

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**Request for Proposals No. 2019-13
Addendum 01 – Q&A**

Note to potential respondents:

This Addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2019-13, issued December 10, 2018.

All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
N/A	N/A	Will OSPI respond to questions submitted by vendors that have not also submitted a letter of intent to bid?	Yes.
	General For Whole Procurement	When do the current OSPI contracts for ELA/Math, Science, WA-AIM, and ELPA21 expire?	ELPA21 is currently set on a year-to-year contract, but a member must give the ELPA21 consortium notice of any transition by October of the preceding year (e.g., Oct 2019 to effect school year 2020-2021). The remainder of the contracts expire December 31, 2019.
	General For Whole Procurement	Does OSPI have options available to extend these contracts if additional transition time is needed?	No extension protocols are currently in place; any action of that nature would be viewed as an emergency procurement.
	General For Whole Procurement	When do the current HIDOE contracts for ELA/Math, Science, and EOC expire?	326
	General For Whole Procurement	Does HIDOE have options available to extend these contracts if additional transition time is needed?	Yes, if absolutely
	General For Whole Procurement	When do the current OPI contracts for ELA/Math, Science, and Science Alternate Assessment expire?	Below are the expiration dates for Montana’s test delivery contracts by subject. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math and ELA contract with Measured Progress expires on 9/30/2019. • Science and Science Alternate contract with Measured Progress expires on 6/30/2019.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
	General For Whole Procurement	Does OPI have options available to extend these contracts if additional transition time is needed?	<p>Montana has run out of options for extending its Science and Science Alternate contract with Measured Progress which expires on 6/30/2019.</p> <p>Montana does have options to extend its current Math/ELA contract with Measured Progress for Smarter Balanced test delivery services.</p>
	General For Whole Procurement	When does the current DDOE contract for ELA/Math expire?	June 30, 2019
	General For Whole Procurement	Does DDOE have options available to extend its ELA/Math contract if additional transition time is needed?	Yes, but DDOE will have a <i>no-cost extension</i> contract for finishing current work, not new tasks.
	General For Whole Procurement	When do the current VIDE contracts for ELA/Math and Science expire?	June 30, 2019
	General For Whole Procurement	Does VIDE have options available to extend these contracts if additional transition time is needed?	No
	General For Whole Procurement	Will the questions and answers become part of any resulting contract with each member state?	Yes
	General For Whole Procurement	Will the Bidder's proposal become part of any resulting contract with each member state?	Yes
	General For Whole Procurement	Will the Bidder be presented with additional terms and conditions from Delaware and the US Virgin Islands upon award? Will Bidders have an opportunity to negotiate these terms upon award?	<p>Delaware - Yes. DDOE has a standard RFP process with terms and conditions for contracts. Refer to Exhibit B4 of the main RFP document. Delaware is open to negotiation within the state procedures.</p> <p>US Virgin Islands - Bidder may be presented with additional terms and conditions and might have an opportunity to negotiate these terms upon award.</p>

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
6	4. Objective and Scope of Work And Exhibit D Proposal Checklist	<p>Text in Question: Bidders may choose to submit, within a proposal, information addressing state-specific work that is included as appendices to this RFP. If choosing to bid on state-specific work, Bidders shall address all elements referenced in the applicable appendix.</p> <p>Question: If bidders choose to bid on the common and state-specific work, how do members want bidders to supply their proposals addressing each of the State-Specific appendices? Detailed appendix/RFP requirements may not align with the Technical and Management Proposal requirements (being scored per the evaluation criteria).</p>	<p>Match the details in response to any state-specific appendix following the layout of the main document (common work for ELA and Math). If the main document layout does not fully conform to a prospective state-specific response bidder will note the variance to form.</p> <p>Proposals in response to state-specific appendices should be able to stand alone for review and not require excessive searching through other proposal submissions of a given bidder.</p>
8	State-Specific Elements Table	This table indicates Science assessment at grade 4 for Hawaii, whereas current information on the Hawaii web site indicates that Science assessment will be moving to grade 5 starting in 2019-20. Please confirm the same student counts indicated in this table would apply for grade 5 as well, or provide a correct count.	It is Grade 5; table in RFP document has been updated.
10	State-Specific Elements	<p>Text in Question: “Response to appendices should follow the same format as the main document response, deviating from the response format only when particular details of an appendix call for such deviation.”</p> <p>Question: Please elaborate on what is meant by “following the same format” as the main document response. Is it desired/required that responses to requirements for ELA/Math that also apply to an appendix should be repeated within the response to the appendix, or is the statement above indicating that just the heading structure and sequence for each appendix response should follow that of ELA/Math, with the appendix response noting only information that is different from or over/above the corresponding response to ELA/Math requirements?</p>	Both – responses should follow the layout sequence similar to ELA/math, but also repeat the details, if the same, in responses to appendices.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
11	4. Objective and Scope of Work	<p>Text in question: “This RFP process is established with the intent of allowing other states to choose to participate while the solicitation is in progress. progress. To the extent allowed by other states, this procurement process is also intended to allow a state to use the cooperative solicitation for post-award contracting”</p> <p>Question: Have any other states joined the procurement process since the RFP was released? Can OSPI disclose the states considering joining this effort?</p>	No new states have joined the solicitation; OSPI is not aware of any states considering joining the MAAC solicitation.
14	Section B.2	Will the decisions for the state-specific scopes of work be made pursuant to the schedule listed on pg. 14 for the common elements scope of work? If not, on what schedule will those contracts be awarded?	Intentions are for states to make all contract decisions pursuant to the posted schedule on Page 14 of the RFP. As states have individual responsibility for contracting—no joint contract—the timelines for contract execution may be different across states.
16	5. Submission of proposals	Could OSPI please clarify the number of hard copies required? It’s unclear whether bidders should provide one copy with original signatures, or one copy for each of the five participating members (resulting in five copies).	One original hardcopy for each MAAC member.
16	5. Submission of proposals	Could OSPI please clarify the number of flash drives required? It’s unclear whether bidders should provide 10 flash drives, or 10 flash drives for each of the five participating members (resulting in 50 flash drives).	10 flash-drives for each MAAC member.
16	5. Submission of proposals	<p>Submission of Proposals: Is the cost proposal to be provided as a separate file on each flash drive with the technical proposal response(s), or as separate files on separate flash drives?</p> <p>If flash drives for the cost proposal are separate from the technical proposal, how many flash drives containing the cost proposal are required?</p>	Cost proposals are to be separate files, but can be within the same flash drive.
16	5. Submission of proposals	Will there be an opportunity to ask follow-up questions based on answers received to these questions and, if so, what would be the timeframe for submitting them and receiving responses?	No

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
17	5. Submission of proposals	<p>Text in Question: “Proposals must include all necessary information for review—no reference to materials external to this proposal will be accepted. The proposal must be complete and contain all references.”</p> <p>Question: Does this mean any additional detailed information provided via an external link, such as sample/demonstration items or systems, will not be considered? If so, how should we provide such information for consideration?</p>	<p>Bidders are submitting proposals (other than the originals) in electronic format on flash drives. Static information, such as sample items could be included on the flash drives.</p> <p>Bidders are to note that as part of the proposal review process MAAC states are to be provided time and access to conduct system trials/tests of vendor-proposed solutions.</p>
21	section 16. Commitment of Funds	The RFP states “No cost chargeable to a proposed contract may be incurred before receipt of a fully executed contract.” Given the very tight timeframe between anticipated contract signature in July and interim assessment administration starting in September, will all members be allowed to start work with Contractors prior to contract signature under a letter of authorization, memorandum of understanding, or at the Contractor’s own risk, provided that the Contractor does not submit any invoices to a member until that member’s contract is fully executed?	All invoices for work must associate with dates after execution of contracts.
22	1. Letter of Submittal:	Can the letter of submittal exceed two pages if the amount of information requested in terms of principal officers, work locations(s), and list of materials/enclosures is more than 2 pages?	Yes; updated in the RFP document.
23	Proposal Contents	Given the directions about response headings and sequence at the top of page 22, should the technical proposal be organized according to the six headings listed on this page and the next?	Technical proposals should follow the section headings identified under “Requirements”. In responding to each requirement, the six items—project approach/methodology, work plan, project schedule, deliverables, outcomes & performance measurement, and risks—should be addressed.
23	Proposal Contents	Should responses to any state-specific appendices be included within the Work Plan section for the ELA/Math common bid, or should responses to appendices be provided as separate documents organized in the same manner, with the same headings listed on pages 23 and 24.	Responses to state-specific appendices should be generated as separate documents organized in the same manner as that for ELA and math.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
24	Section A.1. Test Development	<p>Does each member state pay for access to the Smarter Balanced summative, interim, and formative assessment content independently of the contract(s) resulting from this RFP or should Bidders include costs for Smarter Balanced license/membership fees?</p> <p>If the latter, please provide exact amounts to include for each member for each year, including extensions.</p>	States hold separate agreements with Smarter Balanced for access to the materials.
24	Section A.1. Test Development	If any new ancillary materials are created for the MAAC, who will own these materials? How will ownership be addressed in the individual contracts with member states?	States will jointly possess ancillary materials created for the MAAC common scope; an individual state will possess ancillary materials created for state-specific assessments. Further detail will be called out in the individual contracts for each state.
24	Section A.1 Test Development	<p>Does each member state plan to use the same test blueprints for each grade/subject assessment, for both summative and interim assessment?</p> <p>If not, please provide details of unique blueprints that will be required, including counts of machine-scored and hand-scored items per grade/subject. Please provide this information for all summative and interim assessments where blueprints deviate from the standard Smarter Balanced blueprints.</p>	Smarter Balanced has established the blueprints for both the summative and interim assessments. MAAC states will follow these blueprints for administration of ELA and math assessments.
24	Section A.1. Test Development	Aside from providing an item authoring tool, what other responsibilities will the Contractor have in relation to state-managed item writing exercises?	<p>For ELA and math, Smarter Balanced will engage with states to develop new items. As such Smarter Balanced will work with states to provide item authoring services.</p> <p>For other state-specific assessments (e.g., science), where Bidder may be proposing item development, there will need to be certification, and accompanying evidence, that the proposed item authoring system will meet the same or similar expectations of the Smarter Balanced system.</p> <p>The RFP has been revised to clarify this distinction.</p>
24	Section A.1. Test Development	Is the contractor responsible for facilitating these activities and if so where, when, for how many days, and with how many participants?	<p>ELA and math – no</p> <p>Science or other assessment development activities, where item authoring is part of the proposal – yes</p>

