF awards will be provided technology infrastructure services (e.g., secure file sharing systems) that will ensure that student information is securely protected and compliant with applicable laws and district policies. These services will also reduce the technology investments required of awardees. The use of these systems will be encouraged based on the specific projects of awardees and the affordance available through common services.

All activities that involve human participants will be reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB); likewise data sharing activities will be conducted through approved human subjects protocols to ensure the ethical treatment of student data and to ensure that student privacy is protected.

To ensure the reproducibility of results and additional insights that may be provided through combined analysis of multiple projects, data collected through this program will be required to be shared with AERDF/Reading Reimagined and made available to other funded project teams. Reading Reimagined will provide instructions for data sharing. All

---

[10] See pre-registration sites for instructions on how to pre-register a study. For example, https://help.osf.io/hc/en-us/articles/360019738834-Create-a-Preregistration. For more information about the purpose of pre-registration, see https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/09/more-and-more-scientists-are-preregistering-their-studies-should-you

activities that involve human participants will be reviewed by an IRB; likewise, data sharing activities will be conducted through approved human subjects protocols to ensure the ethical treatment of student data and to ensure that student privacy is protected.

How will we work together?

We will pursue shared outcomes together, across all awarded teams and the Reading Reimagined team. Given this, we will actively collaborate with and monitor awarded teams towards those shared goals. We aim to provide support to teams, ensure collaborative learning opportunities, monitor project implementation throughout the project, move quickly to scale/grow a succeeding research project, scale back less promising research, and actively include community partners in the design and implementation process. We expect teams to engage fully in the expectations laid out below as a baseline of program engagement and we aim to provide differentiated and strategic support based on the needs and feedback of each team. You can find more information regarding a possible work schedule in [Appendix 8](#).

All project teams are expected to progress through a series of milestones, tasks, and benchmarks ([Appendix 8](#)), and should remain agile to support any adjustments based on approval from Reading Reimagined. As Reading Reimagined learns more through the research outlined in this RFP and as funded projects learn more through their research, goals, milestones, and benchmarks may change based on new learning. We will continue to align our portfolio of projects to determine the continuation of funding - ensuring we remain aligned in an agile way towards our goals. This allows for our priority communities to receive solutions that meet their needs, for investment dollars to support the most promising ideas, and for proposers to receive targeted support in partnership with each other and with Reading Reimagined program staff.

Planned Meetings and Other Interactions

Throughout the course of the project, we will collaborate with, monitor, and support the funded research projects. After an initial payment at the time of the award, teams will work with the Reading Reimagined team during contract negotiation to confirm all milestones and payment schedules. Throughout the course of the funded project, the Reading Reimagined team will engage in a collaborative review of the progress made on each awarded project quarterly. Meetings will serve as opportunities for learning,

growth, and continuous improvement around the funded project. Prior to the quarterly meetings, quarterly reports of progress will be submitted by funded proposers to the program. The full reporting schedule and required elements are below. Detailed information is also available in the [Model Contract](#) and [Appendix 8](#).

- Opening Check-in (45 days after award): Completion of Kickoff Meeting and Onboarding Tasks, application for IRB completed
- Quarter 1 Meeting: Reporting Requirements: Quarterly Report, IRB Status Form
- Quarter 2 Meeting: Reporting Requirements: Quarterly Report
- Quarter 3 Meeting: Reporting Requirements: Quarterly Report, Intent Form for Continuation of Research
- Quarter 4 Meeting: Final Reporting Requirements: Final Report, Confirmation of Deliverable

We will host onboarding sessions for each project following the awarding of contracts. Additionally, our team will host a convening of all the funded projects and learning labs to share information about what we are all learning across the various funded projects.

How do I submit a proposal for funding under this Reading Reimagined RFP?

There are three steps to submitting a proposal:

	Process	Submission Window: Due 11:59 p.m. PST	Notes	Response Dates from Reading Reimagined
Step 1	Submit an Indicator of Intent	February 17, 2022 - March 8, 2022	Brief, highly encouraged but not required	n/a
Step 2	Submit a Concept Note	February 23, 2022- March 23, 2022	Required	April 11, 2022
Step 3	Submit a Research Proposal by invitation only	April 11, 2022- May 12, 2022	Required, by invitation only Note: May 26, 2022 - June 10, 2022 - Team Interview Window	June 27, 2022

Step 1: Submitting an Indicator of Intent

The first step in the application process is to indicate one's intention around the RFP. Submitting an Indicator of Intent for a proposal is highly encouraged but not required. This submission is very brief. Information provided is not binding but is instead meant to provide insight into the types of proposals and support needs Reading Reimagined should anticipate.

We aim to have a diverse set of proposers and awardees including researchers, practitioners, and developers who may or may not have previous experience with similar kinds of research initiatives. Given our desire for an open and inclusive process, we aim to provide support as we are able to diverse candidates in need throughout the application process. We seek to learn more about candidates and their needs through this indicator and thus strongly encourage all potential applicants to complete it. We reiterate that while the indicator of intent will be used to guide support, no content collected via this submission is binding or will be used in the selection process. Additionally, this submission is short and should be efficient for all considering applicants.

Indicators of Intent will be accepted until 11:59 p.m. PST on March 8, 2022. Submission window: February 17-March 8, 2022. Indicators of Intent will be completed via Submittable.

Step 2: Submitting a Concept Note

Teams who are interested in submitting a proposal for support between $50,000 and $400,000 per research project must first submit a concept note. Proposers can submit a concept note with a maximum of five double-spaced pages submitted as a PDF via Submittable. Any material submitted as appendices will not count towards the five-page limit. During the concept note process, proposers requesting funding must review a Model Contract that outlines the expectations of Reading Reimagined and AERDF, along with details on data security, intellectual property, and licensing that will govern the use of any elements created as a part of this funded project. As part of the concept note, proposers must complete the Model Contract Agreement Form (Appendix 2) to confirm agreement with terms of the Model Contract and/or provide proposed revisions.

