

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ADDENDUM # 1

ISSUED: 03/11/2013

**RFP NUMBER: CSP905613
INDEX NUMBER: EDU048**

The State of Ohio, through the Department of Administrative Services, Office of Procurement Services, for the Ohio Department of Education is requesting proposals for a:

NATIONALLY STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT FOR PREDICTING COLLEGE READINESS

Attached are page(s) 5, 7 and 9 to this Request for Proposal (RFP). Remove the corresponding page(s) from the existing RFP and replace with the attached.

Reason for Addendum. This addendum is issued to correct section numbering and correct evaluation criteria in the Technical Proposal Evaluation Table.

**PROPOSAL DUE DATE:
OPENING LOCATION:**

**March 20, 2013
Department of Administrative Services
General Services Bid Desk
4200 Surface Road
Columbus, Ohio 43228-1395**

- 1.5.2.1 Offeror shall propose the processes for the timeline of deliverables in accordance with the NSA including details such as the window for registering students, the window for distribution of test materials and collection of test materials, the window for administering the test, and the dates for various reporting of results to ODE, districts, and, possibly, families.
- 1.5.2.2 Offeror shall propose a start-up meeting of the Offeror's staff, the ODE's staff, representatives from OBR, and subcontractors (if applicable). The meeting shall be held in central Ohio. ODE may provide a location for the meeting.
- 1.5.2.3 Offeror shall propose meetings for each year of the contract dealing with the proposed instrument from both technical and administrative perspectives. Meetings may be of both/either an Ohio scale and a national scale.
- 1.5.2.4 Offeror shall propose the method for ongoing communication directly with district and school test coordinators during each year of the Contract. The system must include the ability to contact district and school test coordinators via mail, phone, fax, and e-mail and the contact database must be updated quarterly. Offeror shall also propose the method used to communicate with schools and districts regarding the status of the testing program, and changes in testing policies and procedures each year of the Contract.
- 1.5.2.5 Offeror shall propose the method for a system of ongoing communication directly between the Offeror's program manager and the ODE program manager. Offeror shall provide assurance that the program manager will be proactive at informing the ODE program manager of problems that may affect either the delivery of Offeror's services or the validity of inferences made from the Contractor's reported results.
- 1.5.2.6 Offeror shall propose a detailed plan for ensuring the security of all test materials (including student responses) while these secure materials are under the control of the Offeror and any subcontractors (including shippers and printers) each year of the contract.
- 1.5.2.7 Offeror shall propose a detailed plan for quality assurance, both in terms of products (e.g., test booklets and scoring keys) and services (e.g., scoring and reporting scores). Offeror shall describe the flexibility Offeror has for ODE to review and approve quality assurance plans.
- 1.5.2.8 Offeror shall propose a schedule for payments and approval of payment, at least yearly, for services rendered during each year of the contract.
- 1.5.3 ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OVERSIGHT
- 1.5.3.1 Offeror shall propose the mechanism for oversight of the technical adequacy of the proposed testing program including annual technical reports and the names and qualifications of panels of outside contractors that advise on the testing program. The Offeror shall propose the level of access ODE officials will have to the meeting of Offeror's panels that comment on the technical adequacy of the proposed testing program.
- 1.5.3.2 Offeror shall propose that mechanism that it uses to collect data from local test administrators and schools regarding the receipt and administration of the materials and reports for the proposed testing program.
- *1.5.3.3 Offeror shall propose its level of participation should Offeror be requested to participate in standing and future committee meetings of Ohio's Technical Advisory Committee meetings (most are scholars with eminence in the field of large scale assessment) and Ohio's Test Steering Committee meeting (most are district test coordinators representing local districts with interests in local district).
- *1.5.3.4 Offeror shall propose the level of Ohio involvement in and access to the results of Offeror's committees that review test items for issues of fairness and sensitivity
- 1.5.4 TEST OPERATIONS IN THE FIELD.
- 1.5.4.1 Offeror shall propose accessible solutions that may include tests in Braille, large print, English language audio, audio versions in other languages, the use of scribes, the use of translators, and any other approaches that allow every Ohio student to access the NSA. Offeror shall also include in the proposal a description of those students that the Offeror cannot assess using the NSA. It is anticipated that Offeror will include any additional charges for access solutions, should they exist, in the cost proposal.
- 1.5.4.2 Offeror shall propose a plan to ensure that all students are given the opportunity for testing in each Contract year.
- 1.5.4.3 Offeror shall propose formats for test administration including paper and pencil formats. Offeror's proposal for electronic test administration shall describe technology requirements for implementation at the testing site including requirements for test security if site uses electronic testing.
- 1.5.4.4 Offeror shall propose the method for pre-registration of students including time line for registration, collection of a unique student identifier for purposes of reporting results (at present two alpha characters followed by seven numerical characters), late or test day registration procedures, and ability to associate the student with specific schools or teachers.