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
24	Section A.1. Test Development	Is the Contractor responsible for facilities, travel, stipends, substitute pay or any other costs associated with [state-managed development] activities? If so, please provide details.	ELA and math – no Science or other assessment development activities, where item authoring is part of the proposal – yes
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	How many students receive the field test performance task per grade level and subject area?	Each task requires approximately 2000 student responses across the Consortium.
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Is the Contractor responsible for selecting the sample of students who receive the field test performance task?	Contractor will collaborate with each state to ensure the field test performance task is delivered to the appropriate number of students consistent with the identified sampling plan.
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Is there a unique sample drawn for each state or one sample across all member states?	For bid purposes, Contractor should expect unique sampling for each state.
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	What is the Contractor's responsibility regarding student responses to field test performance tasks?	<p>Contractor's responsibility for field test performance task responses will included: response capture, responses preparation for delivery, and hand-off to Smarter Balanced's scoring contractor.</p> <p>Contractor is responsible for administering the field test tasks in a manner consistent with the test administration manual and handling of sensitive responses (crisis papers).</p> <p>Actual transfer of student responses, may pass directly to Smarter Balanced's scoring contractor or through the applicable state (each state will negotiate its desired process).</p> <p>Additionally, Contractor will provide access of student responses to state staff, upon request.</p>
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Is the Contractor required to score those or are they sent to another contractor for scoring? In either case, what is the timeframe for completion?	Contractor will deliver responses for scoring by another party, managed by Smarter Balanced. The transfer of student responses will typically pass through the applicable states. The field test scoring contractor should receive student responses for scoring by July 1 each year.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Do students receiving the field test performance task use a different blueprint for the CAT portion of their test? If so, please provide specifications, particularly as it relates to the number of items requiring handscoring for each grade/subject.	<p>To support the reporting of claim results without requiring the rapid calibration cycle of field test performance tasks, the Consortium will augment the CAT with additional items.</p> <p>The field test performance tasks are administered to randomly select sampling of 2,000 students per task. Students taking the field test performance task do not take the operational performance task for that grade and subject, they take an expanded CAT with 2 extra math items and 3 extra ELA/L items. There are no math items that require hand-scoring in the CAT. For ELA, there are some items in grades 6-8 and high school that service providers may choose to use hand-scoring or automated scoring for to score the short text items in the CAT.</p> <p>Link to 2018-2019 member approved blueprint: https://portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/elaliteracy-summative-assessment-blueprint.pdf</p>
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Are handscored items included in the 5 to 8 field test items embedded in the CAT? If so, how many students receive them and how are those students selected to receive them and identified within the system?	All CAT items for mathematics, grades 3–8 and high school, are designed to be machine scored. All CAT items for ELA/Literacy in grades 3–5 are designed to be machine scored. Handscored items are included in the ELA/Literacy CAT in grades 6–8 and high school. The CAT field test items are randomly administered to all students in positions 5-N (N= maximum test length). No embedded math field test items in the CAT require-hand scoring. For ELA, Smarter Balanced field tests items in alignment with the blueprint, which includes 0-4 ‘short text’ items in the CAT for grades 6-8 and high school which may require the field test scoring vendor to hand-score. For Bidder purposes, Smarter Balanced requires 1500 responses per item for computing item statistics and calibration.
24	Section A.2. Field Testing	Are machine-scored items embedded in the CAT portion of the test distributed randomly to all students? If not, please provide sampling specifications for item selection and student participation.	Yes, refer to the previous question.

Page(s)	Section	Question	Answer
25	Section A.3 Accommodations	<p>Text in Question: A. Printed Test Form Provisions</p> <p>Question: If a member uses alternative blueprints for online administration, is the Contractor expected to alter the Smarter Balanced-produced paper-pencil forms to reflect state-specific changes?</p>	<p>Smarter Balanced provides the paper forms in PDF and InDesign (same format and delivery method as for all states) consistent with the Smarter Balanced official, publicly available, blueprints. The Contractor is responsible for making member-specific changes to paper forms.</p> <p>On occasion, the online test blueprint or the available bank of test items may lead to differences from that of the Smarter Balanced provided form (e.g., WA high school math). In those instances, Contractor would be responsible for creating a paper-pencil form that conforms to the corresponding online test.</p>
32	Section A.10, Assessment Delivery System and User Interface Interoperability	Please provide examples of “tools that are jurisdiction-specific based on previous online testing history” which the contractor would be required to support.	Refer to table below. (If no state input provided, Bidders can assume no “jurisdiction-specific tools”)

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
			Online testing tools must be compatible with current ones. Such tools include a) TTS, b) Braille, c) calculator, d) highlighting, e) masking, f) strikethrough, and other universal online tools.	<p>Montana has used the Test Information Distribution Engine (TIDE) test delivery system in its successful online history. (Refer to https://mp.tide.airast.org/Common/DashBoard for more details).</p> <p>Montana requests the Contractor to provide support to assist the state with making the main tile page of its Math/ELA assessment as a menu page (or single platform) which test coordinators can access all assessments from (e.g., Science, WIDA and MSAA).</p> <p>Montana does not intend for the Contractor to provide additional support for tools such as its jurisdiction-specific reporting system, GEMS Student Characteristics Dashboard and test security portal, MontCAS Application; however, all data must be prepared according to the state specifications to be compatible with these tools.</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
32	Section A.10, Assessment Delivery System and User Interface Interoperability	We are unable to locate section 2.1.H referenced at the end of the first paragraph or the link referenced as being provided in that section. Please provide this link	The referenced text was an incorrect listing; the RFP document has been updated.
38	Section A.11 Administration, e. Administration and Technical Training	<p>Text in Question: The RFP states “A proposal will demonstrate the ability for members to link test administration training to a state-level Learning Management System (LMS) and provide for individual certification on testing systems and processes.”</p> <p>Question: Is the Contractor responsible for providing the LMS or do member states provide a system the Contractor must work within? If the latter, please specify the LMS products in use.</p>	Refer to table below. (If no state input provided, Bidders can assume no current LMS infrastructure)

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
Washington, at present, is using CANVAS in other state-wide capacities and continues to explore ways to leverage its LMS format for additional purposes like assessment administration training.	Hawaii currently uses their assessment vendor’s platform to provide access to trainings, but has what is called <u>PDE3</u> for state level LMS. Hawaii would be interested in reviewing a proposed solution where the eventual contractor links their trainings to our system.		State of Delaware provides LMS and this is integrated with our Identity Management System (IMS) platform. Our IMS platform needs to connect with the vendor platform.	<p>Montana posts dynamic, interactive, and engaging content for professional development on its Teacher Learning Hub LMS https://learninghub.mrooms.net/ and OPI Connect Google Sites and YouTube Channels.</p> <p>The Contractor is not responsible for providing the LMS only providing the content to be housed within the LMS. Products include “how-to” modules to support with the administration of the assessments.</p> <p>Montana also posts training resources including modules in</p>

				<p>its Test Information Distribution Engine (TIDE) test delivery system at https://mp.tide.airast.org/Common/DashBoard.</p> <p>Lastly, Montana hosts an annual state conference specific for Test Coordinators (refer to link: January/February Montana hosts an annual conference for more details) The state expects the Contractor to present at and/or provide technical training materials for the conference.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Page	Section	Question	Answer
38	Section A.11 Administration, e. Administration and Technical Training	What is the required timeframe for “sandbox” availability in year 1?	<p>For Year 1, Contractor should strive to have the sandbox available as early as October 1, but no later than December 1. The sandbox should allow states an opportunity to try out new enhancements associated with the assessments being delivered, whether these enhancements support the summative or interim assessments. A user guide/manual and professional development supports should also be available within the sandbox system.</p> <p>In subsequent years, a functional the sandbox will be available starting at the earliest possible date in August and be accessible through June.</p>
38	Section A.11 Administration, e. Administration and Technical Training	Will different members have different timeframes to launch the “sandbox” availability in year 1?	Possibly; Contractor can negotiate with the state.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
38	Section A.11 Administration, f. Retake Administration	The RFP implies that the current Contractor is responsible for the fall 2019 retake administration. Given that, how long will the current contract run? If additional time for transition is needed, can the current contract be extended beyond this end date?	Retake administration are specific to WA only; WA's current contract runs through December 31, 2019.
38 - 39	Section A.11 Administration f., d.	Could OSPI clarify the RFP numbering after "f. Retake Administration (WA Only)"? The next section begins with "d. Paper-Pencil Forms". Is there possibly missing text in this section?	Numbering (bulleting) were "corrupted". The sequencing has been corrected.
40	Section A.11 Administration, f. Data Management, Pre-Identification (PreID) System	When will members have final 2019-20 pre-identification file layouts available for the incoming Contractor?	A final date will be negotiated between Contractor and each state, and likely will be based on Contractor's system requirements and data availability at the state. For more state-specific information, refer to the table below. (If no state input is present Bidder should assume similar needs as found with other state details)

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
	Fall 2019		These file are available early in the start of the contract but are usually based on vendor supplied and modified for Delaware's needs.	Montana can have file layouts in the fall of 2019, but not final data until the January 2020 Assessment Registration Collection. Montana uses the Achievement in Montana (AIM)/Infinite Campus student information system and has set collections published on the AIM Collection Schedule .

Page	Section	Question	Answer
41	Section A.11 Administration, f. Data Management, Final Score Files	What is the required timeframe for final score file approval for each member?	Refer to table below. (If no state input is present Bidder should assume similar needs as found with other state details)

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
Washington can accept a timeframe of one week, if preliminary validation of structure and values can be determined ahead of time; otherwise, the state will require no less than two weeks if a sample file has not been validated.	Mid-July of each administration year.		Delaware targets to have the layout approved by February 2020 with receipt of final file by June 2020. Delaware reserves the right to negotiate new arrangements once contracts are in place, but bidders can generalize the February and June timeframes for subsequent years.	<p>Montana currently has a data quality feature in TIDE which schools are asked to complete by the second week of June so the state score file for reporting and accountability can be submitted to Montana by July 1st. The first of July constitutes the final score approval/receipt.</p> <p>If the Contractor provided Data Forensic services to include an element of preliminary data review and school certification, then the timeline could potentially be extended, otherwise the state requires no later than July 1st. Montana has a commitment to share state assessment results with the Board of Public Education during the September meeting.</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	When will member states provide copies of past student responses to summative assessment constructed response, performance, and technology items for the purpose of calibrating automated electronic scoring engines? In what format will responses be provided?	Student responses will be provided within 2 weeks of contract execution or a date negotiated with the specific state. Format of responses will also be negotiated.
42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	When will member states provide copies of past student responses for <u>interim</u> assessment constructed response, performance, and technology items for the purpose of calibrating automated electronic scoring engines?	Refer to response from previous question

42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	How many summative ELA items, by item type, are currently approved for automated electronic scoring?	None
42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	How many interim ELA items, by item type, are currently approved for automated electronic scoring?	Only ELA interim Performance Task full-write responses are currently approved for automated electronic scoring, but automated electronic scores of interim full-writes are not immutable. Educators conducting local hand-scoring of ELA interim Performance Tasks must have the capability to modify scores assigned by automated electronic scoring processes and the resulting changes must be incorporated into the student results for the interim.
42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	How many summative mathematics items, by item type, are currently approved for automated electronic scoring?	None
42	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	How many <u>interim</u> mathematics items, by item type, are currently approved for automated electronic scoring?	None
43	Section A.11 Administration, h. Scoring, Automated Electronic Scoring Requirements	Given prior requirements for a local online entry form for paper-based assessments, under what circumstances would paper testing volumes necessitate contractor receipt and scanning? How many such documents should we anticipate processing each year?	States are interested in solutions that promote transcribing student responses from paper-pencil testing that integrates responses into an online scoring process that minimizes the need for shipping, receipt, and scanning of test booklets. If receipt and scanning becoming necessary, Bidders should consider volumes under 500 for all MAAC states.

44	Section A.11 Administration, i. Psychometrics	Is analysis and documentation of interim assessments' prediction of summative performance required annually? Has this already been established?	Not annually. At present, validity information regarding the interim assessments can be found in the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment Technical Report http://portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/2016-17-interim-assessment-technical-report.pdf . The RFP document has been revised to coincide with this response
46	Section A.11 Administration, i. Psychometrics	Please provide copies of 2017-18 technical reports for each member.	WA will establish a secure process for accessing states' technical reports. (If no state document is presented through the secure process, a recent technical report was not available to provide.) Each prospective bidder is to identify to the listed RFP coordinator a point of contact (POC) with an email address. With this contact information the agency will share the needed access for review of available technical reports. Access to the documents should be construed as limited and only intended for the specific effort of developing a proposal to this RFP. The available documents are not to be disseminated in any form. The documents are not to be downloaded On March 18 access to the technical reports will be removed.
47	Section A.11 Administration, j. Reporting, Individual Student (Score) Reports	Are translations for individual student score reports provided through a translated sample report so families can interpret results from an English-language report of their student's scores, or is each student report to be produced in the language requested with that student's results? If the latter, how is the desired language for translation captured?	Bidder should provide a response addressing both approaches—full translation and translated sample report—per referenced language. This will allow MAAC members the greatest flexibility to fulfill specific needs. MAAC members should be provided cost estimates for translating other ancillary materials in each referenced language.
48	Section A.11 Administration, j. Reporting, Parent request to view and Parent score appeals	Does the contractor have any additional responsibilities beyond providing access to student responses, such as facilitating the reviews? If so, how many reviews should we plan for each year?	Contractor's only responsibility is to provide the needed information and details associated with student responses. The local district will facilitate the actual review activities.