Each Concept Note must contain the following components:
- Project Description: An overview of your draft concept for how you will efficiently and effectively leverage student assets to teach one or more foundational literacy skills to our priority students in service of rapidly improving word recognition and fluency while supporting their unique social-emotional needs. Specifically:

18

- ○ Describe the scope of the challenge you are trying to solve through your research. Please include why you believe your research will be significant to the field.
  - ○ Provide a rationale for the targeted skill(s), approach, and component(s) of the student experience to be studied with a specific focus on theoretical and empirical research to support how the proposed intervention may impact word recognition and fluency with our priority students in grades three through eight.
  - ○ Provide a brief review of the research associated with your proposed research project.
  - ○ Describe your research objectives, research questions, and assumptions.
  - ○ Provide a brief description of your research methodology and research design.
  - ○ Include details of the population(s) you plan to work with during this project, your experience partnering with them previously (as applicable), your current phase of recruitment and partnership building, and how you plan to engage them in the process through community-centered, inclusive research (See "Characteristics of Successful Teams").
  - ○ Provide your proposed timeline, within the confines of those outlined in the RFP.
- Team Description: Describe your team's experience with conducting inclusive R&D. Specifically:
  - ○ Describe how your research proposal will ensure our priority students, their caregivers, and their educators will play a central role in identifying their needs in practice, ensuring the intervention matches their needs, and their inclusion in the process of finalizing the results, implications and future research opportunities.
  - ○ Describe the key personnel involved in the project (e.g. lead researchers, community collaborators, etc.) as well as any additional team members and key partners that will constitute the full team. Please include a description (including demographic percentages and/or representations) of these individuals.
- Estimate of Project Costs (can be considered an appendix). Provide a proposed budget for the project. Specifically:
  - ○ Estimate the appropriate costs given your project design. Please note that Reading Reimagined understands that study teams will not be explicitly tied to the proposed costs in this step, but cost estimates will be used as we evaluate teams moving forward in the RFP process.
- Possible support needed for completion of the RFP (optional/completed directly in Submittable):
  - ○ As an organization, we are committed to elevating diverse voices and experiences in our research and development process. We recognize that

smaller groups and organizations hold valuable insight and expertise, though they may not have responded to RFPs in the past or have specific research or content development focus. While we do not guarantee support, we seek to understand and possibly engage less-established RFP candidates in the field in an effort to gain a better understanding of the types of support needed as well as possibly taking action to ensure our inclusive R&D practices take root at the start of this RFP process.

- ○ Those hoping for additional support will be signaled to outline needs within their Concept Note submission in Submittable (not included in the aforementioned 5 pages). If selected to continue in the process, those study teams should be prepared to apply to the final deadline on May 5, 2022. Requesting or receiving interim support has no bearing on the outcomes of the proposal process.

Reading Reimagined will review all Concept Notes using the evaluation criteria (Appendix 7) and invite selected teams to submit a full proposal. The review and selection process for the Concept Note will use the same evaluation criteria found in the selection of full proposals (see "Submitting a Proposal"). Based on the strengths and weaknesses of the Concept Note, reviewers will make a determination of the Concept Note's overall fundability.

Concept Notes will be accepted until 11:59 p.m. PST on March 23, 2022. Concept Notes will be submitted via Submittable.

Teams will receive notification via Submittable as to whether they will be invited to submit a full proposal by 11:59 p.m. PST on April 11, 2022. This notification will also include feedback that can be used to strengthen their full proposal. For teams that will not move forward towards a proposal, Reading Reimagined will provide feedback on their Concept Note via Submittable.

Step 3: By Invitation Only - Submitting a Proposal

The requirements for the full proposal allow invited teams to build upon the information that they submitted through their Concept Note. Study teams will complete an expanded project description, provide greater detail on their technical approach, define milestones and deliverables, describe their approach for co-design, and submit a comprehensive cost spreadsheet for review. For those teams invited to submit a full proposal, a full proposal consists of the following parts:

1. Vision and Goal of your Research: Given the goals outlined in this RFP, please describe the scope of the challenge you are trying to solve through your research

proposal. Please include why you believe your research will be significant to the field. [Limit: Three double-spaced pages inclusive of graphics, tables, and figures]

2. Describe why this team configuration is suited to conduct this research. Feel free to include any relevant past experiences, partner organizations, and or other key information you believe is critical to the success of this project. [Limit: One double spaced page inclusive of graphics, tables, and figures]

3. Research and Measurement Plan (Appendix 3): How will the study team create partnerships, design the research, recruit participants, conduct research, and analyze and report results. [Limit: No page limit]

4. Project Budget Template (Appendix 4); [Limit: Two double spaced pages inclusive of graphics, tables, and figures]

5. Payable Milestone Schedule (Appendix 5; [Limit: No page limit]

6. Intellectual Property Assertion (Appendix 6): Proposers must detail any pre-existing intellectual property for which a license will not convey to AERDF under any resultant award. [Limit: No page limit]

7. A completed the Model Contract Agreement Form (Appendix 2) for the second time to confirm agreement with terms of the Model Contract and/or provide proposed revisions. This is to ensure that any changes from the Concept Note description to the full project proposal submission are aligned to the Model Contract. [Limit: N/A]

8. Letters of support from potential partners. [Limit: Two double-spaced pages inclusive of graphics, tables, and figures per partner]

Proposals will be accepted until 11:59 p.m. PST on May 12, 2022. Submission window: April 11, 2022-May 12, 2022.

All proposals are submitted via Submittable. Once on the Submittable website, you will complete the templates and forms described under the Submitting Your Proposal section.

Submitting Multiple Proposals

Research teams and individuals may be included in multiple proposals. However, in order to support as many promising proposals as possible, teams may only carry one funded project at a time. In the case that multiple projects from a team and/or individual were deemed fundable, Reading Reimagined will work with said team/individual to determine which funded projects will be prioritized for funding. Under special circumstances, individuals may be listed on more than one funded team at a time. In these cases, the Reading Reimagined team may request additional information, such as a team interview, in order to aid in funding decisions. For all funded projects, Reading

Reimagined will require a lead organization/principal investigator to lead the project. In short, the same lead organization/principal investigator cannot receive funding for more than one funded project at a time.

