RFP # 19-43 Literacy Coaching Initiative
Evaluation Team Consensus Scores

Evaluation Criteria	TNTP, Inc.	We Teach All Educational Consulting, Inc.
Tab 1 **Application Introduction** **(Pass/Fail)**	Pass	Pass
Tab 2 **Application Narrative** **(Max 85 Points)**	81.00	40.50
Tab 3 **Budget Workbook** **(Max 10 Points)**	8.50	5.75
Tab 3 **Budget Narrative** **(Max 5 Points)**	4.00	3.00
Tab 4 **Exceptions to MNPS Contract Terms** **(No Points)**	Yes	No
TOTAL EVALUATED SCORE	**93.50**	**49.25**

Comments

	TNTP, Inc.
Strengths:	The organization illustrates demonstrated coaching success nationally and coaching alignment to multiple initiatives outlined in the RFP. In addition, references provided are similar districts and have shown significant success in Tennessee based on data. The consultant has extensive experience with the PDSA cycle, curricula, and coaching strategies. Teacher professional learning, data collection, and outcomes are clearly explained and defined in plan overview. The consultant provides a clear explanation of teacher benefits and school benefits in each phase as well as the progression for each (teacher and school development) through the plan. The scope is thorough and detailed and provides a clear vision that aligns closely with the vision provided in the RFP. Very realistic with staffing. Realistic expectations. Clear outcomes.
Weaknesses:	Proposal does not meet the entirety of the program length and depth of schools needed in the scope of the RFP. The budget narrative and workbook are brief.

	We Teach All Educational Consulting, Inc.
Strengths:	The Level of data provided from sample experiences is detailed. Longevity with several school districts across the country.
Weaknesses:	The proposal discusses "cities like" but does not provide concrete data for all examples and focuses on strategies such as summer school instruction and the impetus of literacy coaching. The intent of the RFP is to deepen a network of literacy coaches, and the evidence provided does not match that of the description in the RFP as the planned services. There is no customization or explanation of the plan. The proposal was not definitive on how they would train coaches. There is mis-information when addressing how they will support curriculum, and there is no evidence that they have worked with the models or curricula outlined in the RFP. Moreover, the proposal focuses on general coaching strategies through Teach Like a Champion. This choice does not align with the work needed in the RFP, and the budget does not outline or explain in detail which expenses are travel, which expenses are office supplies or photocopies. Further, the literacy resources are never outlined.