48	Section A.11 Administration, j. Reporting, Parent request to view and Parent score appeals	Does the two-month limit after receiving results, as indicated for score appeals, also apply to parental review requests?	No, the process to request to view a test (and possibly appeal a score), and the systems/applications to support the process must be available within two months of district receipt of scores. Once the contractor's system is open to facilitate the request to view, parents/guardians may make requests any time.
48	Section A.11 Administration, j. Reporting, Parent request to view and Parent score appeals	How many score appeals should we plan for each year?	The number of score appeals will vary year to year. For the 2018 administration year, WA had 10 requests for rescore and 65 requests to view in 2018.
48	B. Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments K-12	Given the extremely short contract startup timeframe, will members be willing to accept a later launch date than September 15 for the first year? If so, what would be the latest allowable date?	Bidders are to work toward a September 15 launch date, with a "no later than" date of October 15. In subsequent years Contractor system is to be up for district access prior to August 10.
48	B. Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments K-12	By what date will members identify and provide data related to which districts/schools are participating in interim assessment?	MAAC states have different protocols, but all believe this information can be available by no later than September 1. Contractor and individual states can finalize details at time of contract execution.
48	B. Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments K-12	By what date will member states provide test coordinator contact information for each participating district/school?	MAAC states will provide a preliminary list shortly after contract execution, with Contractor acknowledgement that states have the right to provide regular updates to support personnel transitions within districts.

48	B. Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments K-12	By what date will member states provide student data for each participating district/school?	<p>State responses:</p> <p>Montana: Under its current contract the state has been working with a mid-January exchange with contractor.</p> <p>Delaware: The data exchange can occur in mid-October.</p> <p>Hawaii: State is willing to except October 31</p> <p>Washington: The state works with a rolling input that begins as early as August 15. The expectation would be to maintain a system that is updated nightly to facilitate a formative cycle including interim assessments.</p> <p>MAAC (as a whole): States are looking for proposals allowing maintenance of directory, staff, and student data for all schools and districts statewide such that local users might access the full suite of Smarter Balanced reporting tools and the Digital Library during the entire year. A possible approach might entail data exchanged using an automated process on a daily basis for students, staff contacts should be updatable throughout the year, and allow state flexibility to open or close schools in any vendor-managed platform on an as-needed basis.</p>
49	B.2.c.iv Longitudinal tracking reports	With the Smarter Balanced system for interim assessments, what is the scope of longitudinal tracking?	Contractor system will be responsible to longitudinally capture student performance on interims so it is available to educators. Any results from an instance of interim administration must be maintained within the system starting with the 2014–15 school year administration. Users must have access to interim results from both the current and every previous years.
50	Technology Requirements, Training, and Customer Support Service for Interim Assessments	How long before the launch of interim assessment availability must training be complete?	<p>Training schedules are negotiable for each state. For Year 1, training could be provided following release of the interim system.</p> <p>For all subsequent years, the schedule for training should be complete prior to September 15.</p>

50	Technology Requirements, Training, and Customer Support Service for Interim Assessments	In addition to the nine Washington Educational Service Districts, how many on-site trainings will be required in other member states?	This specific reference has been removed from the main RFP document. Approaches to training and user support should coincide with each state's preferred training methodology (referenced later, in table format, in response to a question about in-person training).
51	Technology Requirements, Training, and Customer Support Service for Interim Assessments	Customer service availability is specified here as 7am to 4pm, whereas elsewhere it is specified as 6am to 5pm. Please confirm if this is correct or clarify if incorrect.	Hours for customer service should be bid at 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., local time. The RFP document has been corrected. An individual state and Contractor may choose to negotiate different times for local needs.
51	Member-Specific Kickoff/Planning Meeting	Will it be possible to begin meeting with members prior to the effective date of the contract and prior to each of the kickoff/planning meetings?	Possibly, within the constraints of each state's procurement rules. Work to be invoiced is to associate with dates after execution of the contract.
51	Member-Specific Kickoff/Planning Meeting	Is the 15-member staff attendance per state or across all states?	15 staff member attendance is per state.
51	Member-Specific Kickoff/Planning Meeting	Would it be feasible to conduct a joint kickoff/planning meeting with all members prior to state-specific kickoff/planning meetings?	Possibly. If considering such an event, Bidder will assume responsibility for associated costs and include this activity in the cost proposal. Bidder should assume the same 6 staff member maximum per state.
55	E.1.b Work Schedule	We are unable to locate section 2.6.A referenced here. Please clarify.	Reference was mislabeled—should be 2.D.1.c. RFP document has been updated.
57	fifth paragraph	By what date will the year-long calendar (Implementation Schedule) be required in the first year?	Within 30 days of the kick-off meeting. The RFP document has been updated to include this information.
60	E.1 Management Proposal, d. Staff Qualifications/ Experience, v. Experience of the Vendor	Could OSPI clarify the RFP numbering for v. Experience of the Vendor? The previous section is iii, so it appears that there is no section iv. Is section iv. missing?	Information is not missing; the numbering in the RFP document has been corrected.

Page 63	Section F.2	<p>A. We presume that if new members sign on to using the MAAC, or alternatively, if current member states leave the cooperative, that the contract terms and conditions for existing states would remain the same except for any changes to the pricing associated with the specific volume tier with the addition or departure or a member state. Is this correct? If this is not correct, please explain.</p> <p>B. If this is correct, we presume that new members would need to have contracts in place in the summer prior to an administration year to allow time to establish volume prices for all participating members. If this is not correct, please explain.</p>	<p>A. Correct.</p> <p>B. Correct to the extent the associated date for new member inclusion is agreed upon.</p>
Page 63	Section F.2	<p>A. We presume that if new members sign on to using the MAAC, or alternatively, if current member states leave the cooperative, that the contract terms and conditions for existing states would remain the same except for any changes to the pricing associated with the specific volume tier with the addition or departure or a member state. Is this correct? If this is not correct, please explain.</p> <p>B. If this is correct, we presume that new members would need to have contracts in place in the summer prior to an administration year to allow time to establish volume prices for all participating members. If this is not correct, please explain.</p>	<p>A. Correct.</p> <p>B. Correct to the extent the associated date for new member inclusion is agreed upon.</p>

65	Evaluation Weighting and Scoring	To allow adequate time for planning, please provide additional detail regarding any agenda items or requirements for the System Tests/Trials portion of the Evaluation Process.	The RFP documents has been updated to reflect new information about the System Test/Trials potion of the evaluation. As for schedule Bidders should look to allow members access to applications during the period starting April 15, 2019 and running through May 3, 2019. With respect to “agenda” Bidders should establish access for states in a manner similar to what might look like a UAT.
65	Evaluation Weighting and Scoring	Will the System Tests/Trials portion of the evaluation be conducted without Bidder involvement or will it be more of an interactive process?	The System Tests/Trials should be set up like a UAT, and available for remote interaction by states. <i>Bidder will be available to address questions that arise and ensure questions and response are shared with all members.</i>
65	Evaluation Weighting and Scoring	Where and when will the System Tests/Trials process take place and for how long?	The System Tests/Trials should be available to allow for remote interaction by states.
65	Evaluation Weighting and Scoring	Will evaluation committee members be held to security, confidentiality, and non-disclosure agreements regarding information or data accessed or shared with them during this process?	Yes, though Bidders would be expected to limit exposure of data that could be viewed as Personally Identifiable Information (PII).
66	ELA/Math, 4. Selection of Apparent Successful Contractor	The first paragraph here references a “site visit.” Does this refer to the System Test/Trial portion of the evaluation process or is there a separate site visit required? If the latter, does this refer to the evaluation committee visiting the Bidder’s site? If so, please provide additional details regarding timeline, number of people and positions, desired agenda, etc.	The RFP documents has been updated to reflect new information about the System Test/Trials potion of the evaluation. There will be no site visits.

Pages 74-85	Exhibit B1	Although there is no provision in this Exhibit for delays in performance as a result of a force majeure event (events beyond the bidder's reasonable control including without limitation, acts of God; acts or omissions of governmental authorities or the other party or any third party; strikes, lockouts or other industrial disturbances; acts of public enemies; wars; blockades; riots; civil disturbances; epidemics; floods; hurricanes; tornadoes; and any other similar acts, events, or omissions), does this member state acknowledge that such delays in performance would not constitute a breach of the contract?	WA acknowledges no specific reference to events commonly recognized as results of force majeure. If a bidder believes explicit language is needed in the general terms and conditions of a contract, bidder is to propose language to that effect as an exception allowed under Exhibit A, Certifications & Allowances.
Pages 76; 97; 111	Section 14; Section 26; Intellectual Property	With respect to ownership of Intellectual property, do the member states agree that rights in any materials and proprietary computer programs previously developed by the Bidder, as well as rights to any derivative works, shall belong to the Bidder?	Yes
Page 89	Section 9	This section indicates that Liquidated Damages may be included in any contract with the state of Hawaii. Will Liquidated Damages be part of this contract? If so, what will they be, or will they be negotiated with the winning bidder prior to contract execution?	This clause is under review and may no longer be an expectation of Hawaii. The actual terms of contract will be shared if an offer contract award is brought forward.
Pages 78-80; 103-104; 114-115	Section 23; Section 5; Required Insurance	We believe we have sufficient insurance coverage that may not match exactly with the insurance requirements detailed in the RFP. Will the Bidder who is awarded any resulting contract have the opportunity to discuss and negotiate exact insurance requirements with the member states upon award?	Bidder should identify, as part of a proposal, any exceptions to the expectations established in the RFP. Noted exceptions are part of the Certification and Assurances process, reflected in Exhibit A1 (for all members) and A5 (MT-specific). Bidders should include language, as part of the Letter of Submittal, identifying exceptions to be noted and justification and/or counter proposals to meet the intention of the RFP expectation.
Pages 86-109	Exhibit B2a and B2b	Bidder assumes that Exhibit B2b, Contract Minimum and Special Conditions will take precedence in any resulting contract over Exhibit B2a, General Conditions. Is this correct? If not, please explain the correct order of precedence in any resulting contract.	Correct

Pages 86-115	Exhibit B	If a Bidder would like to propose exceptions to the member states' terms and conditions located on pages 86-115, should the bidder present these with our proposals, or should the bidder wait until after award and during negotiations to present these?	Note the exception and submit proposed language as part of the proposal process. If the bid is selected for possible contract award, acceptance or rejection of the exception will become part of the negotiation on final contract.
Pages 91; 111	Section 13(d); Force Majeure	With regards to the Force Majeure Clauses included in the sections listed here, we presume Bidder will not be held responsible for delay or default to the extent caused by the member states or third parties contracted by the member states. Is this correct? If this is not correct, please explain.	Correct
121	Exhibit F, Cost Proposal evaluation	This page indicates that 75 points will be awarded based on the lowest submitted price, whereas the evaluation criteria on page 65 states that 25 points will be awarded based on lowest submitted price. The example here also indicates that higher bids will be calculated proportional to the low bid receiving 100 points. Please clarify if the maximum number of points to be awarded based on price is 75 or 100 points. If the maximum for cost is 100 points, how are the remaining 50 points allocated between the two additional cost factors?	The RFP documents have been updated to be consistent across referenced pages.
121	Exhibit F, Cost Proposal evaluation	Please explain what "overall effectiveness to meet the bid" means as it relates to the second cost factor listed here.	Based upon the experience of the members, raters will judge whether the cost proposal aligns to expectations of requested work. The degree of alignment the rater sees in the response will be reflected in the points awarded.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Which cost total will be used in the evaluation process, the Original Contract Period or the Total Contract Period?	Original Contract Period
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Please confirm that all Bidders should base per-student costs on the counts provided in the tables on pages 7 and 8.	Correct

