



# Career Path High

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### Continuous Improvement Expert

---

This Request for Proposals (RFP) has been determined to be the appropriate procurement method to provide the best value to Career Path High (“CPH”). The RFP is designed to provide interested offerors with sufficient basic information to submit proposals meeting minimum requirements but is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant or essential data. Offerors are at liberty and are encouraged to expand upon the specifications to evidence service capability under any agreement. CPH will not be liable for any costs offerors may incur in the preparation or presentation of their proposal.

Offerors should not have any contact with CPH employees or Board of Director members during the RFP process, except as permitted with respect to questions about this RFP as set forth in Section IX of this RFP and oral presentations as set forth in Section XIII of this RFP.

This RFP is issued in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code and applicable Rules found in the Utah Administrative Code. If any provision of this RFP conflicts with the Utah Procurement Code or Utah Administrative Code, those codes will take precedence.

---

#### I. **PURPOSE OF RFP**

The purpose of this RFP is for CPH to enter into a contract with a qualified contractor to:

- Develop and implement a school improvement plan and scope of work;
- Monitor the effectiveness of a school improvement plan through reliable means of evaluation, including on-site visits, observations, surveys, analysis of student achievement data, and interviews;
- Provide ongoing implementation support and project management for a school improvement plan, including making needed adjustments based on data reviewed throughout the scope of the project;
- Provide high-quality professional learning personalized for school staff that is designed to build the leadership capacity of the principal, the instructional capacity of school staff, and educators’ capacity with data-driven strategies by providing actionable, embedded data practices; and
- Leverage support from community partners to coordinate an efficient delivery of supports to students inside and outside the classroom.

## II. **BACKGROUND**

The USBE Center for Continuous School Improvement (CCSI), using data from 2018, 2019, and 2022 school years, identified non-Title 1 Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools in two categories: Targeted Student Groups and Overall Performance. Under the State School Improvement program, “at least” six (6) TSI Non-Title 1 schools (Elevate) were invited to apply to participate in the voluntary Elevate School program’s improvement process. CPH was one of the schools.

Elevate Schools are required to contract with a Continuous Improvement Expert (CIE) consultant to collaboratively:

- 1) develop and implement a school improvement plan; and
- 2) monitor the effectiveness of the school improvement plan through reliable means of evaluation that includes:
  - a. onsite visits;
  - b. observations;
  - c. surveys;
  - d. analysis of student achievement; and
  - e. interview.

The CIE may also include the development of school district/school capacities to effectively respond to the academic and behavioral needs of students in high poverty communities or services that respond to the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

The CIE will use with fidelity the processes, tools, and forms developed by the USBE as detailed in the Utah System of Supports for School Improvement (SoSSI) Handbook.

For purposes of this RFP, the responsibilities of the CIE are for one school, CPH, a 9-12 high school located in Kaysville, Utah. These requirements and responsibilities will be done in partnership with the School Improvement Committee at CPH and other CPH personnel that support the Elevate program.

## III. **LENGTH OF CONTRACT AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

The Contract resulting from this RFP will be for a period of up to 3.5 years (depending on the timing of the awarded contract), starting with the award of contract during the 2023-2024 school year (as the planning year), taking place during the 2024-2025 school year (first implementation year), with two one-year options to extend during the 2025-2026 school year and the 2026-2027 school.

The Contract may not be extended beyond the original period.

CPH reserves the right to review contract(s) on a regular basis regarding performance and cost analysis and may negotiate price and service elements during the term of the contract.

A review will be performed at the end of school year one (end of the 2024-2025 school year) and year two (at the end of the 2025-2026 school year). CPH reserves the right to negotiate the subsequent year's services with the winning offeror.

#### IV. **PRICE GUARANTEE PERIOD**

All pricing must be guaranteed for the initial term and for both one-year options to extend.

#### V. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Upon selection by CPH's Board of Directors, the winning offeror must be prepared to enter a written contract that is consistent with the acceptable services, terms, and conditions outlined in the winning proposal and the requirements set forth in this RFP, as well as any other reasonable terms and conditions required by CPH.

CPH retains the right to refuse to negotiate or accept terms and conditions from the winning offeror that CPH deems are excessive, not in the best interest of CPH, overly expensive or that could result in excessive costs to CPH or the state, or that could adversely impact existing time constraints.