*Indicates change 03/11/13

2.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

2.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS Table 1 contains items that are Mandatory Requirements for this RFP

Determining the Offeror's ability to meet the Mandatory Requirements is the first step of the DAS evaluation process. The Offeror's response must be clearly labeled "Mandatory Requirements" and collectively contained in Tab 2 of the Offeror's Proposal in the "Offeror Required Information and Certification" section.

DAS will evaluate Tab 2 alone to determine whether the Proposal meets all Mandatory Requirements (accept/reject). If the information contained in Tab 2 does not clearly meet every Mandatory Requirement, the Proposal may be disqualified by DAS from further consideration.

2.2 TABLE 1 - MANDATORY PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Mandatory Requirements	Accept	Reject
1. Offeror must have at least 10 years of experience in both administration and score reporting of assessments.		
2. Offeror has a nationally standardized assessment that can generate data which can be used to inform a reporting measure as explained in Ohio Senate Bill 555 legislation. The instrument and scores shall lead to valid inferences about the individual examinee. Details of this requirement are found in 1.5.1.1		
3. Offeror can support administration of the NSA in both an on-line format and a paper-pencil format		

If the State receives no Proposals meeting all of the mandatory requirements, the State may elect to cancel this RFP.

FINANCIAL ABILITY Part of the Proposal evaluation criteria is the qualifications of the Offeror which may include, as a component, the Offeror's financial ability to perform the Contract. This RFP may expressly require the submission of financial statements from all Offerors in the Proposal contents attachment. If the Proposal contents attachment does not make this an expressed requirement, the State may still request that an Offeror submit audited financial statements for up to the past three (3) years if the State is concerned that an Offeror may not have the financial ability to carry out the Contract.

In evaluating an Offeror's financial ability, if requested, the State will review the documentation provided by the Offeror to determine if the Offeror's financial position is adequate or inadequate. If the State believes the Offeror's financial ability is not adequate, the State may reject the Proposal despite its other merits.

2.3 **PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA** If the Offeror provides sufficient information to DAS in its Proposal, demonstrating it meets the Mandatory Requirements, the Offeror's Proposal will be included in the next step of the evaluation process which involves the scoring of the Proposal Technical Requirements (Table 3), followed by the scoring of the Cost Proposals. In the Proposal evaluation step, DAS rates the Proposals based on the following listed criteria and the weight assigned to each criterion. The possible points allowed in this RFP are distributed as indicated in the Table 2 - Scoring Breakdown. Each Proposal passing the Mandatory Requirements will be evaluated by an evaluation committee made up of a representative(s) from DAS, Agency team members, and potentially a subject matter expert or an independent consultant.

2.4 TABLE 2 - SCORING BREAKDOWN

Criteria	Maximum Allowable Points
Proposal Technical Requirements	*1,152 Points
Proposal Cost	*288 Points
Total	*1,440 Points

*Indicates change 03/11/13.

Criteria	Weight	Rating (0 to 9)	Extended Score
1.5.2.2 Startup meeting	2		
1.5.2.3 Annual Meetings	2		
1.5.2.4 Ongoing communication – local districts	2		
1.5.2.5 Communication with ODE's Program Manager	2		
1.5.2.6 Offeror's test security plan	2		
1.5.2.7 Offeror's quality assurance plans	2		
1.5.2.8 Payment schedule plan	2		
*1.5.3 ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OVERSIGHT			
1.5.3.1 Offeror's plan for independent technical oversight	4		
1.5.3.2 Offeror's plan to collect data	4		
1.5.3.3 Offeror's technical support to Ohio TAC and Ohio Test Steering Committee	4		
1.5.3.4 Ohio access to Offeror's review committee for fairness and sensitivity	4		
*1.5.4 TEST OPERATIONS IN THE FIELD			
1.5.4.1 Offeror's accessibility capabilities	3		
1.5.4.2 Offeror's plan to ensure all students are tested	3		
1.5.4.3 Test formats and technology requirements	3		
1.5.4.4 Pre-registration and state ID support	3		
1.5.4.5 Practices regarding proctors	3		
1.5.4.6 Test site requirements and rules	3		
1.5.4.7 Local test administration timelines	3		
1.5.4.8 Packing and receipt verification	3		
1.5.5 TEST SCORING			
1.5.5.1 Offeror's internal quality assurance plan	6		
1.5.5.2 Delivery Schedule and processes	6		
1.5.6 SCORE REPORTING			
1.5.6.1 District reports and data fields	3		
1.5.6.2 Data delivery to ODE	3		
1.5.6.3 Family report and diagnostics	3		
1.5.6.4 Technical reports	3		
1.5.6.5 Data delivery schedule	3		

Total Technical Score: _____

In this RFP, DAS asks for responses and submissions from Offerors, most of which represent components of the above criteria. While each criterion represents only a part of the total basis for a decision to award the Contract to an Offeror, a failure by an Offeror to make a required submission or meet a mandatory requirement will normally result in a rejection of that Offeror's Proposal. The value assigned above to each criterion is only a value used to determine which Proposal is the most advantageous to the State in relation to the other Proposals that DAS received.

*Indicates change 03/11/13.