278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Several rows under column E “Original Contract Period” specify “Per Student Assessment”. Please confirm these entries should read “Total” instead.	There was an error in the original form; the rows in question should have read “Total”. Exhibit Ks have been updated.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Should the amount in column E represent the total projected cost, based on annual student counts and per-student rates?	Yes
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	How should Bidders break down pricing for online and paper-pencil administration, scoring, and reporting, as requested in several sections? Should we duplicate each line within the table, with one line for paper and one for online, or should we duplicate the entire table, with one version containing pricing for each mode?	Unless the primary means of administration at the state level is paper-pencil, Bidder should provide a total price associated with testing with paper. If the primary administration means, Bidder should provide cost details for the applicable state in similar fashion to the presentation for online administration.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Row 51 – The RFP does not specify U.S. History end of course exams. Was this included in error? If not, please provide requirements for U.S. History end of course exams.	Reference to U.S. History was made in error. Exhibit Ks have been updated removing U.S. History as an assessment.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	<p>Rows 55-60 – Science Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If one table for all states is desired, should per-student pricing be based on the total cost across all states divided by total student count across states? ○ If one table is desired and different states award their science assessment to different Bidders, will the Apparent Successful Contractor be held to joint pricing in contracting with the awarding state, or will the Apparent Successful Contractor be able to provide state-specific pricing based on that state’s specified scope of work? 	Members’ science test are different across state (with the exception of WA and MT). Bidders should provide separate costing information for each state.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Row 56 – The table on page 8 listing state specific elements indicates Science assessment at grade 4 for Hawaii, whereas current information on the Hawaii web site indicates that Science assessment will be moving to grade 5 starting in 2019-20., please confirm that pricing is not required for Grade 4 science.	The table has been corrected in the RFP document.

278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	<p>Rows 64-67 – Alternate Science Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given that both Washington and Montana have requested science assessment as an add-on, each of which has different scope, should we reproduce this table for each state with state-specific pricing? ○ If one table for both states is desired, should per-student pricing be based on the total cost across all states divided by total student count across states? ○ If one table is desired and the science alternate assessments are awarded to different Bidders, will the Apparent Successful Contractor be held to joint pricing in contracting with the awarding state, or will the Apparent Successful Contractor be able to provide state-specific pricing based on that state’s specified scope of work? 	Bidder should provide cost tables for each state. The remainder of the bullets below do not require further response.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	<p>Rows 71-76 – Science Assessment – Item & Test Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given that four separate states have requested science assessment as an add-on, each of which has different scope, should we reproduce this table for each state with state-specific pricing? ○ If one table for all states is desired, should per-student pricing be based on the total cost across all states divided by total student count across states? ○ If one table is desired and different states award their science assessment to different Bidders, will the Apparent Successful Contractor be held to joint pricing in contracting with the awarding state, or will the Apparent Successful Contractor be able to provide state-specific pricing based on that state’s specified scope of work? 	Bidder should provide a cost table for each state. The remainder of the bullets below do not require further response.

278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Row 122 – This note seems to suggest that Bidders should repeat the table in rows 124-133 for each applicable state requiring translation, using only the grade-level rows applicable for each state. Please confirm if this is correct or please clarify how we should provide MAAC-member specific pricing.	Correct – states with different translation requirements will need the information per grade per assessment per language.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Rows 139, 143, and 146 – For the sake of receiving comparable bids, please provide an estimate for the number of copies to be printed and shipped annually for each manual.	Bidders should provide cost details associated with volumes, i.e., pricing for a minimum of 100, 250, 500, 1,000, 2,500, and 5,000+ copies.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Rows 150-163 – Given that student counts for interim assessment on page 7 encompass all grades K-12, how should Bidders break out per-student costs for each grade?	Exhibit K has a row for each grade level for interim access – K through 12.
278	Exhibit Ka (Cost Proposal Submission Format.xls)	Rows 167-168 – Given that the scope of effort for technical reporting will vary significantly across members and from year to year, should Bidders repeat these rows to provide Technical Reporting costs separately for each member state? Are costs desired on a per-student basis for technical reporting or is this incorrect as shown?	<p>If Bidder believes technical reporting costs are different across the membership, present details within specific cost proposals for each state.</p> <p>Costs for technical reporting can be presented as annual totals, not requiring a per-student basis. Exhibit K is updated to reflect a sum total cost for technical reporting versus per student cost.</p>
285	Exhibit Kb (Cost Proposal Alternate Format.xls)	Should the sum of the totals for the three sections in this spreadsheet a) match the sum of all elements in the other spreadsheet, b) match the sum of only some sections in the other spreadsheet (and which ones), or c) not match any sum from the other spreadsheet?	The sum totals should match the sum totals of the other cost form. If that is not feasible, Bidder is to explain the circumstance so states can fully understand the variance.
Page 299	Exhibit N	We assume that Exhibit N, Service Level Agreement, only applies to those events included in Exhibit N that take place pursuant to the ELA and Math Summative and Interim Assessments within the state of Washington. Is this correct? If this is not correct, how will the per day amounts be shared across participating states?	Exhibit N has been updated to reflect the needs of all members. Exhibit N reflects the expectations around ELA and math assessment programs, but Bidder will be prepared to include similar terms for state-specific assessments. The associated cost elements will be negotiated with each state.
312	Exhibit O2b, 5.1 Lexile Measure	Does Hawaii already have a separate contract for the use of Lexile measures on Parent reports, or should Bidders include these costs?	Hawaii already holds a separate contract with MetaMetrics.

		Under Section D. Evaluation and Contract Award, the RFP states that cost is 150 points out of a possible 600. Within this section, it states that 25 points are awarded to the lowest cost proposal. However, under Exhibit F. Evaluation Criteria, it states that 75 points are awarded to the lowest proposed bid (yet, in the example provided, it appears to be 100 points for the lowest proposed bid). Which figures are correct?	The main RFP document and associated exhibits referencing the cost proposal calculations have been revised or corrected.
		How is the lowest cost calculated?	The lowest cost will be based on the total cost reported in Exhibit K for the Original Contract Period.
		Under Exhibit F. Evaluation Criteria, the RFP states that 50 cost points will be awarded to bidders on the basis of the "...judgment of the evaluation process of the overall effectiveness to meet the bid." Please provide clarity on how these points will be awarded. What does it mean to "meet the bid"? Please provide a description of how cost impacts the awarding of these points.	The main RFP document and associated exhibits referencing the cost proposal calculations have been revised or corrected.
		Under Section F. Cost Proposal, the RFP states that bidders must use Exhibit K when responding to the cost proposal. Are bidders required to submit both versions of Exhibit K, or should bidders submit only one version?	Bidder needs to provide cost figures for both versions of Exhibit K.
		Under Section F. Cost Proposal, the RFP states that "Costs for subcontractors are to be broken out separately and elements of the Bidder's proposal must be itemized per the prescribed submission format." Should bidders break out the subcontractor costs in the cost narrative, or submit a separate Exhibit K?	Bidder needs to break out subcontractor costs within the cost narrative documentation.

		<p>Under Section F. Cost Proposal, the RFP states that altering the format of Exhibit K may cause the cost Proposal to be non-responsive. There are some differences, however, between the state-specific appendices which are not addressed within Exhibit K. For example, within the Science (General) Assessment Item & Test Development line items, bidders must include all relevant costs (blueprint, item specs, item development, and field testing). But some states already have approved blueprints, or their blueprints may have different handscoring needs. Similarly, under the EOC Administration, Scoring, and Reporting lines, the RFP states that, where feasible, MAAC members will use Smarter Balanced items but will need to supplement their assessments with state-developed items. Hawaii, for example, currently delivers different Smarter blueprints, which require a different amount of hand-scoring. Can bidders break out costs into smaller buckets and/or between states?</p>	<p>RFP direction was intended to guard against alteration of the intended form of cost break-out. If Bidder determines in building cost proposals for state-specific appendices that inserting additional elements to address requested work, Bidder may do so as long as the inserted elements follow the worksheets intended format for data entry.</p> <p>Specific to any noted differences in the MAAC common work, cost proposals are to be provided to each state. Though the intent with the common scope of work is to leverage work volume to the benefit of pricing for the MAAC states, Bidders need to craft cost proposals that align with the individual's states situation.</p>
		<p>Within Exhibit K, under the ELP cost lines, can bidders break out costs between the operational (spring) and the screener (yearlong) administration, scoring, and reporting?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
		<p>Within Exhibit K, in the WA-AM cost lines, should bidders include the necessary item development costs, or should those charges be included elsewhere?</p>	<p>Bidders should include costs for the item development with the Exhibit K format.</p>
		<p>Within Exhibit K, under Translated Forms, can bidders give a per-form cost?</p>	<p>By form would be fine, but if there are differences based on language it would be useful to states to see this identified in the cost proposal.</p>
		<p>Can bidders submit an Exhibit K for an individual state? Delaware, for example, has different Advisory/Committee Meetings than Washington, and science blueprints will vary by state.</p>	<p>Yes, this is expected. The pricing/costs are expected to be consistent when there is common scope of work.</p>
		<p>If bidders choose to offer an option for automated scoring, how would you like this option to be presented in Exhibit K? Should we present a second copy?</p>	<p>Bidder should provide a second copy of the costing to address automated scoring.</p>

		Since item development needs will vary by state, should bidders include a unit price for item development?	Yes, but only for state-specific assessments. Item development should only be different for state-specific assessments (item development for ELA and math are coordinated with Smarter Balanced).
		Would Montana be open to solutions other than licensing WA items that may reduce costs and still meet their technical objectives?	Montana is open to solutions for its Montana Science Assessment as Bidders are encouraged to propose alternative methods from what is described in the appendix should proposals improve the efficiency of the project or quality. Montana is invested in offering a technically sound science assessment to its students with proven validity and reliability to ensure the maximum value for taxpayers' dollars. However, Montana is not interested in alternative methods that are not proven, contextually relevant, or could jeopardize the quality and/or general alignment to standards. In other words, Bidders should avoid proposals that are of lesser quality or where educators cannot contribute to the development.
		Hawaii currently has a custom blueprint for Smarter Balanced assessments for ICA Interims and Summative ELA and mathematics tests. Does Hawaii plan to continue using their custom Smarter Balanced blueprint? If so, can bidders submit a separate cost sheet for Hawaii?	Yes, Hawaii will continue to administer its revised Smarter Balanced blueprint, specific to mathematics only (performance tasks are not part of the administration). Given that Hawaii does not administer the mathematics performance task, bidders may submit separate costs for Hawaii, if warranted, recognizing this administration variance from the other MAAC states.
		The RFP requires locking items and multiple stimuli for the Hawaii science assessment. These features do not exist in the Hawaii specifications or in the bank of items that Hawaii has field tested. Does Hawaii intend to add these features to their test, or will the state remove this requirement?	The reference to locking items has been removed from the Hawaii appendices for science testing.
		The items being field tested for the Hawaii science assessment include symbolically scored equation items, external copy interaction items, the ability to integrate multiple interactions and multiple types of interactions within a single block of text or a table, and heuristically scored graphic response items. Does Hawaii intend to continue the use of these types of items, and if so, will the state add these to the requirements?	Hawaii intends to continue with these types of items for science.