**If negotiations are required, the winning offeror must provide all documents in MS Word format for redline editing. Offerors must provide the name, contact information, and access to the person(s) that will be directly involved in legal negotiations.**

#### VI. **DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK**

The CIE provider is expected to:

1) School Improvement Plan Development Year 1 – The CIE Consultant will collaborate with the Elevate School's School Improvement Committee to develop a school improvement plan based on the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis. The school improvement plan must:

- a. Address the root causes of CPH's low performance identified through the needs assessment;
- b. Include recommendations regarding changes to CPH's personnel, culture, curriculum, assessments, instructional practices, governance, leadership, finances, policies, or other areas that may be necessary to implement the school improvement plan;
- c. Include measurable student achievement goals and objectives and benchmarks by which to measure progress;
- d. Include a professional development plan that identifies a strategy to address problems of instructional practice;
- e. Include a detailed budget specifying how the school improvement plan will be funded;
- f. Include a plan to assess and monitor progress;
- g. Include a plan to communicate and report data on progress to stakeholders; and
- h. Include a timeline for implementation.

2) School Improvement Plan Implementation Year 1-4:

- a. The CIE Consultant will collaboratively initiate implementation and associated tasks for the duration of CPH's school improvement status.

VII. **PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

Detailed Proposal Requirements:

Each CIE consultant must submit to CPH a proposal to contract with CPH to provide services for CPH that includes:

- Strategies to address root causes of CPH's low performance identified through the school's respective Comprehensive Needs Assessment/Root Cause Analysis;
- Scope of Work (SOW) that requires the CIE consultant to at a minimum: develop and implement in partnership with CPH's school improvement committee a school improvement plan;
- SOW to facilitate implementation of strategies to effectively respond to the academic and behavioral needs of students in high poverty communities; or other services that respond to the needs assessment; and
- SOW that may require the CIE consultant to develop sustainable school district/school capacities to effectively respond to the academic and behavioral needs of students in high poverty communities; or other services that respond to the needs assessment.

To assist the CIE consultant in providing a detailed proposal to CPH in meeting the needs of CPH, and recognizing that the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis is yet to be conducted, below is an anticipated list of anticipated areas of focus for CPH that could emerge from the forthcoming assessment and analysis:

- School culture has been challenged with the pandemic coupled with the complexity of the school's blended model consequently, there are higher than desired behavior referrals, impacting student academic outcomes.
- School's blended learning model which allows for some defined flexibility in on campus attendance results in high-maintenance attendance tracking contributing to low attendance expectations by parents and students.
- School focus on technical education provides opportunities for student college and career readiness but lack of preparation and systems for tracking and enforcing progress in these classes results in low success rates.
- With relatively high turnover rates, the school is still gaining its footing on putting in systems in place for new faculty and new students.
- Teachers have somewhat been trained on effective engagement strategies that are the key preventative measure of in-class behavior issues. Administration has not been consistent in holding teachers accountable for the use of these strategies.
- Some teachers are inconsistent in their upholding of school rules and expectations, making other teachers who uphold these rules look like "the bad guys."
- There is a need to develop shared teacher accountability over common expectations everyone follows.
- There is a need to address Tier II student behavior needs through providing professional learning to teachers on trauma-informed classrooms, restorative practices, and culturally relevant teaching.

- There is a need to further evaluate school Tier II and III student supports, making further improvements as needed.
- Teacher observation and feedback cycles are continually interrupted by administrative tasks and need to be prioritized and systemized.
- Professional learning is yet to increase engagement in classrooms, lacking PLC training and absent schoolwide system of intervention, student level of engagement is low, desired PLC outcomes are not being realized, and school-wide interventions are not in place. As a cumulative result, students' Tier I and Tier II instruction is lacking, leading to lower academic outcomes.
- Re: ineffective PLCs – Lack of coaching on how to use assessments to drive instruction and intervention.
- School can utilize better tracking mechanisms to know student progress by standard, and use tracking to guide classroom intervention as well as dedicated intervention time.
- Training can be provided to teachers to facilitate effective PLCs.
- Lack of emphasis on preparing students for the rigor and modality of Utah Aspire + and the ACT in part stems from testing gap years due to the pandemic.
- Lack of understanding about the effectiveness of using interims and benchmarks, as well as lack of training for reteaching based on the results of interim assessments and/or benchmarks.
- Need for greater focus, training and implementation of practices that will increase the student's ability to be self driven learners in a blended model.
- There is a need to evaluate the school's instructional coherence across grade levels and departments, align as needed.