Evaluation of Proposals

Multiple awards are expected; however, the number of awards is subject to the availability of funds. Given the limited funding available for the Reading Reimagined program, not all proposals considered fundable may receive an award and funding. With an initial investment in projects with budgets of $50,000-$400,000, Reading Reimagined hopes to advance research so as to ensure that our priority students in grades three through eight become proficient readers.

Reading Reimagined reserves the right to select some, one, or none of the proposals received in response to the RFP. Reading Reimagined also reserves the right to communicate with proposers prior to awarding funding to ensure a fair and equitable process. Additionally, Reading Reimagined reserves the right to accept proposals in their entirety or to select only portions of proposals for award. In the event that Reading Reimagined desires to award only portions of a proposal, negotiations will be opened with that proposer.

Reading Reimagined reserves the right to request any additional, necessary documentation to support the review, negotiation, and award processes. Reading Reimagined reserves the right to remove a proposal from award consideration should the parties fail to reach an agreement on award terms, conditions, and cost, and the proposer fails to provide requested additional information in a timely manner.

Proposal Review

It is the policy of Reading Reimagined to ensure an impartial, equitable, and comprehensive review of each proposal based on the evaluation criteria listed below. A full description of the evaluation criteria can be found in Appendix 7. The Reading Reimagined program team, members of the Reading Reimagined Advisory Council, and external technical reviewers will conduct an independent review of each proposal. All proposal evaluations will be based solely on the evaluation criteria and will consider the strengths and weaknesses relative to each of the following areas. Full proposals will be evaluated using the following evaluation criteria:

- Overall Scientific and Technical Merit - The proposed research is bold but attainable: it is innovative, feasible, achievable, and complete.

22

- Potential Contribution to Equity - The potential contributions of the proposed effort will directly benefit Reading Reimagined priority students – Black, Latino, and Native American students and those experiencing poverty. The research and development activities are rooted in an inclusive process designed to "interrupt inequity and increase opportunity for those most impacted by oppression" ([National Equity Project, Liberatory Design](#)) (see Characteristics of Successful Teams).
- Cost Realism - The proposed research costs are realistically and accurately aligned to the research agenda and research design.

Team Interviews

Selected teams that submit a proposal will be invited to participate in a team interview within two weeks following the end of the submission window. For this cycle, interviews will be scheduled between May 26, 2022 - June 10, 2022. Teams will be given a Calendly link in order to sign up for their team interview. This team interview is required and it must include, at a minimum, all key personnel from the project. There is no advanced preparation needed for this team interview and questions will be generated from the full proposal. All invited teams will have the opportunity to request accommodations to increase accessibility to and ensure full participation in the interview at the time they schedule the team interview.

Funding Proposals

Based on these identified strengths and weaknesses of the proposals and team interviews, reviewers will make a determination of the proposal's overall fundability. Proposals will not be evaluated against each other during the review process, but rather evaluated on their own individual merit to determine how well the proposal meets the evaluation criteria. For the purposes of this proposal evaluation process, a fundable proposal is a proposal that has been evaluated by Reading Reimagined against the evaluation criteria and the positive aspects of the overall proposal outweigh its negative aspects.

As soon as the evaluation of proposals and interviews are complete, proposers will be notified that (1) the proposal has been selected for funding, subject to award negotiations, or (2) the proposal has not been selected for funding. The listed notifications will be sent via Submittable to the person who submitted the original proposal. Reading Reimagined will also provide brief feedback to proposers who are not selected for funding.

23

Handling of Proposals

It is the policy of Reading Reimagined to protect all proposals and to disclose their contents only for the purpose of evaluation and only to screened personnel for authorized reasons. No submissions will be returned to proposers.

Confidential and Proprietary Information

Proposers are responsible for clearly identifying proprietary information. Proprietary information will be protected by Reading Reimagined staff during the review process, including through the use of redaction, non-disclosure agreements, and/or double-blind review procedures to ensure an equitable review process.

How do I learn more about Reading Reimagined and the process?

Reading Reimagined Team

- Heather Attale, Director, Integrated R&D
- Tali Kirkwood, Program Coordinator
- Rebecca Kockler, Program Director
- Dr. Julia Lindsey, Manager, Early Literacy
- Dr. Brandy Nelson, Academic Director
- Sara Solar, Associate Director, Stakeholder Engagement
- Lauren Tate, Director, Operations and Strategy

Email: readingreimaginedinfo@aerdf.org
Website: https://www.aerdf.org/programs/reading-reimagined/

Ensuring a Transparent Process

The Reading Reimagined team wants to ensure that our work is inclusive and transparent. In support of this, the Reading Reimagined team desires an open communication process so that we may answer questions, support your learning about our inclusive R&D model, and connect promising proposers and ideas together in order to strengthen the ultimate outcomes of this program. During our communication with interested parties, we will not reveal sensitive information about your team or your

solution without your permission. In addition, we strive for our communication across teams to be fair and equitable so as to not advantage one team over another.

The Reading Reimagined team will communicate with proposers through application, deliberation, and award acceptance. As applicants complete their proposals, they should feel comfortable contacting a Reading Reimagined team member via readingreimaginedinfo@aerdf.org to ask questions at any point during the application window.

Key Submission and Decision Dates

- February 17, 2022 - RFP Launch
- February 17, 2022 - March 8, 2022 -Indicator of Intent Window (optional, but encouraged)
- March 8, 2022, 11:59pm PST - Indicator of Intent Closes (optional, but encouraged)
- February 23, 2022-March 23, 2022- Concept Note Window (required)
- March 23, 2022, 11:59pm PST- Concept Notes Due
- April 11, 2022, 11:59pm PST- RFP Invitations Released
- April 11-May 12, 2022 - RFP Submission Window (invitation only)
- May 12, 2022 at 11:59 p.m. PST - RFP Submissions Due
- May 26, 2022 - June 10, 2022 - Team Interview Window
- After June 27, 2022 - Notice of Decision Sent for Full Proposals, Award Letters Disbursed

Communications

Reading Reimagined intends to use email for all correspondence with proposers. Proposers should use readingreimaginedinfo@aerdf.org to communicate with the program team and to ask questions.

All proposal information and other application information should be submitted via Submittable. If you receive a request for information from Submittable or email and want to check its authenticity, please contact the program team immediately. Reading Reimagined intends to leverage social and traditional media to announce investment opportunities, funded projects, and program milestones. No proprietary information will be included in these announcements.