		The items being field tested for the Hawaii science assessment include many items in which scoring depends on multiple, complex interactions. For example, students may be asked to run experiments in a simulator, draw conclusions from the experiments, and identify the trials that support their conclusions. Does Hawaii intend to continue to use this sort of item, and if so, will the state add this capability to the requirements?	Hawaii intends to continue with these types of items for science.
		Does Hawaii and the other science states want to include hand-scored science items or machine scored only?	Hawaii intends for all science items to be machine-scored. Hawaii would be open to future exploration of new item types that might result in a need to include hand-scoring. Other states' science tests will include items requiring hand-scoring activities.
		As described in the proposal, does Hawaii wish to hold either an Achievement Level Setting meeting for Science assessments in grades 5, 8, and Biology, a Standard Setting during the Summer of 2020, or does Hawaii wish to hold both?	Hawaii intends to hold a one-day Achievement Level Descriptors meeting and a three-day Standard Setting meeting in the summer of 2020.
		The Appendix H-1 is contradictory around science interims. Does Hawaii want interim science assessments for grades 5, 8, and Biology?	Hawaii will administer interim science assessments in grades 5 and 8 and in Biology. Both Appendix H-1 and H-2 have been updated.
		Does Hawaii want interim assessments and Algebra 1 and 2 EOC assessments? Will the items used for these interim Algebra assessments be Hawaii-developed items or Smarter Balanced provided items?	Hawaii will administer interim Algebra 1 and 2 assessments; items will be developed by Hawaii teachers in the Hawaii Authoring Program. Bidders may propose the option of using Smarter Balanced items for interim assessments for Algebra 1 and 2.

		<p>Currently, Hawaii does not use Smarter Balanced mathematics items for its Algebra 1 and 2 assessments. Does Hawaii want to use the current Hawaii-developed items for these tests, or does HODOE want to use Smarter Balanced items that match their current test blueprints? If Hawaii decides to switch to Smarter, please respond to the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Would Hawaii like to continue reporting on their current scale, or would they prefer to report on the Smarter Scale? If reporting on the Smarter scale, would they like a linkage in order to maintain a trend line? b. Has Hawaii considered the need for a standard setting if they switch to Smarter-based Algebra 1 and Algebra 2 tests? If the state believes that it will require such a meeting, when would it be scheduled? 	<p>a. Hawaii will consider the use of Smarter Balanced items for Algebra 1 and 2 summative assessments and the use of the Smarter Scale; linkage to maintain a trend line would be desired.</p> <p>b. Hawaii will consider the use of Smarter Balanced items for its Algebra 1 and 2 EOC Exams; the exams should be on the Smarter Scale and if that is the case then the state does not believe that Standard Setting is necessary.</p>
p. 24	Section C.3.6	Does MAAC require a Risk Matrix for item #6 on p. 24 or will a text response fulfill this requirement?	Members will accept risk matrices or narrative.
	B.2.1.2 and B.2.1.3	What is the amount that should be budgeted for the honorarium or stipend for any necessary educator committee meetings?	\$200 per day
6	A.4	Please clarify whether a Bidder must submit a proposal for the common elements if they want to also bid on one or more of the state-specific appendices, or if a Bidder may ONLY submit a proposal, or proposals, for one or more of the state-specific appendices (and not bid on the common elements).	The common scope is the driver for the MAAC RFP; Bidder is expected to submit proposals for the common scope of work. The state-specific work can be viewed as optional for bidding, though members are looking for Bidders to propose solutions for all elements included in the RFP.
	Appendix WA-3	Please provide the evaluation criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals in response to the Washington ELPA appendix.	RFP document updated to include ELPA evaluation.
16	B. General information for Bidders; 5. Submission of Proposals	Are bidders to submit the same numbers of copies of the Cost Proposal as the Technical proposal (1 hard copy original to each member state and 10 flash drives to each member state)?	Yes

18	B. General information for Bidders; 6. Proprietary Information/Public Disclosure	<p>Can the Redacted Proposal be included on the same flash drive as the Technical Proposal, just with the word “redacted” in the file name?</p> <p>If they are to be on separate drives, how many electronic copies should be submitted?</p>	Yes – the redacted version can be included on the same flash drive (with appropriate file name).
22	C. Proposal Contents and C. Proposal Contents; 2. Executive Summary	<p>Section C includes an “Executive Summary” between the “Letter of Submittal” and the “Technical Proposal,” however it is not included in the four (4) major sections listed at the beginning of Section C.</p> <p>The RFP instructs bidders to tab these major sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Letter of Submittal b. Technical Proposal c. Management Proposal d. Cost Proposal <p>Where are bidders to include the Executive Summary? Is it supposed to go between the letter of submittal and the technical proposal? Is it part of the letter of submittal?</p>	Bidder should view the Executive Summary as part of the Letter of Submittal section.
24	C. Proposal Contents; 3. Technical Proposal	<p>The RFP states that bidders are to “format the Technical proposal such that the original RFP language provisions and numbering are directly quoted and included in the proposals, followed respectively by the Bidder’s response to each provision in formatting which makes the original language and Bidder’s response easy to distinguish and read.”</p> <p>Does this mean that all RFP language needs to be included in our response, or are the numbered/bolded headings sufficient?</p>	<p>The numbering and labeling of headings is sufficient for the response.</p> <p>Consideration could be given toward inserting a small portion of RFP text in those instances where a distinct number or heading reference is not available or the information presented is framed on a small detail within a larger section of RFP information.</p>
28	A.4 Practice Tests	Please confirm that any practice tests that are “prescribed by the state” will only include Smarter Balanced items, and not any additional state-specific items. If the latter, please provide specifications of numbers of items for costing purposes.	<p>Only Smarter Balanced items populate practice tests for ELA and math.</p> <p>Other state-specific assessments that have practice tests available will use only items constructed from the corresponding item banks.</p>

37	e. Administration and Technical Training	Are any in-person trainings required? If so, please provide specifications for costing purposes.	The mode of training will be determined collaboratively between the member and contractor. Refer to table below. (If no state input, Bidder should propose solutions for all referenced formats identified by other states)
----	--	--	---

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
WA applies video module formatted trainings.	Yes. One new test coordinator training on Oahu in Aug for 40 people; Five 'district' trainings in Sep on Oahu, Maui, Kauai and the Big Island; 500 people; Eight test coordinator trainings on four main islands in Jan/Feb, 200 people		Most meetings should virtual meeting (call, webinars, or skype) but allow for a few face-to-face especially the yearly planning meetings.	Annually, Montana conducts a face-to-face meeting in Montana to support test coordinators with managing the assessments at a state-wide conference. MT expects the Contractor to prepare presentation(s)—to be reviewed and approved by the state—and for the Contractor to present the approved presentation(s) at the conference. Typically, we have at least one “How to administer” session, one “Test settings & accommodations” session, one “How to give the interims” session, and one “How to access reports Online Reporting System” session.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
39–46	C. Proposal Contents; 4. Requirements; A.11 Administration	<p>The lettering appears to be off in this section beginning after “f. Retake Administration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Administration Windows b. Field Support c. Operations Support (Help Desk) d. Technical (Tech) Support e. Administration and Technical Training f. Retake Administration d. Paper-Pencil Forms e. Irregularities f. Data Management g. Data Analytics/Forensics h. Scoring i. Psychometrics j. Reporting <p>Please confirm bidders should re-letter this section, beginning with “g. Paper-Pencil Forms” as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Paper-Pencil Forms h. Irregularities i. Data Management j. Data Analytics/Forensics k. Scoring l. Psychometrics m. Reporting 	The lettering got misaligned and is now corrected in the RFP document. Bidder should follow sequencing in the updated RFP text.
39	f. Retake Administration	For the table on the top of page 39, can the State provide the split of the 20,000 students between the fall and spring retake opportunities?	Bidder should provide costs as an annual total; the distribution will be negotiated at time of contracting.
43	Automated Scoring Requirements	<p>The RFP states: “Members shall also have the right to visit Contractor’s scoring facilities and attend all training sessions for scorers and scoring sessions.”</p> <p>What costs, if any, should be included in bidder proposals for member state staff attendance at scoring?</p>	Bidder’s proposal should include as an optional service for states resources to cover costs for state presence (maximum of 3 people) at annual scoring activities. The identified costs should be provided at the per person basis and only would need to address travel-related expenses (e.g., lodging, meals, transportation, incidentals, etc.)

Page	Section	Question	Answer
44	i. Psychometrics	The RFP states: "Select states may require Contractor to collaborate with designated third-party psychometric consultant in verifying annual administration results." Which of the member states have this requirement? Does each State contract separately with the third-party consultant?	This clause was included to provide for future opportunity—no state has such a third-party arrangement. Bidder is to be aware of this possibility and the likely need to share data with the third party.
48	School & District Reports	How should costs for printing of school and district reports be included in the cost proposal? There are no lines on the cost proposal format.	Exhibit K has been updated to include this element for the costing.
52-53 and Exhibit J	d. Advisory	Are bidders required to include a daily stipend amount for the Washington STAC? If so, what is the amount?	\$200 where applicable (only for person attending on personal time—not a contract day with current district employer). No STAC members are known to attend on personal time.
54	D.4 Inventory of Student Responses	Can the State(s) provide more detail on the retention requirements of each state for student responses?	Refer to table below. (If no state input, Bidder should propose a solution aligned to an identified state protocol resulting in the longest period of retention—also assumed to be the highest cost. Bidder is to ensure the state that provided no input is aware the proposal condition to allow for reconsideration at time of contract finalization)