The anticipated findings do not constitute a synopsis of the findings from the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis. Rather, the list above represents anticipated needs that will be discovered as a result of the assessment and analysis. The anticipated findings are presented to the CIE vendors in an effort to design a proposal.

#### Company Qualifications and Experience:

1. Having a credible track record and experience designing and leading school improvement initiatives resulting in initial and sustained teaching and learning growth and improvement measured by statewide assessments with an emphasis on the following student group: Students with Disabilities.
2. Experience with and examples of working with blended, competency based high schools to improve academic outcomes.
3. Experience with and examples of effective PBIS structure and practice including professional development offerings provided by the consultant.
4. Experience with and examples of effective MTSS structure and practices including professional development offerings provided by the consultant.
5. Experience with and examples of effective Tier 1 instruction including professional development offerings provided by the consultant.
6. Experience with and examples of effective leadership coaching including professional development offerings provided by the consultant.
7. Experience working with the various education entities that govern public charter schools.
8. Experience in working with school systems and enacting sustainable change,

understanding and leveraging drivers for sustainable educational reform.

9. Familiarity with the Utah Accountability Technical Manual
10. Familiarity with the Utah System of Support for School Improvement USoSSI
11. Familiarity with Utah's Personalized, Competency Based Learning (PCBL) Framework
12. Familiarity with Utah's High Quality Instructional (HQI) Cycle
13. Capacity to fulfill scope of work and responsibilities for CPH in a high quality manner that meets or exceeds contractual expectations.

Regarding the experience requirements above, outline experiences that the company has had in helping improve student outcomes for other schools. List schools, dates, and the extent of work provided for the school. Include school performance data before working with your company, progress made while working with your company, and data since working with your company.

#### VIII. **ANTICIPATED SOLICITATION TIMELINE**

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Release RFP</b>	11/03/2023
<b>Questions Deadline</b>	11/20/2023 by 5 p.m. MST
<b>Proposals Due</b>	12/01/2023 by 5 p.m. MST
<b>Anticipated Evaluation Period</b>	12/01/2023 – 01/08/2024
<b>Board of Directors Award of Contract</b>	01/08/2024 (subject to change)
<b>Contract Negotiations/Creation</b>	January 2024

#### IX. **QUESTIONS**

All questions must be submitted in writing to Stacey Hutchings via email at [stacey.hutchings@utahcph.org](mailto:stacey.hutchings@utahcph.org).

#### X. **PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT**

All proposals must include a technical proposal and cost proposal. Formats for both documents follow:

##### A. **Technical Proposal Format**

Hard copies are to be tabbed by section.

Tab 1. **Executive Summary.** A one- or two-page executive summary is to briefly describe the offeror's proposal. This summary should highlight the major features of the proposal. It must indicate any requirements that cannot be met by the offeror. The reader should be able to determine the essence of the proposal by reading the executive summary. Protected information requests should be identified in this section.

Tab 2. **Detailed Response.** This section should constitute the major portion of the proposal and must contain at least the following information:

1. A complete narrative of the offeror's assessment of the work to be performed, the offeror's ability and approach, and the resources necessary to fulfill the requirements. This should demonstrate the offeror's

understanding of the desired overall performance expectations. Clearly indicate any options or alternatives proposed.

2. A specific point-by-point response, in the order listed, to each requirement in the RFP. In this response, the offeror will clearly outline how they will meet contract expectations, including the types and frequency of interactions with CPH staff members. In the proposal, offerors will also outline their proposed means of holding themselves and CPH accountable in successfully designing and implementing CPH's improvement plan, including metrics that will be tracked and targets to be reached.

**Tab 3. Protected Information.** All protected information must be included in this section of proposal response. Do not incorporate protected information throughout the proposal. Rather, provide a reference in the proposal response directing readers to the specific area of this Protected Information section.

The Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA), Utah Code Ann., Subsection 63G-2-305, provides in part that:

“the following records are protected if properly classified by a government entity:

- (1) trade secrets as defined in Section 13-24-2 if the person submitting the trade secret has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in Section 63G-2-309;
- (2) commercial information or nonindividual financial information obtained from a person if:
  - (a) disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to result in unfair competitive injury to the person submitting the information or would impair the ability of the governmental entity to obtain necessary information in the future;
  - (b) the person submitting the information has a greater interest in prohibiting access than the public in obtaining access; and
  - (c) the person submitting the information has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in Section 63G-2-309
- (6) records, the disclosure of which would impair governmental procurement proceedings or give an unfair advantage to any person proposing to enter into a contract or agreement with a governmental entity, except, subject to Subsections (1) and (2), that this Subsection (6) does not restrict the right of a person to have access to, after the contract or grant has been awarded and signed by all parties:

- (a) a bid, proposal, application, or other information submitted to or by a governmental entity in response to:
  - (i) an invitation for bids;
  - (ii) a request for proposals;
  - (iii) a request for quotes;
  - (iv) a grant; or
  - (v) other similar document; or
- (b) an unsolicited proposal, as defined in Section 63G-6a-712

GRAMA provides that trade secrets, commercial information or non-individual financial information may be protected by submitting a Claim of Business Confidentiality.

To protect information under a Claim of Business Confidentiality, the offeror must: provide a written Claim of Business Confidentiality *at the time the information (proposal) is provided to CPH* and include a concise statement of reasons supporting the claim of business confidentiality (Subsection 63G-2-309).

**If you submit a proposal containing confidential information you must submit an electronic “redacted” (excluding protected information) copy of your proposal response. Copy must clearly be marked “Redacted Version.”**

A Claim of Business Confidentiality may be appropriate for information such as client lists and non-public financial statements. Pricing and service elements may not be protected. An entire proposal may not be protected under a Claim of Business Confidentiality. The claim of business confidentiality must be submitted with your proposal on the form which may be accessed at:

<http://purchasing.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/confidentialityclaimform.doc>

**An entire proposal cannot be identified as “PROTECTED”, “CONFIDENTIAL” or “PROPRIETARY” and may be considered non-responsive if marked as such.**

To ensure the information is protected, you must include all protected information in Tab 3 of the proposal response. Any protected information incorporated in other sections of the proposal response may result in release of data at no fault of CPH.

All materials submitted become the property of CPH. Materials may be evaluated by anyone designated by CPH as part of the RFP evaluation committee. Materials submitted may be returned only at CPH’s option.



## B. Cost Proposal Format

The proposal must be set forth in such a way that it will allow the merits of the proposal to be evaluated in conjunction with applicable cost. **Please review the Best and Final Offers section below to ensure you properly submit your cost proposal.** CPH requires an outline on how the awarded amount will be utilized per year using an itemized breakout of task to be provided per year, the resources provided, and the rate of the resources provided.

A review will be performed at the end of implementation school year one (end of the 2024-2025 school year) and year two (at the end of the 2025-2026 school year). CPH reserves the right to negotiate the subsequent year's services.

## XI. SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL

Proposals must be received by the posted due date and time. Proposals received after the deadline will be late and ineligible for consideration.

Proposals must be sent electronically via email to Stacey Hutchings at [stacey.hutchings@utahcph.org](mailto:stacey.hutchings@utahcph.org) and in hard copies as follows: one original and five identical copies of your proposal must be delivered to Career Path High located at 550 East 300 South, Room 2037, Kaysville, Utah 84037.

All submitted proposals must consist of both a cost proposal and a technical proposal. The cost proposal and the technical proposal should be separated and provided in different files.

When emailing the proposal, the email should contain, if possible, two separate files – one containing (and labeled) the technical proposal and another containing (and labeled) the cost proposal. No cost information may be submitted in the technical proposal. CPH acknowledges that electronic proposals may require including multiple electronic attachments. However, CPH may be unable to view certain documents. Therefore, you **MAY NOT submit** documents that are **embedded (zip files), movies, wmp, and mp3 files**. All documents must be attached as separate files and labeled as technical proposal and cost proposal, as applicable.

When delivering written proposals, the technical proposals (and copies) should be in one sealed envelope labeled “technical proposal” and the cost proposal (and copies) should be in a different sealed envelope. No cost information may be submitted in the technical proposal.

In responding with their technical proposals, CIE companies must outline the extent and quality of service that will be provided to CPH for the duration of the contract. As previously indicated, **the offeror must clearly outline how they will meet contract expectations, including the types and frequency of interactions** with CPH staff members. In the proposal, CIE companies must also outline **their proposed means of holding themselves and CPH accountable** in successfully designing and implementing CPH's improvement plan, including metrics that will be tracked and targets to be reached.

NOTICE: By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, offeror is acknowledging that the requirements, scope of work, and the evaluation process, outlined in the RFP are fair, equitable,

not unduly restrictive, understood and agreed to. Any exceptions to the content of the RFP must be protested to the purchasing agent prior to the closing date and time for submission of the proposal.