Webinar and Office Hours

In order to support proposal development and answer questions, potential proposers will have access to a pre-recorded webinar that covers overarching program goals, and RFP details. Please visit the Reading Reimagined website for information about our pre-recorded webinar. Webinar will be available by March 1.

Need to meet with us to discuss your RFP? Sign up via Calendly (limited # of time slots): Link to register for Office Hours.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Reading Reimagined Research Scan Findings and Reference List
- Appendix 2: Confirmation of Agreement with Terms of Model Contract Form (For Concept Note Submission)
- Appendix 3: Research and Measurement Plan Template (For Proposal Submission Only)
- Appendix 4: Project Budget Template (For Proposal Submission Only)
- Appendix 5: Payable Milestone Schedule (For Proposal Submission Only)
- Appendix 6: Intellectual Property Assertion Form (For Proposal Submission Only)
- Appendix 7: Evaluation Criteria (For Concept Note and Proposal Submissions)
- Appendix 8: Reporting, Deliverable, and Other Requirements

Appendix 1

Reading Reimagined Research Scan Findings and Reference List

Our research scan identified these key findings across three areas that future research can support:

1. Foundational Literacy Skills: Developing Word Recognition and Fluency in Older Students
   - When students receive ineffective or insufficient foundational literacy skills instruction in their early years—preschool and kindergarten through second grade—they rarely receive the support they need in third grade and beyond. When they do receive support with word recognition, it is usually better suited to younger students, is often inefficient and disconnected from their core instruction, and does not attend to—or may exacerbate—the negative beliefs students may have developed after years of struggling to read (Liben & Liben, 2021).
   - When children in the middle grades are reading below a threshold of adequate decoding, they are unlikely to comprehend proficiently. Children who read below this decoding threshold have been shown to experience almost no growth in reading comprehension (Wang et al., 2019).
   - It is never too late to intervene and support students who are struggling to read. For example, adolescents are particularly well primed for support, given the neuropsychological maturation occurring during this period (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
   - Strong phonemic awareness is essential to enabling effective word recognition (Shaywitz et al., 2004, Torgesen et al., 2001).
   - Systematic phonics programs (i.e., programs that follow a clear scope and sequence, in which skills and concepts are taught in a logical order) maximize the number of students achieving proficient word recognition (National Reading Panel, 2000).
   - Reading intervention programs often address phonology (pronunciation), but too often do not adequately address orthography (spelling) and morphology (word structure—e.g., suffixes), despite the fact that proficient readers are skilled across all three elements (Liben & Liben, 2021).
   - Multisyllabic word reading is key to older students' ability to read grade-level texts (Kearns, 2015; Nagy & Anderson, 1984).
   - Students in many grade levels can benefit from engaging in oral reading fluency instruction and practice (Kuhn and Stahl, 2003; O'Connor, Swanson, and Geraghty, 2010; Paige, 2011).
   - Meta-analyses of reading intervention studies find that the most successful programs for children in grades three through eight possess instructional characteristics such as: individualized, data-driven instruction, a focus on multisyllabic word decoding, and the integration of multiple components of reading by integrating decoding instruction into contextualized application in a wide range of texts (Donegan & Wanzek, 2021; Scammacca et al., 2015).

2. Developing Comprehension

27

- Reading comprehension requires a reader to coordinate a complex set of cognitive, linguistic, and text-specific processes as well as executive functioning skills. How and what we teach has measurable impacts on students (Connor et al., 2014).
- Important determinants of students' comprehension include vocabulary, access to relevant knowledge, and complexity of reading materials (e.g., Alexander et al., 1994; Cervetti et al., 2016).
- Vocabulary knowledge is highly predictive of reading comprehension–even years later (Lepola et al., 2016; Lervåg et al., 2018; Roth et al., 2002)--highlighting the importance of building children's knowledge of words as they grow as readers.
- Knowledge impacts students' comprehension, and we know that students come to school with varying amounts of knowledge on particular topics (Moll et al., 1992). As such, engaging students in a knowledge-rich curriculum can support their growing knowledge base.
- Top-performing schools ensure all students, including multilingual learners and students with individualized education plans, have maximum exposure to the same, knowledge-building curriculum (Neuman & Kaefer, 2018; Vaughn et al., 2017).
- Children who experience success in reading are more motivated to read more texts, thereby building more knowledge and skills than their peers, and experiencing even more reading success. In other words, in reading, the "rich get richer." This is referred to as the "Matthew effect" (Stanovich, 1986).
- Text-processing skills, such as inference making, influence a reader's ability to make sense of a text and uniquely contribute to comprehension growth over time (Ahmed et al., 2016).
- Students need to be taught different strategies for reading print and digital text (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021; Wolf, 2018).

3. Attending to Beliefs and Social-Emotional Skills
- Research and experience demonstrate that key elements of students' experiences in school affect their academic success, including their reading success. These variables can be categorized into two broad buckets: (1) beliefs that shape students' motivation to engage in learning behaviors and (2) cognitive, social, and emotional skills that enable students to make progress toward goals and engage successfully with others (Student Experience Research Network, unpublished, 2017).
- The research base on reading development suggests that certain beliefs and skills are especially critical to reading success. These include self-efficacy (a person's belief in how well they can do something); identity (how a person understands and perceives themselves and their abilities; and executive function, which includes maintaining focused attention, persisting at tasks, thinking flexibly, and planning ahead (Berg et al., 2017; Harvard GSE, 2021; Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
- While there is strong evidence for what comprises a productive social-emotional learning environment, researchers have not yet integrated investigations into reading development and social-emotional growth (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021) which could be particularly powerful for improving our priority students' reading.
- Higher self-reported self-efficacy in reading is associated with better reading skills, such as word reading (Carroll & Fox, 2017).