WA	HI	VIDE	DE	MT
Washington requires one year from final score file delivery for grades 3-8; two years for high school. Inventory of responses would be used by vendor to generate details supporting parent test reviews.	Minimum of two years		Delaware will implement its own retention policy to securely protect and retain students' information (ID, and responses). All exchange of materials or retention material should be done through a secure FTP.	Montana's OPI Records Management Policy provides a retention schedule for all public and non-public documents. However, historically for Assessment, the OPI has a retention schedule of 15 years for paper documents and 20 years for electronic documents. The OPI has relied on the vendor to retain documents.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
60	E. Management Proposal; E.1 Project Management; d. Staff Qualifications and Experience	It appears the lettering is off in this section. i. Roles and Responsibilities ii. Bidder Experience iii. Qualifications of Personnel v. Experience of the Vendor Please confirm that bidders should change “v. Experience of the Vendor” to “iv. Experience of the Vendor.”	The lettering got misaligned and is now corrected in the RFP document. Bidder should follow sequencing in the updated RFP text.
62	F. Cost Proposal	Please confirm that bidders are required to submit costs in both formats of Exhibit K.	Confirmed
65	Evaluation of the Cost Proposal	The RFP states that “a total of 25 points will be awarded to the lowest of the three cost proposals.” Please confirm that this should read 75 points.	The points associated with the cost proposal evaluation have been corrected to maintain consistency throughout the RFP document.
65	Evaluation of the Cost Proposal	Please confirm that the evaluation points using the formula will only be used on the common Smarter Balanced elements. Essentially on lines 8-26 only of the Cost Proposal Submission format.	The formula for the cost proposal evaluation will be applied to all assessments where more than one proposal was submitted.
121	Cost Proposal	Please confirm that the second sentence should say 75 points, instead of 100 points. And that the example should use 75 points as well.	The points associated with the cost proposal evaluation have been corrected to maintain consistency throughout the RFP document.
	Exhibit K – Cost Proposal Submission Format	Can bidders add lines to the cost proposal format, if they identify the added lines in some way?	Yes, but ensure the cost proposal narrative identifies any addition.
	Exhibit K – Cost Proposal Submission Format	Under the Manuals section of the Cost Proposal format, it states “ <i>broken out by assessment type</i> .” Please clarify what this means for bidders when calculating their costs.	If Bidder determines a need to provide a different manual for elements of the assessment program bid then the cost sheet should identify this situation, as applicable.
	Exhibit K – Cost Proposal Submission Format	There is a line for US History on the Cost Proposal format, but US History is not included in the state-specific elements chart on page 8 of the RFP. Please clarify if US History should be included and with how many students, for which state.	This was an error and has been updated in the RFP document and associated cost proposal formats.
	Exhibit K – Cost Proposal Submission Format	The costs for Technical Reporting are requested to be provided “per student assessment.” This is not typical for technical	The Exhibit K forms have been updated to accept technical reporting costing at the assessment or program level.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		reporting; should this be “per state” or “per assessment” instead?	
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.1 Development	Requirement 2.1 states that a full set of example items will need to be completed for ELA and mathematics, however, Exhibit WA-2A shows the need for sample items to be developed for science. Shall the bidder include costing for the development of science sample items?	Bidder should provide costing for science items. The RFP document has been updated.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.1 Development	Requirement 2.1 states that the bidder will collaborate with OSPI to complete full sets of example items for all performance tasks in ELA and math. Is OSPI interested in the items to be developed by Washington teachers through meetings or vendor developed example items with a teacher item review?	Vendor-developed with teacher reviews.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.1 Development	What is the time frame in which example items are to be written?	Work would need to be completed, inclusive of all necessary reviews and approvals, prior to the start of the 2020-2021 school year.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.1 Development	How many example items is OSPI anticipating having pre-populated into the web-based interface?	All when the full set of items are ready for system integration.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.2 Meetings	Are there any teacher review committee meetings included in the scope? If so, please provide specifications.	None are currently identified within the proposed scope. Bidder could look to other assessment appendices for WA (i.e., WA-1 WCAS) for examples as needed.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 3	2. Requirements; 2.2 Meetings	Please confirm that the bidder only needs to include costs for their own staff attendance at TAC meetings, and not for any other meeting costs.	Bidder is expected to include travel-related costs (applicable food, lodging, etc.) for all participants attending TAC meetings. This would be expected of any advisory or other type of educator meeting linked to the assessment program. Stipends/honorarium for attendees would be expected for those people not employed by the SEA or, in the case of STAC participants, not attending on a schedule work day under a district contract.
Appendix WA-2; pg. 4	2. Requirements; 2.7 Sample Pulling Process	Would sample pulling meetings only occur for spring administrations containing new standards? How often are new standards	Sample pulls only occur for the spring administration, and occur irrespective of the standards involved in the administration.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		anticipated?	
Appendix WA-2; pg. 4	2. Requirements; 2.7 Sample Pulling Process	Where will sample pulling meetings occur? Are any teachers included in sample pulling meetings?	At the Contractor scoring location. No teachers are included, but representation from the SEA will occur—the associated travel costs being the responsibility of the Contractor.
	Appendix WA-1: Science Assessment (WCAS)	Washington appears to be on track to have detailed item specifications for each PE prior to July 2019. What is the work effort expected for the item specifications going forward (referencing Appendix WA-1 page 4)?	The vendor will update the Grade 5, 8, and 11 Test Design and Item Specifications documents annually. Updates will be at the direction of OSPI and based on feedback from educators that is gathered during the course of item development meetings. The vendor will produce an accompanying Modifications Log. The vendor will be responsible for producing final pdfs that are ADA compliant.
		As with standalone items, will OSPI specify PE bundles for item clusters to be developed (referencing Appendix WA-1 page 6)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For item clusters, the vendor will identify development needs based on clusters in the operational bank and clusters already in production for field testing, then propose PE bundles (usually 2 PEs) for the item cluster. Each proposed bundle will include at least one phenomenon/design problem suggestion, and a description/outline of the proposed cluster. b. For standalone items the vendor will identify development needs based on standalones in the operational bank and standalones already in production for field testing, then propose PEs (1 per item) to target. c. OSPI will review, provide feedback for, and approve/reject proposed PE bundles/phenomena for clusters and proposed PEs for standalones.
		Will OSPI allow for transfer of its current practice and training tests from its current vendor, to then be updated as needed for the new vendor's system (referencing Appendix WA-1 sections 2.1.D and 2.1.E on pages 12-13)?	OSPI will allow transfer of the current science training tests (there are no science practice tests) from the current vendor. The functionality and appearance of the tests needs to remain as close to their current form as possible. For example, item locking, collapsing stimuli, horizontal expansion of stimuli and items must be available. Art work and constructed response items (hand-scored and machine-scored) should be in line with text and presented in full size. The exact presentation of these features, however, may vary from current presentation within psychometrically-approved limitations. OSPI's periodic table should be available at

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			grades 8 and 11. The representation below is from the Grade 8 Science Training Test available on the <u>WCAP Portal</u> .

The screenshot displays a digital learning interface. On the left, a sidebar contains three sections: 'Section 1—Sea Star Reproduction', 'Section 2—Sea Star Reproduction', and 'Section 3—Sea Star Reproduction'. A red box labeled 'Collapsing Stimuli' points to the plus signs next to these sections. The main content area shows 'Section 3—Sea Star Reproduction' with text describing sea star anatomy and a diagram of a sea star with labels for 'Arm' and 'Tube feet'. Below the diagram is a 'Genetic Information Model' flowchart with three boxes connected by arrows. A red box labeled 'Locking' points to the text 'Move the labels into the boxes to show the flow of genetic information in the tube feet cells.' Below the flowchart are three labels: 'Sticky foot trait', 'Sticky foot protein', and 'Sticky foot gene'. A red box labeled 'Horizontal expansion' points to the navigation arrows at the top, and another red box labeled 'Periodic Table' points to a 'Periodic Table' icon in the top right corner.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		Please define “key personnel” as referenced on Appendix WA-1 page 34.	Key personnel include all those who fill the roles described in section 3.1.C, which includes contractor’s WCAP personnel and science specific personnel.
		Referencing the Bias and Sensitivity Review committee described on Appendix WA-1 page 6, what support, if any, can the vendor expect from OSPI for bias and sensitivity committee member recruitment and selection?	OSPI will provide names and contact information for potential Bias and Sensitivity participants. OSPI is currently working to grow this list, and is open to recruitment suggestions from the vendor. The vendor will be responsible for contacting potential committee members and securing their participation prior to meetings. OSPI will assist in the selection of committee members, and will review recruitment materials/communications.
		Referencing section 2.1.B on Appendix WA-1 page 8, when is the expected first field test administration for items developed under this contract? Are there items developed under a previous contract that would need to be field tested in spring 2020?	a. The first field test administration for items under this contract is spring 2022 and will include both standalone items and item clusters. Development of these items for spring 2022 field test, however, needs to start in year 1 of the contract. Items go through a 1.5 to 2 year development track to provide adequate development time which includes applying accessibility features (including text-to-speech and

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			<p>glossing) prior to field testing.</p> <p>b. Standalone items and clusters developed under a previous contract will be field tested in both spring 2020 and spring 2021. While most accessibility features (including text-to-speech and glossing) for these items will have been completed by the previous contract, there may be some accessibility features that the contractor would be responsible to apply to these field test items.</p>
	<p>Appendix HI-1: Science Assessment (HSA-Sci)</p>	<p>Referencing Appendix HI-1 page 4, what is the work effort and/or product of the item specifications development?</p>	<p>An <i>Item Specifications</i> document is a requirement of the item development process. An item specifications document requires details specifying the content to be tested, construct definitions, item types, etc. The <i>Items Specifications</i> document is used as a reference by item writers.</p> <p>Hawaii would expect the contractor to use the existing the <i>Items Specifications</i> document in defining an initial scope of work, but also make part of a proposal opportunity to collaborate on enhancements to the document within the contract period.</p>
		<p>Referencing the Bias and Sensitivity Review committee described on Appendix HI-1 page 6, what support, if any, can the vendor expect from HIDOE for bias and sensitivity committee member recruitment and selection?</p>	<p>HIDOE staff will create the DOE memo that announces recruitment for committee members. HIDOE staff will review the list of applicants for committees and provide the vendor with the selected participants.</p>
		<p>Will HIDOE allow for transfer of its current practice and training tests from its current vendor, to then be updated as needed for the new vendor's system (referencing Appendix WI-1 sections 2.1.D and 2.1.E on pages 12-13)?</p>	<p>Hawaii will allow for the transfer of the items owned by HIDOE to the new vendor's system.</p>
		<p>Referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-1 page 12, appendix HA-3 (Hawaii Authoring Program) describes scope for the production and maintenance of an interim assessment bank. Please describe the intended difference between these two systems/scope expectations.</p>	<p>The Interim Assessment system contains interim assessments that will be developed using the items shared among the MOU states. The Hawaii Authoring Program system contains the items created by Hawaii teachers. The test delivery system for both could be the same system.</p>
		<p>Referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-1 page 12, there are no</p>	<p>The interim assessments are expected to be developed by the MOU states. The vendor is expected to provide</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		development expectations specified for the interim assessment requirement. Is Hawaii requesting an interim system that is already populated with items? If not, what are the development expectations for the interim assessment system?	the delivery platform.
		Is the October 1 availability expectation for the interim assessment for October 2019 or October 2020 (referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-1 page 12)?	October 2019
		Please define “key personnel” as referenced on Appendix HI-1 page 36.	Key personnel include those whose primary assignment is with the Hawaii contract; positions include project manager, project coordinators, psychometricians and others who communicate regularly with HIDOE staff.
		Referencing section 2.1.B on Appendix HI-1 page 8, when is the expected first field test administration for items developed under this contract? Are there items developed under a previous contract that would need to be field tested in spring 2020?	Items are currently being developed along with other states that have signed on to an item sharing MOU. Some items have been field tested. HIDOE intends to administer an operational field test in the spring of 2020.
	Appendix HI-2: End-of-Course Exam – Biology	Referencing Appendix HI-2 page 4, what is the work effort and/or product of the item specifications development?	An <i>Item Specifications</i> document is a requirement of the item development process. An item specifications document requires details specifying the content to be tested, construct definitions, item types, etc. The <i>Items Specifications</i> document is used as a reference by item writers. Hawaii would expect the contractor to use the existing the <i>Items Specifications</i> document in defining an initial scope of work, but also make part of a proposal opportunity to collaborate on enhancements to the document within the contract period.
		Referencing the Bias and Sensitivity Review committee described on Appendix HI-2 page 6, what support, if any, can the vendor expect from HIDOE for bias and sensitivity committee member recruitment and selection?	HIDOE staff will create the DOE memo that announces recruitment for committee members. HIDOE staff will review the list of applicants for committees and provide the vendor with the selected participants.
		Hawaii is currently administering Biology EOC assessments. Please describe how Hawaii expects the assessments described in the RFP	The current Biology EOC Exam is a ‘bridge’ assessment aligned to both the legacy content standards and the NGSS; the new exam will be aligned only to the NGSS.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		to be “new” compared to the current assessments.	
		This question is in reference to Appendix HI-2 page 8 where new items are described. In the HA-1 Appendix, item clusters and standalone items are discussed for development expectations. In HA-2 Appendix, only standalone items are discussed in the field test plan (referencing Appendix HI-2 page 8). Is Hawaii expecting to use item clusters or only standalone items for the Biology EOC?	Hawaii will use both item clusters and standalone items for the Biology 1 EOC Exam. Hawaii is a member state of the item sharing MOU in which items are being developed and shared across states. Hawaii will continue to develop item clusters and standalone items throughout the life of the contract.
		In the HA-1 Appendix, specific item counts are presented in the Field Test section, however, only maximum item counts per student are mentioned in HA-2 Appendix (section 2.1.B Field test on page 8). What, if any, are the anticipated item count production expectations for the Biology EOC?	The item count production expectations for the Biology EOC Exam are provided in HI-1, p. 8 for the grade 11 assessment, specifically, up to 12 clusters and up to 30 standalone items.
		Referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-2 page 12, appendix HA-3 (Hawaii Authoring Program) describes scope for the production and maintenance of an interim assessment bank (including for HI Biology EOC). Please describe the intended difference between these two systems/scope expectations.	The Interim Assessment system contains interim assessment items that will be developed using the items shared among the MOU states. The Hawaii Authoring Program system contains the items created by Hawaii teachers. The interim assessments will be common among the item sharing states. The HAP item bank will be used to administer teacher-created interim/summative assessments. The test delivery system for both could be the same system.
		Referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-2 page 12, there are no development expectations specified for the interim assessment requirement. Is Hawaii requesting an interim system that is already populated with items? If not, what are the development expectations for the interim assessment system?	The interim assessments are expected to be developed by the MOU states. The vendor is expected to provide the delivery platform.
		Is the October 1 availability expectation for the interim assessment for October 2019 or October 2020 (referencing section 2.1.F Interim Assessment on Appendix HI-2 page 12)?	October 2019
		Please define “key personnel” as referenced	Key personnel include those whose primary assignment