## **XII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

A committee will evaluate proposals against the weighted criteria below. Each area of the evaluation criteria must be addressed in detail in submitted proposals. All proposals in response to this RFP will be evaluated in a manner consistent with the Utah Procurement Code, procurement rules and policies, and the evaluation criteria established in this RFP.

<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>
40%	Cost
20 %	Demonstrated ability to meet the scope of work
20 %	Demonstrated technical capability (proven track record), etc.
15 %	Qualification and expertise of staff proposed for this project
5 %	Performance references for similar projects

Understandability and comprehensiveness of information supplied in this RFP will affect the evaluation of the above criteria.

## **XIII. DISCUSSIONS WITH OFFERORS (ORAL PRESENTATION)**

An oral presentation by an offeror to clarify a proposal may be required at the sole discretion of CPH. However, CPH may award a contract based on the initial proposals received without discussion with the offeror. If oral presentations are required, they will be scheduled after the submission of proposals. Oral presentations will be made at the offerors' expense.

## **XIV. SHORTLIST**

Unless there is a successful offeror based on the initial review of the responses, the evaluation committee will develop a shortlist of the highest scoring offerors based on the stated criteria. To be included on the short list an offeror must have a total score of no less than a three (3) in any of the stated criteria. Vendors with a score lower than a three (3) will not be considered further in the evaluation. The shortlist of offerors may be asked to prepare a presentation and/or provide additional information prior to the final selection.

## **XV. BEST AND FINAL OFFERS**

Vendors should offer their best offer in the original technical proposal. The use of a Best and Final Offer process is regulated by Utah Code 63G-6a-707.5 and will only be used if:

- a. no single proposal adequately addresses all the specifications stated in this RFP;
- b. all proposals are unclear or deficient in one or more respects;
- c. all cost proposals exceed CPH's identified budget or available funding; or
- d. two or more proposals receive an identical evaluation score that is the highest score.

It is important to understand this so as not to anticipate that a best and final process will allow for an offeror to "sharpen their pencil" in a subsequent phase.

**XVI. AWARD OF CONTRACT**

Award shall be made to the offeror whose proposal is the most advantageous to CPH taking into consideration price and the other evaluation factors set forth in this RFP.

CPH reserves the right to award the contract(s) to a technically qualified lower cost offeror(s) in the event the high scoring offer is determined to not be the best value offered to CPH, based on a cost benefit analysis.

**CAREER PATH HIGH**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
*Continuous Improvement Expert*

**Firm Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Score will be assigned as follows:

0 = Fail, fails to address the requirements

1 = Poor, inadequately addresses the requirements

2 = Unsatisfactory, only partially responsive to the requirements

3 = Satisfactory, meets minimum requirements

4 = Good, meets requirements and exceeds in some respects

5 = Excellent, exceeds all of the requirements

		Score (0-5)	Weight	Points
<b>1. Demonstrated Ability to meet scope of work (20 points possible)</b>		----	----	----
Level of support provided.	10 points possible		X 2	
Plan for monitoring and accountability.	5 points possible		X 1	
Develop a school plan with goals, strategies and action steps that address school needs, priorities, and root causes.	2.5 points possible		X .5	
Ability to leverage support from community partners, engage parents and families, report on school progress to stakeholders.	2.5 points possible		X .5	
<b>2. Demonstrated Technical Capability (20 points possible)</b>		----	----	----
Capacity to design and facilitate effective professional learning, instructional and leadership coaching to address each specific school's needs identified in current and future root cause analyses.	10 points possible		X 2	
Capacity to work collaboratively with the school leadership team in creating, implementing, and monitoring a school improvement plan. This may include making recommendations to school systems, curriculum, instructional design, drivers of culture.	10 points possible		X 2	
<b>3. Qualification and Expertise of Staff (15 points possible)</b>		----	----	----
Experience with blended-competency based school models, student behavior, PBIS, MTSS, Tier I instruction, leadership coaching, and professional learning.	10 points possible		X 2	
Proven track record, previous work done, working with education entities, meeting goals and timelines for implementation.	2.5 points possible		X .5	
Familiarity with technical manual, USoSSI, PCBL, and HQI cycle.	2.5 points possible		X .5	
<b>4. References (5 points possible)</b>	5 points possible		X 1	
<b>5. Cost (40 points possible)</b>	40 points possible		X 8	
<b>TOTAL EVALUATION POINTS</b>	<b>(100 points possible)</b>		<b>Total</b>	