- Students' beliefs, including self-efficacy, are malleable and can be improved. Improvement requires instructional strategies and learning environments that honor and support students' self-efficacy as readers and their identities as cultural community members (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
- Culturally responsive practices, which incorporate students' cultural backgrounds, can improve students' self-efficacy and bridge students' home and school identities (Hammond, 2014; Immordino-Yang et al., 2021; Ladson-Billings, 1994), and can help students to become better readers (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).
- There are periods of risk and opportunity in a person's childhood in which literacy skills, beliefs, and social-emotional skills can be optimally supported (e.g., infancy, early childhood, and adolescence). However, the precise timing of those periods varies from person to person (Immordino-Yang et al., 2021).

Further Reading
Our partners– the Center for Affective Neuroscience, Development, Learning and Education (CANDLE) at the University of Southern California; The Institute for Education Policy at Johns Hopkins University; and Reading Done Right–conducted extensive scans of existing research to help us produce the summaries included in this paper and the information that is informing our inclusive R&D work. Their more extensive research summaries and works cited can be accessed below. To see their annotated bibliographies please email us at ReadingReimaginedInfo@aerdf.org.

- Foundational Literacy Skills: Developing Word Recognition and Fluency in Older Students (Reading Done Right, David and Meredith Liben)
- Developing Comprehension: Works Cited (Institute for Education Policy, Johns Hopkins University)
- Attending to Beliefs and Social-Emotional Skills: Becoming a Reader: What We Know and What We Need to Know about Literacy and Reading Self-Efficacy among Black, Brown, and Indigenous Low-SES Youth (The Center for Affective Neuroscience, Development, Learning and Education [CANDLE], University of Southern California)

Reference List

Ahmed, Y., Francis, D., York, M., Fletcher, J., Barnes, M., & Kulesz, P. A. (2016). Validation of the direct and inferential mediation (DIME) model of reading comprehension In grades 7 through 12. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 44-45, 68-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.02.002

Alexander, P. A., Kulikowich, J. M., & Schulze, S. K. (1994). How subject-matter knowledge affects recall and interest. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 313–337. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031002313

Berg, J., Osher, D., Same, M. R., Nolan, E., Benson, D., & Jacobs, N. (2017.) Identifying, defining, and measuring social and emotional competencies. American Institutes for Research. https://www.air.org/resource/report/identifying-defining-and-measuring-social-and-emotional-competencies

Carroll, J. M., & Fox, A. C. (2017). Reading self-efficacy predicts word reading but not comprehension in both girls and boys. Frontiers in Psychology, 7, 2056. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02056

Cervetti, G. N., Wright, T. S., & Hwang, H. (2016). Conceptual coherence, comprehension, and vocabulary acquisition: A knowledge effect?. Reading and Writing, 29(4), 761-779. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9628-x

Connor, C. M., Phillips, B. M., Kaschak, M., Apel, K., Kim, Y. S., Al Otaiba, S., Crowe, E.C., Thomas-Tate, S., Cooper Johnson, L., & Lonigan, C. J. (2014). Comprehension tools for teachers: Reading for understanding from prekindergarten through fourth grade. Educational Psychology Review, 26(3), 379-401. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271948440_Comprehension_Tools_for_Teachers_Reading_for_Understanding_from_Prekindergarten_Through_Fourth_Grade

Donegan, R. E., & Wanzek, J. (2021). Effects of reading interventions implemented for upper elementary struggling readers: A look at recent research. Reading and Writing, 1-35.

Edmonds, M., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C., Cable, A., Tackett, K., & Schnakenberg, J. (2009). A synthesis of reading interventions and effects on reading comprehension outcomes for older struggling readers. Review of Educational Research, 79, 262–300.

Filderman, M. J., & Toste, J. R. (2021). Effects of Varying Levels of Data Use to Intensify a Multisyllabic Word Reading Intervention for Upper Elementary Students With or At Risk for Reading Disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 00222194211048405.

Hammond, Z. (2014). Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students. Corwin.

Harvard Graduate School of Education. (Undated). Explore SEL. http://exploresel.gse.harvard.edu/

Kearns, D. M. (2015). How elementary-age children read polysyllabic polymorphemic words. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107, 364–390. doi:10.1037/a0037518

Kim, Y. S. G. (2017). Why the simple view of reading is not simplistic: Unpacking component skills of reading using a direct and indirect effect model of reading (DIER). Scientific Studies of Reading, 21(4), 310-333.

Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. Journal of Educational Psychology, 95(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.3

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). What we can learn from multicultural education research. Educational leadership, 51(8), 22-26.

Lepola, J., Lynch, J., Kiuru, N., Laakkonen, E., & Niemi, P. (2016). Early oral language comprehension, task orientation, and foundational reading skills as predictors of grade 3 reading comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 51(4), 373-390. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.145

Lervåg, A., Hulme, C., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2018). Unpicking the developmental relationship between oral language skills and reading comprehension: It's simple, but complex. Child Development, 89(5), 1821-1838. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12861

Miciak, J., Roberts, G., Taylor, W., Solis, M., Ahmed, Y., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. (2018). The effects of one versus two years of intensive reading intervention implemented with late elementary struggling readers. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 33, 24–36.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory Into Practice, 31(2), 132-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

NAEP Reading Report Card. (2019). Retrieved from
https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/

Nagy, W. E., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How Many Words Are There in Printed School English? Reading Research Quarterly, 19(3), 304–330. https://doi.org/10.2307/747823

National Reading Panel (US), National Institute of Child Health, Human Development (US), National Reading Excellence Initiative, National Institute for Literacy (US), & United States Department of Health. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

Neuman, S. B. & Kaefer, T. (2018). Developing low-income children's vocabulary and content knowledge through a shared book reading program. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 52, 15-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.12.001

O'Connor, R. E., Swanson, H. L., & Geraghty, C. (2010). Improvement in reading rate under independent and difficult text levels: Influences on word and comprehension skills. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(1), 1-19. https://doi.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Fa0017488

Paige, D. D. (2011). 16 minutes of "eyes-on-text" can make a difference: Whole-class choral reading as an adolescent fluency strategy. Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts, 51(1). https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol51/iss1/3/

Roth, F. P., Speece, D. L., & Cooper, D. H. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the connection between oral language and early reading. The Journal of Educational Research, 95(5), 259-272. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670209596600

Sabatini, J., Wang, Z., & O'Reilly, T. (2019). Relating reading comprehension to oral reading performance in the NAEP fourth-grade special study of oral reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 54(2), 253-271.

