| **Question Number** | **Original Question** | **Response to Original Question** | **RFP Referencing Information** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFP Section** | **RFP Page Number** |
| 1 | Does the State request vendors to mail Appendix A, or may we submit an electronic version via email? | Please email the Acknowledgment of Receipt form to Kimber Sanchez.  \*Amendment No. 1 provided an email address for Kimber Sanchez | Section II.B.2  *Amended 6/5* | 12 |
| 2 | Will the contractor be required to handle the following:   * Scoring & reporting * Administration, test security, data integrity, data privacy, and technical quality * Providing an IT platform * Developing and hosting solutions to support local summative and interim assessment operations   If any of the above are required, would it be possible for us to only respond to the content development portion of this  RFP? | In Table 12, there are groups of services to be procured via this RFP that may be awarded separately by assessment system components and type of service. If an Offeror proposes any services beginning with a specific letter (e.g., “A”), it must propose all services beginning with that letter. The roles as groups of services shown in Table 12 are as follows:   1. Primary contractor responsible for the bulk of the work including the following:    * management services;    * development of state-provided summative assessment in grades 3-10 in ELA/Math;    * peer review assistance for summative assessment in grades 3-8 in ELA/Math;    * administration, test security, data integrity, data privacy, and technical quality for all state-provided summative and interim assessments;    * providing/extending IT platforms to support local summative and interim assessment;    * supporting local summative and interim assessment operations;    * developing and hosting solutions to local summative and interim assessment operations covering content development, administration, test security, data integrity, data privacy, technical quality, scoring, and reporting as appropriate for local assessments; 2. Content development for state-provided summative assessment in grades 3-8 in SLA 3. Content development for state-provided grade K-12 interim assessments in ELA/Math 4. College admission assessment contract responsible for all aspects of the college-admission assessment except client-facing management services (to be managed by the prime Contractor) 5. Content development for curriculum materials and professional learning resources in assessment & data literacy. 6. Scoring of all state-provided summative and interim assessments 7. Reporting on all state-provided summative and interim assessments. 8. Standard setting on all state-provided summative and interim assessments | IV.A,  Specifically Table 12 | 23 - 26 |
| 3 | On RFP format of Scope of Work. Are the following sections missing response boxes, i.e. RFP pg. 66: Is a response box needed for IV.R.2 Content Standards; RFP pg. 104, Is a response box needed for IV.V.3.c Quality Control Analysis? Also, per RFP pg. 96, is there a directive for how to respond for IV.W.3 irregularities? | Yes. There are some missing response boxes. They will be noted in Amendment No. 2. Please insert response boxes as follows:  **For section IV.R.2**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A3* | |  |  | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) B* | |  |   **For IV.Y.3.c** (Assuming the identified IV.V.3.c is a typo since it does not exist and Quality Control Analysis)   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A10.* | |  |   **For IV.W.3**  Section IV.W.3 is a preamble to the subsections which require responses. Responses to its subsections constitute a response to Section IV.W.3. | listed in response section |  |
| 4 | Would New Mexico PED consider a 1 – 2 week extension to the current due date in order for vendors to properly provide a response? | In Table 10, the identified due date for proposals is July 15, 2019, 12:00 p.m. NMT. | II.A | 12 |
| 5 | Can the electronic Technical Proposal be in pdf format? | Neither section of the RFP states that proposals must be in a specific file format. PED is able to open and view pdf format. | II.B.1  II.B.2 | 22 |
| 6 | Does NM PED require vendors to provide 3 additional project references in addition to the 3 projects vendors are required to submit using the Appendix E Organizational reference questionnaire Form? | No, IV.D.2 requires Offerors to provide brief descriptions, work samples, and references questionnaires (found in Appendix E) of the three similar recent previous projects. The information should include:   * Name, address, and telephone number of client/contracting agency; * Name and contact information (phone, email, address) of the client’s staff member primarily responsible for the project; * Information technology services provided (by the service group); * Dates of service/contract; * Executive summary of the work/services performed, including IT services (by service group); * Staff assigned to the work performed on the project that are proposed in response to this RFP (by service group); and * A description of how the work is similar to that described in this proposal in terms of scope, type of work performed, and complexity. | IV.D.2 | 30 - 31 |