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		on Appendix HI-2 page 36.	is with the Hawaii contract; positions include project manager, project coordinators, psychometricians and others who communicate regularly with HIDOE staff.
		Referencing section 2.1.B on Appendix HI-2 page 8, when is the expected first field test administration for items developed under this contract? Are there items developed under a previous contract that would need to be field tested in spring 2020?	Items are currently being developed along with other states that have signed on to an item sharing MOU. Some items have been field tested. HIDOE intends to administer an operational field test in the spring of 2020.
	Appendix HI-3: End-of-Course Exams - Algebra 1 and 2	The first paragraph of the appendix mentions that EOC mathematics assessment items will be drawn from the Smarter Balanced item bank and augmented with Hawaii owned items. Other references in the appendix (e.g., first bullet in middle of p. 1) regarding the source of items is limited to the Smarter Balanced item bank only. Will the source of items include Hawaii owned items?	The source of items will include Hawaii owned items. The Hawaii Authoring Program is expected to generate items that may be included in both the Algebra 1 and Algebra 2 EOC Exams.
		Page 1 references “computer-based, fixed form.” Please confirm that the Algebra 1 and 2 EOC Exams are fixed-form assessments and are not CAT assessments.	This is an error. Both the Algebra 1 and 2 EOC Exams are CAT. The appendix has been corrected.
		Please confirm that “test development” in Section 2.1.A (p. 2) refers only to the development of test forms and that item development is not a required element of the scope of work.	Correct. Algebra 1 and 2 item development will occur as part of the Hawaii Authoring Program, Appendix HI-4.
		Please clarify the requirements for “Print On Demand” (p. 4) and “Paper-Pencil Forms” (p. 14). Is the contractor required to also construct a paper-pencil form for each administration? Or, is the expectation that for any student needing a paper form, the paper form will be a printed copy of the main test form?	A paper-pencil form is not required for each administration. The fixed form will be delivered using “Print On Demand.”
		For the Practice Tests mentioned in Section 2.1.D (p. 6), do the Practice Tests currently exist and only need updating or should the contractor expect to develop new Practice Tests? How many items appear on a Practice Test?	The practice tests currently exist and are available at alohahsap.org .
		For the Training Tests mentioned in Section	Training tests do not currently exist and will need to be

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		2.1.E (p. 6), do the Training Tests currently exist and only need updating or should the contractor expect to develop new Training Tests? How many items appear on a Training Test?	developed. The training test items may be extracted from the current practice tests.
		A breach form is mentioned in Section 2.1.K (p. 11). Does HIDOE prefer a new breach form be constructed for every administration (Fall and Spring of each year) or may a new version of the breach form be constructed only if an existing breach form has to be administered?	A new version of the breach form will be constructed only if an existing breach form has to be administered.
		Regarding Section 2.4.B (p. 23), Logistical Requirements – Meetings, how many educators does HIDOE expect to attend each test form-construction meeting?	A test form-construction meeting will include approximately eight educators.
	Appendix HI-4: Hawaii Authoring Program	<p>Page 1 indicates that the scope of work addressed by Appendix HI-4 includes interim/benchmark and summative assessments for mathematics, ELA, science, and social studies for grades K-12. On page 2, the scope is further defined as first year implementation focusing on mathematics, ELA, and science in grades 3-12 with social studies and additional grades to be phased in over time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For budgetary purposes, in what years should vendors budget for social studies item development? b. For budgetary purposes, in what years should vendors budget for item development for grades K-2? c. For budgetary purposes, in what years should vendors budget for development of instructional/professional resource development for social studies and K-2? 	For all response, a. through c., budgeting should be for Year 3.
		Page 1 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that the primary mode of administration of the HAP assessments is online adaptive. Is the adaptive option to be employed for both interim/benchmark and summative	Interim and summative (e.g., end of unit) item banks will continue to grow and it is anticipated that by Year 3 an adaptive interim and summative assessments will be delivered.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		assessments?	
		Given the desire for adaptive test forms, please provide information about the size of the existing HAP item bank for each grade and content area.	Existing item banks for ELA and mathematics at the elementary, middle and high school levels contain approximately 50 items that have not gone through field testing.
		Please confirm our understanding that the sole use of the summative assessments as defined by Appendix HI-4 is for classroom use for grading purposes.	Teacher-created summative assessments are for teacher use only, e.g., grading purposes.
		Are there any high stakes decisions associated with students' grades that may impact the policy or psychometric considerations for item development and field testing of the summative assessments?	There are no high stakes purposes for HAP items/assessments other than, potentially, student grades.
		Page 2 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that HIDOE content and assessment specialists will work with the Contractor to coordinate item development training, item writing certification and item review collaboration activities. Please explain what is meant by item writing certification and the vendor scope expectations for supporting this.	Item Writing Certification will involve teachers being trained in a content area claim/domain/reporting category and then submitting items for review by content and assessment specialists. Upon completion of a set of items the teacher will achieve certification for that content area claim/domain/reporting category. A certified item writer will be paid approximately \$40 per item that makes it to field testing. The item reviewer will be paid approximately \$40 for that same item that makes it to field testing for a total of \$80 being paid to the writer/reviewer. It is anticipated that a total of 20 teachers per content area will become certified item writers and that each will produce 30 items that make it to field testing each school year. Approximately 20 teachers per content area have already become certified. Some will continue to write items and some may 'retire' from item writing.
		Page 2 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that HIDOE content and assessment specialists will work with the Contractor to coordinate item development training, item writing certification and item review collaboration activities. Please describe the nature of the collaboration. (i.e., Will the Contractor be responsible for drafting documents and training materials and revising them based on Department feedback, or will the development of agendas, training content	The contractor is expected to develop all training, certification and item review materials and HIDOE will review and provide feedback.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		and activities, and item review processes be joint activities of the Department and the Contractor?)	
		Are all item authoring trainings described on page 2 of Appendix HI-4 to be held in person, or can some of these training activities be offered remotely by the Contractor with the experienced item authors serving as onsite facilitators and item reviewers?	Some of the trainings and meetings will be held via webinars. For each content area the contractor will provide face-to-face trainings as follows: five days of training in June, two days of training in October and two days of training in March for approximately 10 teachers each year.
		Page 2 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that experienced item authors participate in training activities. Do these experienced item authors also write items and should be included in the total number of writers for whom payment should be made per item?	Yes – refer to previous response with item fee structure related to teacher item writing and reviews.
		Page 3 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that item reviewers are to receive \$30-\$40 per item. When budgeting for item review, should vendors budget for one reviewer per developed item?	Yes – refer to previous response with item fee structure related to teacher item writing and reviews.
		Referencing Page 3 of Appendix HI-4, is the total number of items developed annually by the item writers the total number of items to be developed annually? Or, is the Contractor expected to develop additional items? Are the items divided equally across the summative and interim/benchmark item banks?	All items are to be developed by Hawaii teachers. The contractor is not expected to write items. The items will be divided equally across the summative and interim item banks.
		Page 3 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that HIDOE content and assessment specialists will work with the Contractor to coordinate professional development and collaboration activities. Please describe the nature of the collaboration. (i.e., Will the Contractor be responsible for drafting documents and training materials and revising them based on Department feedback, or will the development of agendas, training content and activities, and item review processes be joint activities of the Department and the Contractor?)	The contractor is expected to develop all ancillary documents and all training, certification and item review materials; HIDOE will review and provide feedback.
		Are all trainings described on page 3 of Appendix HI-4 to be held in person, or can	Some of the trainings and meetings will be held via webinars. For each content area the contractor will

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		some of these training activities be offered remotely by the Contractor with the experienced resource developers serving as onsite facilitators and reviewers?	provide face-to-face trainings as follows: five days of training in June, two days of training in October and two days of training in March for approximately 10 teachers each year. (this is in addition to the trainings for item writing)
		Please clarify the expectations for payments for resource developers. Page 3 of Appendix HI-4 indicates, "Both the resource developer and reviewer may work independently and receive \$30-\$40 per resource that is moved to the item bank for test administration." When budgeting for resource review, should vendors budget for one reviewer per resource?	Yes, vendors should budget for one reviewer per resource.
		To support comparable budgeting across bids, please provide guidance for the distribution of item types by content area. Please indicate whether this balance of item types should differ by grade level. Are the distributions of items by type different for the summative and interim/benchmark assessments? If so, please provide guidance for the purpose of budgeting.	Math items will be standalone CAT items; ELA will be similar in proportion to the SBA, e.g., 40 CAT: 1 PT; Science will be one cluster for every three stand-alone items; it is anticipated that the development of item types will be the same/similar to the types of items developed for SBA and NGSS assessments.
		Page 5 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that HAP assessment development requires item and stimuli development with HIDOE staff. Please clarify this expectation. Is the Contractor expected to provide stimuli for HIDOE review prior to item writer training to support item development activities?	It is preferable to have teachers write stimuli; the Contractor may provide stimuli for training purposes.
		Page 6 of Appendix HI-4 references the requirement to develop item specifications. What is the expected level of effort to achieve the quality/completeness that HIDOE desires? Are these documents to be developed "from scratch," or will this activity involve revision and refinement to existing documents?	Item specifications will be similar to the existing SBA and NGSS specifications; revision and refinement are required to ensure alignment to HAP expectations.
		Page 6 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that a complete item includes associated meta-data. What meta-data are to be maintained for each item?	The items are intended for CAT delivery and, eventually, an assessment will generate a scale score that is on the same/similar vertical scale as the SBA; science and social studies assessments will also provide a scale score and the necessary meta data will need to be collected in order to provide teachers with information

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			that will inform instruction.
		Page 7 of Appendix HI-4 indicates the Contractor shall provide examples of item types appropriate for each grade span and assessment that must be developed. Please clarify if "examples" means that bidders should include a list of the types of items that are being proposed for each grade span or that bidders should include sample items in their proposals.	Bidders should include a list of proposed item types.
		Page 8 of Appendix HI-4 references "common assessments." Are all items developed, whether used for interim/benchmark or summative assessments, to be field tested?	Yes. The contractor is expected to develop all ancillary documents and all training, certification and item review materials; HIDOE will review and provide feedback. However, bidders may propose alternatives to "common assessments."
		Page 8 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that 5 to 6 teachers from the appropriate grade level and content area attend each Content-Data Review session whereas page 10 indicates that Content Review and Data Review meetings include 8 educators per level (elementary, middle, and high school). Please clarify the number of teachers that should be budgeted for each meeting.	5-6 teachers and 2-3 community members attend content/data review committee meetings for a total of 8 participants
		Page 9 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that Hawaii assessment specialists shall work with the Contractor's test delivery and scoring psychometrician to select items for operational test forms. Are these item-selection meetings to be done face-to-face, or is a virtual meeting an option?	These meetings are to be conducted virtually.
		What number of interim/benchmark assessments will be selected each year by grade and content area? Is more than one summative assessment constructed per grade and content area annually?	It is anticipated that each year one interim and one summative assessment will be generated for each grade level in each content area.
		Page 9 of Appendix HI-4 references item refreshment. What is the desired minimum percent refreshment? Does the HIDOE have a policy for resting an item before reuse? Does the HIDOE desire release of any items from	HIDOE does not have a minimum percent refreshment as it intends to build the item banks for adaptive testing purposes; HIDOE desires to release items from the bank each year for instructional use after item banks are of sufficient size for adaptive testing; HIDOE expects to

