



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

ABOUT TEACH

To Educate All Children (TEACH), formerly known as Knowledge Arts Foundation (KAF), was founded in 2005 by business leader Susan Sarofim and lifelong educator Mary Yenik. With Susan's career background in the staffing industry, and with Mary's expertise in training educators and corporate leaders, these two women realized that no one has tougher sales work or a more important clientele than a teacher. It's the teacher who moves the educational system from pre-K to the job market.

Many students in the United States face serious barriers to education. While teachers cannot alleviate poverty, they can work to create calm classrooms, reduce disciplinary actions, and increase their teaching time.

A safe and stable school environment is crucial for students that may not experience safety or stability anywhere else in their worlds. Far easier said than done, creating calm classrooms and schools requires practice, experience, and an unwavering commitment and belief in the students. TEACH provides educators with intensive trainings on classroom management, focusing on areas such as de-escalation, conflict resolution, building students' self-image, and nonverbal communication.

TEACH has operated in both Louisiana and Texas schools. For the past several years, it has concentrated its efforts exclusively in the Houston Independent School District where it is serving 25 schools for the 2018-2019 academic year.

OVERVIEW

Understanding whether and in what ways TEACH's interventions are impacting students, classrooms, teachers, and schools is an essential component of demonstrating the effectiveness the TEACH program. Yet, given the variety of student backgrounds across TEACH partner schools – and the importance of these background factors for academic achievement – a broader analysis that considers factors like student growth and puts trends at TEACH partner schools in a broader context is required.

In this project, we would like an external firm to evaluate the TEACH program and evaluate its impact by collecting and analyzing data and trends in schools where TEACH has been implemented. Drawing on publicly available data of Texas schools from academic years 2011-2012 through 2017-2018, we would like a comprehensive portrait of TEACH partner schools and compare them to other urban schools statewide with similar demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. In this way, we will be able to measure impact at our partnering schools and assess our effectiveness in improving students' academic outcomes as well as determining all impacts of TEACH's program beyond students; i.e. teacher retention, campus culture, principal leadership, etc. Additionally, resulting from this evaluative process, TEACH would like to identify the top metrics to utilize in measuring its ongoing impact in the schools where it provides services. TEACH would also like recommendations for developing an internal evaluation process within the organization moving forward.



LIST OF EXISTING TEACH SCHOOLS

School Name	Type	# Years Partnering
1. Garden Oaks	Elementary	4
2. MacGregor	Elementary	2
3. Mading	Elementary	4
4. Mitchell	Elementary	2
5. Thompson	Elementary	2
6. Walnut Bend	Elementary	2
7. Attucks	Junior High	2
8. Cullen	Junior High	7
9. Revere	Junior High	2
10. Thomas	Junior High	0.5
11. Welch	Junior High	2
12. DAEP	Alternative School	0.5

LIST OF NEW TEACH SCHOOLS TO BE ADDED IN 2018 – 2019 ACADEMIC YEAR

School Name	Type	# Years Partnering
1. Ashford	Elementary	0
2. Bastian	Elementary	0
3. Blackshear	Elementary	0
4. Codwell	Elementary	0
5. Foerster	Elementary	0
6. Highland Heights	Elementary	0
7. Reynolds	Elementary	0
8. Wesley	Elementary	0
9. Young	Elementary	0
10. Fleming	Junior High	0
11. North Forest	High School	0
12. Sterling	High School	0
13. Wheatley	High School	0



SAMPLE RESEARCH QUESTIONS*

Please note that the following is provided as a **sample of potential research questions to explore; however, TEACH expects that evaluation partner will be able to guide the process in determining best research questions after better determining TEACH's needs and research objectives.*

PHASE 1 [Publicly available 2018 Spring STAAR and demographic data]

- Demographic analysis
 - What is the demographic breakdown of the TEACH schools?
 - Race, ethnicity, gender, G/T, SPED, at risk, English language learners, economic disadvantaged (e.g. free and reduced lunch, poverty data by zip code)
- STAAR analysis:
 - What % of students are performing on grade level in Reading & Math (MEETS) in the STAAR assessments?
 - How does this performance compare to other campuses with similar demographic characteristics?
 - How does the year-to-year and/or multi-year change in the % of students at the MEETS level in Reading & Math at TEACH campuses compared to other similar campuses in the school district and statewide?
 - How does STAAR Reading & Math (MEETS) performance and change in performance differ by the number of teachers supported at a particular TEACH campus and/or grade level?
 - How do TEACH-supported students perform on academic assessments years later?
 - Between non-TEACH HISD and State teachers and TEACH teachers (1 year, 2 years, 3-5 years, etc.)

PHASE 2 [Data through sharing agreement]

- Attendance:
 - How does student attendance (number of days attended in a school year) by individual student compare at TEACH classrooms vs. non-TEACH classrooms from the first day of school through their last day of school?
 - How does student attendance (number of days attended in a school year) by individual student compare before and after TEACH intervention at classrooms?
 - What is the projected increase in funding as a result of the change in attendance by students supported by the TEACH program?
 - What is the cost of missed attendance days and what is the return on investment that TEACH generates by potentially reducing the number of student and teacher missed days?
 - If TEACH were to expand to X number of schools in Houston ISD, what would be the projected change in attendance funding from the State as a result of the change in attendance?
- Teacher Turnover:
 - How does teacher retention compare at TEACH supported classrooms vs. non-TEACH classrooms?
 - Teacher retention
 - Between new non-TEACH teachers and new TEACH teachers
 - Between non-TEACH HISD and State teachers and TEACH teachers (1 year, 2 years, 3-5 years, etc.)
 - Comparison of teacher retention between veteran teachers and TEACH teachers
- Disciplinary Consequences:
 - What change in disciplinary actions do students experience before and after the TEACH intervention?