| 7 | The description on pg. 22 listing the “Proposed Oral Presentation Outline” is different than the order in the response boxes. Question: Does it matter how a vendor lists the response per this item? Also per RFP pg. 27 and pg. 127 orals/presentation, does NMDOE request an outline or simply a compliance statement? | Please use the order presented in the response boxes.  Section III.C.1, page 27 requires an outline.  Section V.D requires a statement of understanding and a commitment to comply. | listed in response section |  |
| 8 | There are 2 Required sections to the RFP; 3-8 and 11th college entrance assessments.  Does a prime bid require that companies address both of those parts, if they prime, or is only one required to be compliant? | The prime contractor must coordinate all activities that fall under service group A1, per Table 12 of the RFP. The prime contractor will be obligated to address all components of management as specified in the footnote for Management in Table 12 of the RFP. | IV.A,  Specifically Table 12 | 12 |
| 9 | As referenced on page 11, Section I.F.1. Services to be procured and Table 9. Assessment system components to be procured via this RFP, if we are applying for grades 3-8 only, not 9-10, is it still required that we have a college admission assessment for grade 11? | No. Please note on page 28, language that indicates that, “Offerors may submit proposals covering only some groups of services…” | IV.B | 28 |
| 10 | Sec. IV.K.2. Existing state information technology systemsmakes reference to another RFP# 90-92400-19-24339 for a Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) data management solution. We were unable to find this RFP in the Link provide.  **Question**: Can you provide for clarification on where this other RFP can be found? | The RFP has closed and can now be found as “Historic Information 90-924-19-24339 Referenced in Assessment RFP.pdf” at: <http://bit.ly/NM_SPD_24665> | IV.K.2 | 54 |
| 11 | Table 11 on page 25 of the RFP shows the evolution of the grade 3-8 summative assessments for ELA/Math, transitioning from TAMELA to custom content by 2023-2024. Please confirm that the solutions described on page 54 in section IV.J such as hybrid are allowed in 2023-2024 and beyond--that 100% custom content is not required. | Yes. Custom content solutions for 2023-24 may include customized hybrid solutions. | IV.J | 54 |
| 12 | In which tab and row(s) of the Cost Proposal Workbook should offerors show licensing costs for New Meridian content? | A new row should be inserted between rows 64 and 65 on the “Base” tab of the cost proposal workbook for content licensed from New Meridian. |  |  |
| 13 | What is the difference between "custom" and "customized" in table 11 on page 25? | Per the Table Notes,  A *custom* indicates new content compatible with TAMELA (i.e., no stark difference in student experience between TAMELA and custom content).  C *customized* indicated any combination of (1) *existing* content, (2) *existing* content adapted for compatibility, or (3) *custom* content in which all content is compatible with TAMELA and custom content. | IV.A | 25 |
| 14 | In order to compare proposal costs as described on page 165 of the RFP, do all offerors need to assume the same percentage of licensed items from New Meridian through 2022-2023? | No | Appendix G | 165 |
| 15 | The RFP, on page 2 and page 11, clearly requires the use of the New Meridian content: "Note that leased items will come from the existing Contractor (New Meridian) at least for the initial years of the contract. This is not a transition activity, but an RFP requirement to procure the content to be used in the first few years." Does the State have established pricing with New Meridian for this to ensure all potential bidders have fair and consistent costs included for the required New Meridian content? | It is up to Offeror to negotiate a leased price. | I.F.1 | 11 |
| 16 | Please clarify how many schools and districts contractor can expect to ship test materials to and retrieve from. | There are 89 districts, 53 state charter schools operating as their own district, and 41 BIE schools (should they choose to participate in the contract). Some district charters may request to have materials sent straight to their school. There are 46 district charters in the state. Numbers for shipping materials of various assessments may be different due to varying grade levels taught at charter & BIE schools. See chart of schools at end of RFP. | I.E.I | 9-10 |