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		the summative or interim/benchmark bank for instructional use?	release 10 items per content area and grade level each year.
		Page 6 of Appendix HI-4 indicates that the new assessments are to utilize item types found in the Smarter Balanced assessments in addition to item types provided specifically for the HAP assessments. Page 7 indicates that the HIDOE intends to include standalones in the item bank. Further, Appendix HI-4 indicates on page 9 that the total stand-alone items described in the appendix are the expected number of items that will be approved for presentation to the Content Review and Bias & Sensitive Review participants. Please clarify the expectations for the development of the range of item types and the review of item types by educator committees.	One common interim and one common summative assessment per content area and grade level are desired each year; each assessment will include a variety of items types as described in the item specifications manual; the items on these assessments will be reviewed by educator committees; Bidders may propose alternatives to “common assessments.”
		Page 11 of Appendix HI-4 references a single meeting to revisit established achievement levels. Please indicate for what content areas, grades, and assessments achievement levels should be revisited.	Each content area and grade will have the achievement levels revisited; both the common interim and summative will be on the same scale.
		Page 11 of Appendix HI-4 indicates during the school year educators will receive substitute reimbursement. Please specify what rate should be used to support comparable budgeting.	During the school year substitute cost will be provided by HIDOE; the Contractor will provide a stipend to teachers who work on a weekend or holiday; the rate is \$200 per day.
	Appendix USVI-1: Science Assessment (VIDE SA)	Referencing Appendix USVI-1 page 4, what is the work effort and/or product of the item specifications development?	A guideline document that provides information about the NGSS assessment design and development. Standards alignment, cognitive complexity, scoring, and vocabulary should be included.
		Referencing the Bias and Sensitivity Review committee described on Appendix USVI-1 page 6, what support, if any, can the vendor expect from VIDE for bias and sensitivity committee member recruitment and selection?	The SEA will recruit and select the VIDE educators that will participate in bias and sensitivity reviews.
		Appendix USVI-1 section 2.1.B on page 8 describes the expected number of items within item clusters (also referenced as scenarios), number of item clusters, and number of stand-alone items in two ways. Please confirm the	There are two methods because this section describes the number of items for the Spring 2020 pilot (first year of field testing) and the number of items that should be developed to be field tested within the operational assessments administered annually beginning in spring

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		expected development number of item clusters/scenarios (and items within an item clusters/scenario) and items for each year of development.	2021.
		In reference to Appendix USVI-1 section 2.1.B on pages 8 and 9, the relative low n-count of students per test does not appear to support the expected field test item numbers. Can VIDE give more information about the expected development and/or field test plan?	The VIDE would like to partner with other MAAC states for field testing. Therefore, the number of field test items would be distributed across all participating MAAC states.
		The development window (starting no earlier than anticipated contract start date of July 15, 2019) to first field test of spring 2020 (as referenced in Appendix USVI-1 section 2.1.B on page 8, is a very short time frame to achieve item development as described in the appendix. Please confirm the expected first field test administration for items developed under this contract. Are there items developed under a previous contract that would need to be field tested in spring 2020?	No items have been developed so far.
		Please define "key personnel" as referenced on Appendix USVI-1 page 30.	Personnel listed on pages 29 and 30.
	Appendix MT-1: Science Assessment	Referencing Appendix MT-1 page 19, what is the work effort and/or product of the item specifications development? Is MT OPI interested in utilizing Washington's publicly released item specifications in any way to support development of their own?	<p>Montana intends to fully lease Washington's (OSPI) items during the first administration of the three-dimensional online assessment in spring of 2020. The work effort would be to support OSPI and Montana (OPI) to implement this leased assessment and work towards helping Montana contribute to the item pool in future administrations.</p> <p>Montana (OPI) is interested in delivering Washington's (OSPI) in 2020 and leveraging Washington's item specifications to develop items of their own in future administrations (possibly as early as spring 2021).</p>
		Referencing Appendix MT-1 page 31, will MT OPI have access to Washington's practice and training tests as part of the collaboration agreement? Is MT OPI open to utilizing Washington's practice and training tests for the 19-20 and 20-21 school years?	<p>Yes, as part of the Washington-Montana agreement, Montana (OPI) will have access to Washington's (OSPI) practice and training tests.</p> <p>Yes, Montana plans to utilize Washington's (OSPI) practice and training tests for the 19-20 and 20-21</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			school years.
		Please define “key personnel” as referenced on Appendix MT-1 page 58.	“Key Personnel” refers to the staffing assignments as listed on MT-1 pages 56-59 starting with section C.1.3 Program Coordination.
		Referencing the Bias and Sensitivity Review committee described on Appendix MT-1 page 23, what support, if any, can the vendor expect from MT OPI for bias and sensitivity committee member recruitment and selection?	Montana (OPI) will support the contractor with committee member recruitment efforts to include providing names of qualified individuals, obtaining contact information, and assisting with the selection of committee members.
		Referencing Appendix MT-1 page 10, will MT OPI please clarify/expand on the relationship presented here? Is it the intent that MT OPI’s long-term goal is to develop its own MSA assessment, with item sharing with other states (including WA)? Is it the intent that MT will use WA’s item clusters and items for its Year 1 (spring 2020) administration? What, if any, data analysis will MT OPI expect prior to and/or after spring 2020 administration of WA’s items?	<p>The relationship presented in MT-1 page 10 shows in the 2019-2020 school year Montana (OPI) plans to fully administer as a census field test to Montana students using the Washington (OSPI) assessment. To support Montana with its Theory of Action goals, Montana intends to work with Washington to contribute future Montana-developed items to the item pool as early as the 2020-2021 school year. Montana and Washington are in the process of establishing an agreement for these described purposes.</p> <p>Montana’s intent is not to fully develop its own assessment, but rather to eventually contribute to the item pool through Montana-developed items/tasks.</p> <p>Yes, it is the intent that Montana (OPI) will use Washington’s (OSPI) item clusters and items for Montana’s Year 1 (spring 2020) administration.</p> <p>Montana will expect data analysis to include the validation of these item clusters and items to Montana students to verify appropriateness before operational testing in 2021 and use within the Montana ESSA Accountability Plan.</p>
		Referencing Appendix MT-1 page 12, what, if any, modifications will OPI expect to be made to the WA grades 5, 8, and 11 assessments prior to administration in MT for spring 2020?	Montana does not intend for any changes prior to the administration in Montana for spring 2020. Modifications may be needed prior to the 2021 administration.
		Referencing Appendix MT-1 Section A.6.3 on page 13, the development window (starting no earlier than the anticipated contract start date of July 15, 2019) to first field test of spring	Montana intends to administer Washington’s (OSPI) assessment in the spring of 2020 without modification through census field testing in grades 5, 8, and 11.

Page	Section	Question	Answer
		<p>2020 is a very short time frame to achieve item development as described in the appendix. Please confirm the expected first field test administration for items developed under this contract. Is MT OPI open to variations in development processes (from what is described in the appendix) for development efforts for a spring 2020 field test?</p>	<p>Montana (OPI) plans to work with Washington (OSPI) to train Montana teachers starting in 2019 to write items, item clusters, and tasks per Washington’s item writing protocols. Upon terms established between Washington and Montana, Montana expects these Montana-developed items to be introduced into the item bank for future administrations. However, Montana expects items to go through the necessary piloting and field testing processes prior to including vetted items within the operational package and before using scores in the state accountability system.</p> <p>Bidder may propose alternative development processes from what is described in the appendix as Bidders are encouraged to propose alternative methods or modifications to tasks or identify additional tasks that they feel are necessary or would improve the efficiency of the project and/or quality of the materials produced for the project.</p>
		<p>Referencing the note on Appendix MT-1 page 14, does MT OPI expect any items from spring 2020 field test to be used to populate the Year 2 (spring 2021) operational assessment?</p>	<p>Montana expects items from the 2020 field test to populate the Year 2 (spring 2021) operational assessment. Montana intends to introduce Montana-developed items to the item pool through a vetting process established with Washington pursuant to the Washington-Montana agreement. Montana expects the Montana Science Assessment to allow for continuous items to be piloted and field-tested each administration to expand the pool and allow for item release (e.g., growing, cycling, and refreshing as needed).</p>
		<p>Referencing the Appendix MT-1 section B.2.1 on page 15, what role is the vendor expected to play in supporting OSPI Mentorship of MT OPI staff and processes? Please further outline what advisory and educator committees will be held, who will be participating (e.g., educators, MP OPI staff, OSPI staff, vendor staff) and the expectation of vendor support of logistics for each group and vendor support for the actual meetings.</p>	<p>Through the Washington-Montana agreement, Montana expects Washington (OSPI) to serve in a mentorship and advisory role to have Montana educators effectively items pursuant to OSPI’s protocols. Bidder should participate in meetings as appropriate with key personnel defined in section C.1.3 and establish meeting times, frequencies, and committee membership with Montana having final approval.</p> <p>Montana has outlined these educator committees in section B.2.7, B.2.8, B.2.9, B.2.10, and B.11.2. Depending on the activity (e.g., Montana educators,</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			<p>Montana (OPI) staff, Washington (OSPI) staff, vendor staff) may be expected to participate. Some committees may not require OSPI staff to attend, but the other aforementioned groups should always expect to participate.</p>
		<p>“OSPI” is referenced in multiple ways across pages 15-23, significantly as the approving agency for deliverables. Given the mentorship relationship described in this appendix, please confirm that the intended reference to OSPI in these pages is intended to reference “MT OPI” and/or specify when WA OSPI is the intended reference.</p>	<p>Montana and Washington are in the process of establishing an agreement to include specificity on details described in pages 15-23. As such the references to OSPI on these pages signify Washington (OSPI) as in Year 1 (2020) Montana intends to deliver Washington’s assessment without modification.</p> <p>In future administrations or upon negotiation and agreement with Washington (OSPI), some references in pages 15-23 may switch to Montana (OPI) with advanced notice to the Contractor (e.g., item and stimuli development with OSPI staff). Within the Washington-Montana agreement after Year 1, Washington may permit Montana (OPI) to development item and stimulus without OSPI staff.</p>
		<p>Referencing the Appendix MT-1 section B.2.10 on page 25, other than supporting the logistics of attendees’ attendance, what content support is expected from the vendor for the Prioritization of Standards workshop? Other than the specified meetings, what meetings should be budgeted for “future amendment work”?</p>	<p>Montana OPI intends to validate the Prioritization of Standards” Washington work with Montana’s Content Standards for Science (2016) during the summer of 2019. The level of expected support and effort from the Contractor is subject to any findings. It is expected the Subcontractor will generate a Findings Report with recommendations to resolve any identified alignment concerns.</p> <p>If significant issues are raised by the OPI Science Partner Task Force, then the Contractor may expect to establish a meeting to address the alignment concerns and identify future amendment work including new items, item clusters, tasks, etc. Montana would expect a future amendment work meeting to last one day with 45 teachers as described in B.2.10.</p> <p>Presently, Montana only anticipates one future amendment work meeting as Washington’s science standards and Montana’s science standards are very similar. If Montana was unable to confirm the alignment</p>

Page	Section	Question	Answer
			<p>of the items with its standards and for use at these specified grades (e.g., grades 5, 8, and 11), then additional meetings could be warranted, but this scenario seems unlikely given the extensive overlap between these adopted standards.</p>
		<p>Referencing the Appendix MT-1 page 21 language, “. . . and Montana and, by extension, Washington (during the period of the item leasing agreement) are open to innovative approaches to item development and test form development which incorporates the . . .”, please clarify the intent of this information. Other than development of items for each individual state, will the vendor have additional responsibilities/expectations related to the item leasing agreement?</p>	<p>The quoted text was a result of track changes and version compatibility issues. It should state, “OSPI and Montana are open to open to innovative approaches to item development and test form development which incorporates the three-dimensional aspects of the state science standards. Tests for the general assessment can include multiple item types, taking advantage of industry best practices and emerging research in the field of science assessment.”</p> <p>The Contractor must have the technologies in place to allow Washington (OSPI) to share secure materials with Montana and to conduct quality reviews and activities as described in the Washington-Montana agreement.</p>