Scammacca, N., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., & Stuebing, K. (2015). A meta-analysis of interventions for struggling readers in grades 4–12: 1980–2011. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 48, 369–390.

Solis, M., Ciullo, S., Vaughn, S., Pyle, N., Hassaram, B., & Leroux, A. (2012). Reading comprehension interventions for middle school students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of 30 years of research. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 45, 327–340.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-407.

Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34(1), 33-58.

Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Wanzek, J., Roberts, G., Swanson, E., & Fall, A.-M. (2017). Improving content knowledge and comprehension for English Language Learners: Findings from a randomized control trial. Journal of Educational Psychology, 109(1), 22-34. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000069

Vaughn, S., Roberts, G., Miciak, J., Taylor, P., & Fletcher, J. (2019). Efficacy of a word- and text-based intervention for students with significant reading difficulties. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 52(1), 31–44.

Wang, Z., Sabatini, J., O'reilly, T., & Weeks, J. (2019). Decoding and reading comprehension: A test of the decoding threshold hypothesis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 111(3), 387.

Wanzek, J., Otaiba, S. A., Schatschneider, C., Donegan, R. E., Rivas, B., Jones, F., & Petscher, Y. (2020). Intensive intervention for upper elementary students with severe reading comprehension difficulties. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 13(3), 408-429.

White, T. G., Sabatini, J. P., & White, S. (2021). What Does "Below Basic" Mean on NAEP Reading?. Educational Researcher, 50(8), 570-573.

Wolf, M. (2018). Reader, come home: The reading brain in a digital world. New York: Harper Collins.

Appendix 2

Confirmation of Agreement with Terms of Model Contract (For Concept Note Submission)

Please sign under the appropriate statement:

I am an authorized negotiator for my team. I have read the Model Contract provided as part of the Reading Reimagined RFP, and I concur with its terms and conditions.

_____   _____

Signature   Date

I am an authorized negotiator for my team. I have read the Model Contract provided as part of the Reading Reimagined RFP, and I am requesting the following changes be made to the contract terms and conditions.

<List requested changes>

_____   _____

Signature   Date

Appendix 3

Research and Measurement Plan Template (For Proposal Submission Only)

Within the research plan proposal, applicants will need to answer the following questions:

1. Describe the targeted foundational literacy skill(s)[11] and the approach that you will be implementing and how your proposed intervention will likely meet the goal of increasing word recognition and fluency for our priority students in grades 3 - 8.
   a. What specific population are you planning to study? Which student groups identified as priority students will you include in your research?
   b. What foundational literacy skill(s) does your intervention specifically target?
   c. What novel or unique approach are you proposing to study? Please describe the specific approach in as much detail as possible.
      i. What theory supports the use of your proposed approach?
      ii. What empirical research already exists to support the use of this approach to improve word recognition and fluency, and has any research on this or similar approaches not found positive results? If so, why?
      iii. What is novel or unique about your approach? How is your proposed approach better than current approaches, and what specifically suggests that your approach will result in improved word recognition and fluency for our priority students in grades 3 - 8?
   d. How will your research contribute to the body of literature on reading and literacy for students in grades 3 - 8?
   e. What are your research questions related to the foundational literacy skill(s) and the approach that you will be implementing?
2. Describe how your research will address each student's experience[12] and leverage their assets.
   a. What components of the student experience will you examine?
   b. Why are these specific components important for ensuring our priority students in grades three through eight will develop and improve word recognition and fluency?

---

[11] Skills necessary for automatic and accurate word recognition, including print concepts, alphabet knowledge, phonemic awareness, sound-spelling knowledge, decoding skills, and morphological awareness.

[12] A student's experience matters to academic outcomes. For our work, the student experience includes a student's beliefs, social-emotional skills, and executive functioning as it relates to literacy. More specifically, we believe that beliefs, social emotional skills, and executive functioning influence a reader's sense of belonging and self-efficacy, including their cultural identity and identity as a reader. We define "self-efficacy" as a person's belief that they can and will be successful at a given task. We define "identity" as how a person understands and perceives themselves and their abilities, generally, as a member of one or more cultures and as a reader.

35

    c. What theory and/or empirical research suggests that improving these components will lead to improved word recognition and fluency for your study population?

    d. What are your research questions related to the student experience?

3. Describe your research design.

    a. What work, if any, needs to be completed on preparing your intervention to be implemented with students? If work needs to be done, describe the process for completing that work.

    b. What is the setting where you will conduct your research? This should include de-identified information about the district, school, and classroom(s), if relevant.

    c. How will your research design allow you to pivot and adjust over the course of the research while still working toward your stated goals?

    d. Sample:

        i. Who will be included in the treatment sample for your research? Indicate how many students you will include and their expected grade levels and demographics. If you will include teachers in your research as part of the sample (e.g., if they will be participants in the research and not partners in conducting the research), include information on the number and characteristics of the teachers you will include. If you will have multiple phases of your research, please separate the sample information by phase.

        ii. How will you recruit your sample? Please provide a timeline for obtaining IRB approval, contacting potential participants and their families, and obtaining appropriate informed consent. Include this information for all phases of the research and for all groups of participants (e.g., students, teachers). This description should align with the letter(s) of support from your proposed partner(s).

        iii. Who will be included in the comparison group for your research? If you are recruiting one sample and will be assigning students to treatment and comparison groups, please indicate how students will be assigned to groups and justify that choice of assignment. If you have multiple phases of your research, please separate the comparison group information by phase.

    e. Procedures:

        i. What are the procedures for implementing and testing the foundational literacy skill(s) and approach you are studying? Be as specific as possible and include a timeline. If there are multiple phases for your research, please describe each phase separately. Include information on when each step of the research will occur, who will be responsible for implementing each step, and where the research will occur.

    ii.   What is the timeline for administering the measures? Include all phases of the research, and all groups of participants (e.g., students, teachers, etc.). Describe how the measurement timeline corresponds to the rest of the research timeline. Include all comparison groups in the timeline.