| 17 | Notwithstanding the vision statement of the Sec. of Education concerning a balanced assessment system, have funds been appropriated to cover the cost for the development and administration of the *Optional* Interim Assessments in Years 1-5 of the contract? If not, how will technical points be awarded (if at all) for articulating a parallel plan to fulfill the vision for the optional balanced assessment system? | These components are optional because PED does not have an expected range of cost and thus cannot confirm whether costs will be within the range of appropriations for statewide assessment. In addition, funding for statewide assessment can vary significantly based on many factors outside PED control. Being optional allows for response to potential changes in appropriations over time. | I.E.2  I.F.1  Table 9 | 10-11 |
| 18 | Given that New Mexico desires that the summative assessment at grade 11 “focus on college admission requirements,” do you anticipate that the interim assessments for grades 11 and 12 will be aligned to college admission content frameworks? | The idea is to balance the alignment to New Mexico Common Core State Standards in grades 11 and 12 to complement the narrower coverage of a college admission assessment. | IV.F | 36 |
| 19 | Will New Mexico expect a Fall 2019 test administration delivery? | Yes, but it will be administered through the current Contractor and is not a part of this RFP. | IV.L | 56 |
| 20 | *Calculation Device (Calculator Sections of Math) v: Before Testing:**Materials: Pop-up calculators (compatible with TI and Desmos)*  Regarding the statement “compatible with TI and Desmos” – do both TI and Desmos versions need to be offered in the online system? | Yes. Both are preferred, but Offeror may indicate availability per category, CAP, AWD, and NAP per page 42. | IV.H.3  Table 17 | 43 |
| 21 | Should due date for Fully Functional practice test be Oct 1 2019 instead of 2020? | Yes, this should be Oct 1, 2019. Please see Amendment No. 2. | IV.L | 56 |
| 22 | Does the state have a milestone due date for when the test administration portal should be available to allow administrators to add and edit students and create test sessions and technology? | This date will be negotiated with the Contractor once the contract has been awarded. | IV.L | 56 |
| 23 | Does the state have a milestone due date for when the student testing application should be available to install on student test devices? | PED does not have a milestone due date. However, the practice test requirement states “The Offeror is responsible to create fully operational practice tests for summative assessments so that all students can experience an authentic testing event and their teachers can see how students interact with the test administration platform.” The milestone date for the practice test is October 1, 2019. | IV.EE.3.b. | 121 |
| 24 | Please identify the applicable service groups for IV.R.2. Content Standards requirement. | Offeror Response boxes have been added to Amendment No. 2 with the following service groups identified.  **For section IV.R.2**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A3* | |  |  | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) B* | |  | | IV.R.2 | 66 |
| 25 | Are manuals intended to be online only or hardcopy? | Both. As noted in Table 19, hardcopy manuals are due to arrive in district by March 23, 2020. | IV.L  IV.V.4 | 56  93 |
| 26 | Please identify the applicable service groups for IV.Y.3.c Quality control analyses requirement. | **For IV.Y.3.c**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A10.* | |  |   Noted in Amendment No. 2. | IV.Y.3.c | 104 |
| 27 | Between sections IV.AA.4. Consideration of Audiences  & IV.AA.8. Parent Reports there is reference that parent reports are to be in paper form, and a statement that the parent reports are printed by districts or schools.  Will the State confirm that all reports will be either electronic from the vendor or printed by district/school staff? | Summative ISRs must be printed and shipped hard copy to districts/schools. Districts can also print additional copies of summative ISRs for their use. Interim reports should include a printable option for LEA use, which could also extend to sharing with parents. Both Summative and Interim results should be available via an online portal/data dashboard. See Amendment No. 2. | IV.AA.4  IV.AA.8 | 111 - 113 |
| 28 | Please clarify what the requirement is with respect to the OFFEROR RESPONSE, Applicable to service groups G1, G2, and D7 for IV.BB. Test and Data Security, Data Integrity, and Data Privacy. | This response box was inserted inadvertently. It may be ignored.  See Amendment No. 2. | IV.BB | 115 |
| 29 | There are “Emergency test booklet” volumes to be estimated, yet nothing in the RFP to define specifications for the forms.  Please clarify the expectation for Emergency Forms. | The emergency test form shares the same specifications with all other forms and will specifically address this element:   * Enough forms to avoid catastrophic effects of item exposure (for fixed form testing and multistage adaptive testing) | IV.R.7 | 69 |