- In-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, office referrals, alternative placements, expulsions, other
- What is the cost of student disciplinary actions (missed days, personnel) and what is the return on investment that TEACH generates by potentially reducing the number of student disciplinary actions?
- Social and Emotional Learning (SEL):
 - How do non-TEACH and TEACH-supported students assess on social emotional dimensions such as self-image and self-esteem as measured by self-reported surveys?
 - How do teacher impressions and perceptions of students evolve after TEACH training and coaching?
- Other data:
 - How do students in non-TEACH and TEACH-supported classrooms perform across other indicators (e.g. red, yellow, green flag trends as captured by the non-profit organization *Pro Unitas*)?

Through publicly available data, teacher self-reported data, and/or observational data:

- Professional Development:
 - Does TEACH change the average number of hours teachers invest in professional development?
 - Measure the average number of hours non-TEACH and TEACH-supported teachers invest in professional development
- Teaching Time:
 - Do TEACH strategies increase teaching time?
 - Create classroom observation scans to determine if TEACH strategies increase teaching time

STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

***Please note that the following strategies and activities are provided as a general guideline; however, TEACH expects that the strategies and activities will be developed in collaboration with the evaluation partner and based on evaluator recommendations.*

1. [STRATEGY] Selection Rubric

- Create a rubric or matrix with qualitative and quantitative dimensions that assesses
 1. The conditions for success a school needs in order to succeed
 2. How current and new potential schools perform against those conditions for success
 3. A school's school culture to establish a baseline and track changes in school culture over time (including correlations with student achievement)
 4. Identify any other areas that are recommended to assess

2. [DATA] Data collection and demographic analysis

- Collect and compile data on student characteristics and academic outcomes at TEACH partner schools and districts into an easy-to-use spreadsheet.
- Document demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of schools and districts where TEACH has implemented its program, including:
 - Number of students served
 - Race-ethnic composition of students
 - % gender breakdown
 - % G/T breakdown
 - % students economically disadvantaged
 - % Limited English proficiency
 - % At-Risk
 - % in Special Education
 - Mobility rates



3. [DATA] Analysis of student performance trends

- Analyze trends over time in academic achievement at TEACH partner schools, including:
 1. Math and Reading STAAR test scores by campus and grade level
 2. Student-level year-to-year growth
 3. Attendance, disciplinary, teacher turnover trends by student, classroom, and grade level
- Compare these trends at TEACH partner schools to trends at schools with similar demographic profiles within the same district and across the state.

4. [DATA PRESENTATION] Write report on key findings highlighting bright spots and areas for growth

- Based on the analyses, identify areas and schools where TEACH partnerships are leading to marked improvements in student performance and where there are opportunities for growth.
- Project the impact TEACH could have on the school district and region if the program were to expand to additional schools and school districts
- Write a comprehensive report with graphics and profiles of each school that communicate the key findings clearly.

5. [STRATEGY] Provide recommendations on metrics that TEACH should consider adopting as part of its ongoing evaluation process

- Outline a strategy for how TEACH can exchange information and data with Houston ISD and other school districts
- Identify an “index” or “scorecard” of metrics that TEACH can track on a weekly, monthly, and yearly basis to measure impact
- Identify how to communicate TEACH’s “return on investment” using the aforementioned data

APPLICATION PROCESS

Interested applicants can submit written proposals via email to info@toeducateallchildren.org

Detailed proposals detailing qualifications, past experience, 3 examples and references of past projects, and proposed costs are due by September 21, 2018. For questions related to the RFP, please email info@toeducateallchildren.org by September 5, 2018. TEACH will send out a response to all questions received by September 10, 2018

Questions regarding the RFP can be submitted via email to info@toeducateallchildren.org

TIMELINE

The following is a sample project timeline; however, it will be finalized in collaboration with the evaluation partner.



CATEGORY	TEACH	DATA ORGANIZATION	DEADLINE	ACTION	
FINALIZE RFP			OCTOBER	Agree on deliverables & timeline	
CREATE MATRIX/RUBRIC			OCTOBER	Create draft matrix for selection & school culture	
FINALIZE MATRIX/RUBRIC			OCTOBER	Provide feedback to finalize	
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			OCTOBER	Outline Phase 2 data collection strategy & ID how to troubleshoot	
PHASE 1 ANALYSIS			NOVEMBER	Complete Phase 1 draft analysis	
PHASE 1 ANALYSIS			NOVEMBER	Provide feedback to Phase 1 draft analysis	
PHASE 1 ANALYSIS			DECEMBER	Finalize Phase 1 analysis	
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			OCTOBER	Finalize data sharing agreement	
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			NOVEMBER	Launch data collection with district(s)	
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			DECEMBER	Data collection update & troubleshooting	
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			JANUARY		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			FEBRUARY		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			MARCH		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			APRIL		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			MAY		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			JUNE		
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			JUNE		Complete Phase 2 draft analysis
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			JUNE		Provide feedback to Phase 1 draft analysis
PHASE 2 ANALYSIS			JULY		Finalize Phase 2 analysis