    iii.   What is the expected dosage and duration of the intervention? Please indicate how much time you expect members of the treatment group to participate in the intervention and the number of expected sessions over the expected period of time. Please also specify the minimum dosage and duration necessary for the intervention as some students may receive shorter or fewer sessions due to scheduling, absences, etc. If you have multiple phases of the research, please indicate dosage and duration for each phase.

    iv.   What will the comparison group experience in place of the skill(s), approach, and component(s) of the student experience that you are studying? If your comparison group will continue with typical practice (e.g, business as usual) please describe the typical practice for your setting. Include any information that may be relevant for reading proficiency including the names and descriptions of curricula and interventions in place. If your comparison group will experience a different intervention or practice from what is typical for their classroom, please describe those activities and practices.

    v.   Identify which proposed studies and methods will be exploratory and which will be confirmatory.

  f. Measures:

    i.   What measures are you including in your research?

    ii.   What reading measures and assessments will you use? You will need to administer the identified subtests of the Capti Assess, but you are encouraged to administer other measures as needed. For each additional measure or assessment, please describe the measure and indicate its psychometric properties. Describe why this measure is appropriate for your goal, intervention, and sample.

    iii.   How will you measure the impact of the intervention on students' experience? Describe why this approach is appropriate for your goal, intervention, and sample.

    iv.   How will you measure the feasibility of the intervention? If research staff are implementing the intervention, please also provide information regarding how you will determine the extent to which the intervention will be feasible for teachers or other practitioners to implement.

    v.   How will you determine the fidelity of implementation? Include any checklists, materials, and processes for measuring fidelity of

implementation. If checklists or materials need to be developed, describe that process. Indicate who will be measuring fidelity of implementation and at which time points in the research fidelity will be measured.

    g. Analysis plan:
        i. How will you use data to answer each of your research questions? Please provide an analysis plan for each research question, including statistical equations as appropriate.

4. Provide a timeline for your research that includes proposed benchmarks/milestones.
5. Describe how your research and development activities will be rooted in an inclusive process that centers the needs and experiences of our priority students (and their educators and/or caregivers, as applicable).
    a. Describe the process you have/will take to engage families, students, and communities in your research project.
    b. How will these engagements be structured?
    c. What is the frequency of the engagements?
    d. What are the purpose and outcomes of the engagements throughout the duration of the research project?
6. Describe the personnel for your project and how the combined expertise and experience of your team provide the best opportunity for the project to succeed.
    a. Who will work on this project? Describe the team profile and identify each member of the team and what their specific role and responsibilities will be. Describe each person's expertise for their role and estimate their time spent on the project. Include all consultants. Be sure to indicate any organizational partnerships and/or subcontracting.
    b. How will you develop and maintain relationships among researchers, developers, and practitioners? Please describe any prior history of working together, relationship building done to-date, and your plans for this project.

Appendix 4

Project Budget Template (For Proposal Submission Only)

	2022	2023	Total	Detail (include justification for expense and calculation)
Staffing				
	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
Staffing Subtotal	$0	$0	$0	
Direct costs	$0	$0	$0	
Subcontracts	$0	$0	$0	
Travel	$0	$0	$0	
[Include other line items as needed]	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
Direct Cost Subtotal	$0	$0	$0	

Indirect Costs	$0	$0	$0	
General & Administrative	$0	$0	$0	
	$0	$0	$0	
Indirect Subtotal	$0	$0	$0	
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	

Reading Reimagined

aerdf

Appendix 5
Payable Milestone Schedule (For Proposal Submission Only)

While our project payment structure is negotiable, we are interested to learn more about payable and non-payable milestones for your project. Please complete the table below, indicating how you have mapped out the project milestones, specifically indicating the payable milestones and the non-payable milestones. Below you will find additional information about payable and non-payable milestones.

Payable Milestones: Milestones that will trigger a payment from Reading Reimagined upon completion, submission, and acceptance of the deliverable(s) detailed at each milestone. Payable milestones have the following limitations:

1. Time of Award: Maximum allowable payment is 15% of total awarded amount.
2. Final Report: Minimum amount reserved will be 15% of total award.
3. Project Checkpoints: remaining 70% of total award will be distributed according to the percentage of the project that is completed.

NOTE: payable milestones may also correspond to quarterly reporting requirements.

Non-payable Milestones: Milestones that represent major phases in the project, but do not trigger a payment from Reading Reimagined. These non-payable milestones may also encompass quarterly reporting (with the exception of the final report).

Quarterly Reporting: Please include your quarterly reporting requirements in your overall milestone count.

Your milestones must include an anticipated date of completion, using the suggested time frame from the RFP document.

Payable & Non-Payable Milestone Schedule				
Milestone #	Milestone Title	Milestone Completion Criteria	Anticipated Completion Date	Amount (indicate $0.00 if the milestone is non-payable)

EXAMPLE 1	Example: Time of Award	Completion of all award documents (signed award letter, signed contract, W-9 form, verification of tax exempt status, attendance at kickoff meeting, and compilation of onboarding requirements).		$ No more than 15% of total award
EXAMPLE: 3	Example: Community Engagement & IRB Secured	Community engagement team secured and onboarded. IRB approval confirmed		$0.00
EXAMPLE: 5	Example: First round of academic and student experience assessments completed and Analyzed	First round of assessments completed and analyzed in conjunction with the community engagement team.		$15% of the total award
EXAMPLE: 9	Example: Final Report and Deliverable Submission	Payable upon approval of report and deliverables by Reading Reimagined		$ No less than 15% of total award

Appendix 6

Intellectual Property Assertion Form (For Proposal Submission Only)

Intellectual Property to be Furnished with Restrictions	Basis of Assertion	Rights to be provided to Reading Reimagined	Who is Asserting Restrictions?
e.g. ABC process, dated XX/XX/XXXX	Developed exclusively at private expense	Internal Use Only	Entity Name

Appendix 7

Evaluation Criteria (For Concept Note and Proposal Submissions)

Instructions to Applicants:

The Reading Reimagined program team, members of the Reading Reimagined Advisory Council, and, if needed, external technical reviewers will conduct an independent review of each Concept Note and Final Proposals. The review teams will examine: Overall Scientific and Technical Merit, Potential Contribution to Equity, and Cost Realism.