| 30 | Page 22 of the RFP states: “One redacted original should be submitted and one (5) electronic copies of the proposal containing ONLY the Redacted Technical Proposal on a separate USB flash drive.” Please confirm we are required to submit one redacted original and one electronic copy, not 5 electronic copies. | Only one redacted electronic copy is required. Please see Amendment No. 2. | III.B.1 | 22 |
| 31 | As stated in the RFP, PED requires each proposer’s references to complete and sign Appendix E, Organizational Reference Questionnaire. We are happy to provide the contact information for the states in which we currently deliver assessments. However, an increasing number of states do not want to provide written references in response to other state RFPs and prefer to do so over the phone. Taking this into account, would PED consider allowing proposers to provide the contact information of references that are unable to return a written reference? | Offerors are required to submit APPENDIX E: Organizational reference questionnaire to the business references listed in this section for independent completion by the business reference. It is the Offeror’s responsibility to ensure the completed forms are received on or before for inclusion in the evaluation process.  Organizational References that are not received or are not complete may adversely affect the Offeror’s score in the evaluation process. | IV.D.2 | 30-31 |
| 32 | Will PED make available engine training and validation samples for open-ended items in the PARCC tests, which will enable automated scoring in the first year of test administration? | New Meridian will provide hand-scoring training materials for human scored items from the licensed bank. Hand-scoring training materials will include the available rubric, anchor, practice, and qualification sets, and calibration and validity responses as approved by New Meridian’s affiliate states.  Materials are provided in the following formats:   * Anchor, practice, and qualification annotations are Word or PDF or in individual html docs for each response. * Annotations for validity or calibration are html documents.   Responses for math are available as .png files and responses for ELA are available as .html files. |  |  |
| 33 | The RFP is unclear as to what role the contractor will have related to the summative college admission test. For example, in Table 11 on page 25 of the RFP, it appears the prime contractor will be responsible for this test under the base contract costs. However, page 24 of the RFP also states: “College admission assessment contractor responsible for all aspects of the college-admission assessment except client-facing management services (to be managed by the prime Contractor)”. Could you elaborate on what role the contractor will have regarding the college admission assessment? What is meant by the “client-facing management services”? | This means that it is highly preferred that the college admission assessment contractor subcontract to the contractor responsible for service group A, where the prime contractor is responsible for management of the contract and oversees the work of the college admission assessment contractor responsible for service group D.  Client-facing management services indicate all management services under service group A1 that primarily interact with the client. This is to reduce the number of primary points of contact for NMPED. However, NMPED reserves the right to direct communications with the college admission contractor, keeping the prime contractor apprised of such communication. | IV.A | 23-26 |
| 34 | Is it PED’s expectation that the contractor will be required to subcontract with existing college admission vendors (i.e., ACT and/or SAT) and that those college admission tests will be administered, scored, and reported on the contractor’s platform? | No. The only part of the college admission assessment subcontract that the prime contractor will be responsible for is service group A1. | IV.A | 23-26 |
| 35 | Will PED be responsible for licensing the Year 1 PARCC test items, or will the contractor? | As noted in footnote 3, the vendor is responsible for licensing the items from New Meridian. | I.F.2 | 11 |
| 36 | Does PED have an existing contract with New Meridian that would allow for the new contractor to have access to the items for use in New Mexico or would the new contractor need to contract with New Meridian directly? | As noted in footnote 3, PED is requesting the Offeror lease the items directly from New Meridian. | I.F.2 | 11 |
| 37 | If an alternative/value-added option is proposed, can the proposed options be described throughout the proposal with a summary of the alternative in Section IV.M.3, or would PED request that the entire alternative proposed option be described completely within Section IV.M.3? | Yes, the proposed options should be described throughout the proposal with a summary of the alternative in Section IV.M.3. | IV.M.3 | 58 |