Overall Scientific and Technical Merit

The proposed research is bold but attainable: it is innovative, feasible, achievable, and complete.

- There is a strong and clear rationale for how this proposed research plan will generate a greater understanding of teaching foundational literacy skills to our priority students in grades three through eight. The rationale clearly connects the research plan, questions, and hypotheses to existing literature. The rationale articulates how the proposed research is innovative, feasible, and aligned to the vision and goals of Reading Reimagined.
- The research team has the expertise and experience to accomplish the proposed tasks outlined in the research proposal.
- The project descriptions, tasks, research design, and associated elements provided are complete and in a logical sequence with all proposed deliverables clearly defined such that fidelity of the project is expected and the project achieves its desired goal during the award term. Timelines are clear and there is research design coherence within the project.
- The proposal clearly defines and articulates major technical and adaptive risks from the research and lays out a plan to feasibly mitigate those risks. The proposal also describes how the study team will plan for contingencies around technical issues or other types of issues that might arise as the study team executes the proposed research plan.
- The proposal does not include intellectual property restrictions that will significantly impact Reading Reimagined's ability to meet its Global Access requirements.
- The proposal addresses and resolves all issues and concerns noted by the Reading Reimagined team in the Concept Note feedback (used during the proposal stage of the RFP only).

Potential Contribution to Equity

The potential contributions of the proposed effort will directly and significantly benefit our Reading Reimagined priority students' reading success – our Black, Latino, and Native American students and those experiencing poverty.

- The proposed research expects our students will achieve rapid trajectories in reading success that matches their potential. The proposed research seeks significantly accelerated reading trajectories for our students.
- The proposed research acknowledges the historical context and therefore the necessity of research and development activities rooted in an inclusive process that centers our students who have not been centered in our current education systems (see further guidance under Characteristics of Successful Teams).
  - The proposal describes the team's beliefs about how their inclusive research and development mindsets and actions will "interrupt inequity and increase opportunity for those most impacted by oppression" (National Equity Project, Liberatory Design)
  - The proposed research includes clear roles for students and the adults who support them in identifying their needs in practice, ensuring the intervention matches their needs, and discussing and sharing the results, implications and potential next steps
- The proposed project will be led by a team that is diverse in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. If not, the team has a viable action plan to increase the diversity of leadership and influence a commitment to diversity across the organization. Note that team members can be international, though the learning systems are required to be designed and developed in U.S. schools.
- If required, the proposed research uses technology that can be readily accessed by most schools, families, and/or community organizations. The proposed solution should reflect the needs and desires of those most likely to implement it in the future.
- The proposal addresses and resolves all issues and concerns noted by the Reading Reimagined team in the Concept Note feedback (used during the proposal stage of the RFP only).

Cost Realism

The proposed research costs are realistically and accurately aligned to the research agenda and research design.

- The proposed costs are realistic and accurately reflect the technical goals and objectives of Reading Reimagined.
- The proposed costs are consistent with the proposer's project description and reflect a sufficient understanding of the costs and level of effort needed to successfully accomplish the proposed technical approach.

45

- The costs for the proposer and any teammates are substantiated by the details provided in the proposal (e.g., the type and number of labor hours proposed per task; the types and quantities of materials, equipment, and other associated costs; team members; travel; and any other applicable costs and the basis for the estimates).
- The proposal addresses and resolves all issues and concerns noted by the Reading Reimagined team in the Concept Note feedback (used during the proposal stage of the RFP only).

Appendix 8

Reporting, Deliverable, and Other Requirements

Contractor will report on progress towards the Contract goals according to the following schedule:

Expectation/Deliverable	Purpose and Description	Timing/Notes
Opening Check-in Meeting	Purpose: Written report submitted to Reading Reimagined Program Director to provide documentation of completion of Kickoff Meeting and Onboarding Tasks, and proof that the application for IRB was completed.	45 days after award
IRB Approval Report	Purpose: Written report submitted to Reading Reimagined Program Director to provide documentation of IRB approval (see Attachment 3), if not already provided.	All funded projects must apply for IRB approval within 45 days of award. Must be secured prior to beginning research activities.
Quarterly Status Reports	Purpose: Written report (see Attachment 2) submitted to Reading Reimagined Program Director to share progress and document key discoveries and findings over the prior 3 months of the Contract period	Beginning 3 months after contract award and quarterly thereafter

Final Report	Purpose: Used by AERDF for final Contract closure (see Attachment 4). Includes: Narrative account of what was accomplished due to the investment, including a description of all findings resulting from the research and how such findings achieved the goals of the Contract.	Within 30 days after the Contract ends or after funds have been expended, whichever comes later.
Materials used in any implementation procedures or structures	Digital copies of the materials for ongoing learning and research purposes; materials may include lessons, texts, and/or handouts that were used and any implementation procedures or structures.	Within 30 days after the Contract ends or after funds have been expended, whichever comes later.
De-identified raw data	De-identified raw data including all of the subtests of the Capti Assess, reading motivation measures, and other outcome data. Demographic data for students and any data used to identify group assignments in multi-group designs must also be included.	Within 30 days after the Contract ends or after funds have been expended, whichever comes later.
Reading Reimagined Learning Lab	Purpose: To share learnings, and participate in professional growth opportunities. This can include guest speakers, targeted group-based work sessions, and shared time across the cohort for	December 15 - 16, 2022 (virtual) June 23 - 24, 2023 (dates finalized in late 2022; potential for face-to-face meeting)

	team-building.	
Reading Reimagined Kickoff Meeting	Purpose: Meet with the Reading Reimagined Director and Academic Director for a personal welcome into the Reading Reimagined Community.	Scheduled June 2022-July 2022 60 minutes in length
Reading Reimagined Community Convening Meeting	Purpose: Meet the larger Reading Reimagined community and other funded projects.	Scheduled late August 2022 - early September 2022 2.5 hours in length
Monthly R&D Checkpoint Meetings	Purpose: To support your progress on project milestones and to offer any support that may be needed from Reading Reimagined. To support your research design & implementation strategy.	Asynchronous & synchronous; conducted via Zoom. Please expect that up to three of these may be site visits conducted by a Reading Reimagined Team member. Meetings start in September 2022