| 38 | Section IV.S.8 of the RFP states: “PED desires to use a mix of procured and commissioned stimuli, weighted toward the option that is the most cost effective, with the additional requirement that there must be at least one (1) commissioned stimulus on any assessment that uses stimuli.” Does this mean that each student must see one commissioned stimulus (e.g., each form must contain one)? Or does it mean that there must be at least one commissioned stimulus per grade available in the ELA pool? | Each student must see at least one commissioned passage. | IV.S.8 | 76 |
| 39 | The table in section IV.R.6 which is related to the procedural approach to testing does not include the summative college admissions test.  Should Offeror include a response for this section if they are including a summative college admissions test in their response? | As indicated in the Offeror Response box, this section is applicable to service groups A3, B, C1, C2, D2, A6, and D3. | IV.R.6 | 69 |
| 40 | For this section, Optional Technical Assistant, is a response/proposal required?  If a response is required, who will determine if the option is exercised and when?  Will these positions be considered employees of PED or the Offeror? | The Offeror must provide a proposal for both options cited. The Assessment Director will determine if the option is exercised during contract negotiations. As noted, Offeror must acknowledge that the Offeror will be responsible for all costs for the two positions making the positions employees of the Offeror. | IV.DD | 117 |
| 41 | The Volume of Valid scores chart reflects a testing volume of approximately 9,000 for grade 11, however, enrollment for 11th grade is approximately 23,000.  Can you confirm the estimated testing volume for 11th grade college admissions exam? | In the Spring 2018 test administration, 22,659 11th graders took the ELA 11 assessment. Table 15 has been amended. Please see Amendment No. 2. | IV.H.2 | 41 |
| 42 | IV.R.2 Content standards; IV.S.11.e; IV.W.3.c Disaster planning and recovery -  these response items have no corresponding text boxes.  Should vendors respond to these items?  If so, which service groups? | **For section IV.R.2**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A3* | |  |  | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) B* | |  |   For IV.S.11.e and IV.W.3.c, the text directly following the header is a preamble to the subsections. Responding to the subsections is sufficient. | IV.R.2 | 66 |
| 43 | IV.FF.1 Documentation; IV.FF.2; IV.FF.3 Service groups missing from some text boxes *“Applicable to service group(s) <insert applicable service group labels here>”* | This was intentional. The Offeror should indicate what service groups their responses apply to. This may require multiple Offeror response boxes. | IV.FF.1-3 | 121-126 |
| 44 | Section IV.L says that there will be a fall testing window for seniors who need to retake the assessment in order to graduate. Will students be required to earn a certain score on the college entrance exam in order to meet graduation requirements? If so, what is the first cohort that will be required to meet this requirement? | This is yet to be determined. | IV.L | 56 |
| 45 | Is the attached Sample Contract (Appendix C: Information Technology Agreement) intended to be the template PED expects to use in connection with contracting for assessment services? If yes, should we submit deviations for those provisions which are not applicable to our proposed services? | The attached Sample Contract (Appendix C) was provided as the beginning of a template. PED recognizes that some deviations will be necessary. Deviations should be submitted in the proposals. The final contract will be based on the template and the proposal. |  |  |
| 46 | Do the approximate milestones for the Spring 2020 administrations also apply to the optional 9th/10th grade ELA/Math summative assessments.  The narrative below the chart notes that the dates listed are for 3-8 testing. | There are stages identified for each school year for the 9-10 ELA/Math Summative Assessment that align to the stages of the required 3-8 ELA/Math Summative Assessment. Footnote A simply states that this will set the baseline for the new assessment system. | IV.A  Table 11 | 25 |
| 47 | Is the desire/intent of the 9th/10th grade summative assessments to be aligned to the 3-8 summative assessments and be customized over time from the TAMELA? | As shown in Table 11, the Stage in Evolution cell is combined for grades 3-8 and 9-10 summative assessments because the desire/intent is for the assessments to be aligned. | IV.A  Table 11 | 25 |
| 48 | If the state adopts an Offeror’s 9th and/or 10th grade summative assessment(s) will all districts/school be required to participate in the assessment(s)? | Table 11 shows this is a district option. | IV.A  Table 11 | 25 |
| 49 | Will PED consider an off-the-shelf assessment for the 9th/10th grade summative assessment? | The 9-10 summative assessment is to be *custom*, indicating new content compatible with TAMELA. PED will also consider an off-the-shelf assessment compatible with the college entrance exam as a cost-savings option. | IV.A  Table 11 | 25 |
| 50 | Can an offeror propose a different psychometric model for the college admission component? | Yes | IV.Y | 103 |
| 51 | Currently, a college admissions exam is an alternative to meeting the state’s graduation requirements. Since the state plans to move to the use of a college admissions exam, will there be alternative assessments/options? If so, what are they? | This is to be determined, but if an assessment requirement remains, the alternative options addressed in current graduation manuals will remain viable. | IV.L | 56 |
| 52 | When would PED be able to provide a full list of schools that would be required to administer the college admissions component in Spring 2020? | A complete list of 218 high schools can be generated upon award of the contract. Until then please see Amendment No. 2 which has a corrected Table 15 that shows approximately 22,000 eleventh graders who participated in the ELA assessment in 2018. | IV.H.2  Table 15 | 41 |
| 53 | Please clarify PED's visions for the assessment system across grades 9, 10 and 11 given that the 9th and 10th grade assessments are optional. | The PED’s vision is that students will progress toward college readiness in grades 9 and 10, with college readiness being assessed in the grade 11 college entrance exam. The PED will encourage districts to assess students in grades 9 and 10 in order to ensure they are on track toward grade 11 goals, but the stakeholder input provided to the task force was for a smaller assessment footprint in the state, and for the assessments of students in grades 9 and 10 to be left to local decision-makers. | IV.F | 36 |
| 54 | Renaissance Learning’s Star assessments are currently included on the list of 2018-2019 Preferred Statewide Formative Assessments.  Can you confirm if this list will be extended into the 2019-2020 school year? If not, is the purpose of the preferred formative assessment list now encompassed by RFP# 90-924-19-24665 for Grade 3-8 and High School General Populations Assessments? | No, the 2018-2019 list is not extended beyond the end of the school year. | IV.F | 35 |
| 55 | Table 11 on page 25 of the RFP requires custom field test content for grades 3-8, 9 and 10 for language arts and mathematics summative assessments in year 1. Due to the short-turn around in year 1, will PED consider licensing vendor-owned items for field testing in year 1 as a compliant solution? If not, and the vendor proposes rapid item development, will PED recruit educators for item review meetings that would need to take place in Oct/Nov 2019 for items to be field tested in spring 2020? | PED still requires custom-developed items to be field tested in Spring 2020. PED will assist with the recruitment of educators for item review committees. | IV.S.11.a | 81 |
| 56 | Are socio-emotional assessments and formative assessments part of this procurement? If not, are those expected to be separate future procurements? To what extent should proposals address these types of assessment? | Expansion beyond assessments of academic achievement to address the whole child by measuring non-academic components of 21st century skills often labeled as socioemotional learning, soft skills, or wellbeing to create a holistic picture of each child will take time.  The evolution to cover the whole child will need further fleshing out with PED and its stakeholders to define the expanded and more holistic system. The response requires a proposal for managing that evolution over time. | IV.F | 36 |
| 57 | The RFP references student “engagement” and “wellbeing.” However, it is unclear what sort of engagement and wellbeing (i.e., physical, emotional, social, cognitive) this entails. Would the PED please clarify which non-academic constructs the system should prioritize? | Offeror should propose assessments that address bulleted list in the RFP. | IV.F | 35-36 |
| 58 | Does the PED have any current initiatives focused on specific non-academic constructs that the State would like to see integrated into a new assessment system? | No, PED does not. |  |  |
| 59 | Would the PED be open to an SEL system that also asked teachers to report briefly on the SEL characteristics of their students—or is this procurement limited to student-completed measures? | Yes | IV.F | 36 |
| 60 | Regarding the process for securing New Meridian content in Year 1, can the PED confirm that New Mexico will establish identical contract terms to be used by all prospective vendors in Year 1? | As noted in footnote 3, PED is requesting the Offeror lease the items directly from New Meridian. | I.F.2 | 11 |
| 61 | Would the PED expand on the State’s goals for K–2, particularly given the significant EL population? | The State’s goals for K-2 students is that they are performing at grade level and on track to be proficient in math and ELA in 3rd grade, and that ELs are making progress toward proficiency. The K-2 assessment should predict with some degree of accuracy how students will perform when they reach 3rd grade and take the 3-8 assessment. |  |  |
| 62 | Would the PED please provide the n-counts by grade level for the Spanish Language Arts enrollment? | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Grade** | **# Students Tested** | | 3 | 1099 | | 4 | 756 | | 5 | 236 | | 6 | 210 | | 7 | 233 | | 8 | 246 | | 11 | 529 |   The above numbers reflect the number of Spanish Reading assessments administered in Spring 2018. |  |  |
| 63 | Does the Model Instructional Unit involve curriculum materials/development? | Yes | IV.F | 35 |
| 64 | Does the PED expect that the local K–12 platform be different than the summative platform? Could the local K–12 platform be designed as an extension of the summative platform? | The local K-12 platform should be the same as the summative platform. The intention is for the student experience to be substantially similar to how they interact with the platform administering secure assessments. | IV.A | 24 |
| 65 | The RFP states, “Additionally, the prime contractor must receive approval, in writing, from the Agency awarding any resultant contract, before any subcontractor is used during the term of this agreement.”  If a subcontractor is named in the proposal, and a contract is awarded, will that mean that written approval has been granted to use those subcontractors? | Yes, if that subcontractor is named for any awarded service group. | II.C.4 | 15 |
| 66 | The RFP states, “The contract between an agency and a Contractor will follow the format specified by the Agency and contain the terms and conditions set forth in Sample Contract (APPENDIX C: Sample contract).”  The Sample contract includes language options. Should the Offeror identify which option applies with its proposal response? If not, how will choices be determined? | The sample contract is provided solely as an example. The language will be developed on the basis of the RFP and the proposal through contract negotiations. | II.C.15 | 17 |
| 67 | Please confirm that the Contractor can share confidential information with a subcontractor or any other third-party named in the proposal, without needing to obtain Agency’s written permission, provided the confidential information is related to the work that the subcontractor or third party is performing. | This is correct, with the understanding that the prime contractor is fully responsible for the continued confidentiality of all confidential information shared with the third party and that the third party is bound by the confidentiality requirement. | II.C.25 | 18 |
| 68 | The RFP states that the “Offeror must agree to advise all employees of the availability of State publicly financed health care overage by providing each employee with, as a minimum the following we site link to additional information.”  Please confirm that this refers to employees that are residents of New Mexico and work in New Mexico—not employees that live in another state and work in New Mexico for at least 20 hours per week over a six-month period for the duration of contract. | This only applies to employees who work and/or reside in New Mexico. | II.C.28 | 19 |
| 69 | The RFP states, “One redacted original should be submitted and one (5) electronic copies of the proposal containing ONLY the Redacted Technical Proposal on a separate USB flash drive.”  Should Offerors submit one (1) or five (5) redacted electronic copies (i.e., flash drives)? | Only one redacted electronic copy is required. Please see Amendment No. 2. | III.B.1 | 22 |
| 70 | For the local K–12 platform listed in Table 11, there is requirements gathering (RG) in 2019–20. Would the PED please provide more information on the high-level intent for the platform in terms of what content it might be designed to deliver? For example, in the future, might any of the interims, or components such as SEL and formative assessment, be delivered on that platform? Would it be expected for Offerors to include an item bank such that educators could build their own interim or formative assessments? Would the data, reporting, or any other functionality be expected to integrate with the summative platform? | Yes, it could integrate. | IV.A  Table 11 | 25 |
| 71 | How many items are in the current New Mexico item bank that will need to be migrated to the new vendor? | Based on the projected TAMELA test design for Spring 2020 represented by the **high-level blueprints**, offerors should be prepared to ingest at a minimum the following item counts to the support 5 licensed operational forms per grade for ELA and 5 forms per grade for Mathematics\*:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **ELA** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | | SP20 Operational TAMELA Items | 90 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Math** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **Alg1** | **Geo** | | SP20 Operational TAMELA Items | 165 | 155 | 155 | 145 | 155 | 150 | 140 | 145 |   \*Note that TAMELA is planning the reuse of two accommodated versions per subject area from the Spring 2019 assessment.  Migrated item counts past Spring 2020 will be dependent upon the Offeror’s TAMELA transition plan. |  |  |
| 72 | How many forms per grade per content area, and how many items per form, are on the current TAMELA assessments? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | The following are **high-level blueprints** that reflect general item counts for the Spring 2020 TAMELA assessments. Note that specific item counts may vary by form since the blueprints are based on a total number of points.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Subject** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | **ELA** | | **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | | Spring 2020 TAMELA Operational Items per Form | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Subject** | **M** | **M** | **M** | **M** | **M** | **M** | **Alg1** | **Geo** | | **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **HS** | **HS** | | Spring 2020 TAMELA Operational Items per Form | 33 | 31 | 31 | 29 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 29 |   The operational forms per grade projected for the Spring 2020 TAMELA assessments are:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **ELA** | **Math** | | Non-Accomm\_1 | Checkmark | Checkmark | | Non-Accomm\_2 | Checkmark | Checkmark | | Accomm\_1\* | Checkmark | Checkmark |   \*Note that TAMELA is planning the reuse of two accommodated versions per subject area from the Spring 2019 assessment. | |  |  |
| 73 | In what format (e.g., XML, QTI) will the new vendor receive the items? | QTI content packages provided by New Meridian will be validated against the IMS PARCC APIP profile. Details of the requirements are posted to the IMS Global site at https://www.imsglobal.org/ims-parcc-apip-profile . Content packages will include the IMS Global validation report for each QTI package. |  |  |
| 74 | Regarding item transformation costs, who will be responsible for the costs of transforming New Meridian items exported in Year 1, where necessary? | Awarded offeror would be responsible for this cost |  |  |
| 75 | Page 29 states that “any contract(s) awarded based on this RFP will be an agreement solely between PED and the Contractor(s) to whom the contract(s) are awarded. No contracted services will be available for use by any other NM state government agency.”  However, page 33 of Section IV.E.2 states, “With regard to the work performed on any contract resulting from this RFP, PED, GSD are together the sole client of all Contractor(s) (outside the business relationships among themselves on the resulting contract). All Contractor(s) must treat PED and GSD as its sole client as described.”  Would the PED please clarify why Section IV.B states only PED, while Section IV.E.2 states that both PED and GSD are the sole client? | The General Services Department (GSD) serves as the official buyer for every contract made with any state agency, including the PED, but the contracted services are provided directly to the agency listed in the contract as THE AGENCY, in this case, the PED. | IV.E.2 | 33 |
| 76 | Will the PED provide the braille and large print student counts by grade level and content area? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Content/Grade Grade/** | **Large Print** | **Braille** | | ELA 3 | 6 | 3 | | ELA 4 | 7 | 1 | | ELA 5 | 4 | 3 | | ELA 6 | 8 | 1 | | ELA 7 | 8 | 2 | | ELA 8 | 3 | 6 | | ELA 11 | 6 | 1 | | Math 3 | 7 | 3 | | Math 4 | 7 | 1 | | Math 5 | 5 | 2 | | Math 6 | 8 | 1 | | Math 7 | 8 | 2 | | Math 8 | 3 | 3 | | Alg 2 & Geo | 10 | 1 |   The above chart shows the number of assessments taken in the Spring 2018 administration. |  |  |
| 77 | Besides the grades 3–8 summative assessments, what other assessments require braille and large print paper forms? | All summative assessments should be available in braille and large print. | IV.H.3 | 42 |
| 78 | Which accessibility features described in Table 17 apply to the Spanish Language Arts assessments? | All of them. PED understands there may be limitations on some features being applicable. | IV.H.3 | 42 |
| 79 | Which, if any, of the accessibility features listed does the PED intend to be a requirement? For example, both ASL and closed captioning availability are part of this list. If available, does the PED also want the vendor to provide ASL and closed-captioning costs as part of the ELA and mathematics summative program base pricing? | The current State academic assessments for the general student population have many existing accessibility features. It is of critical importance that the range of accessibility features not be significantly reduced. Yes, ASL video and closed captioning costs should be part of the ELA and mathematics summative program base pricing. | IV.H.3 | 42 |
| 80 | Please confirm that the Offeror is not liable for disclosure of items or scores by New Mexico educators and PED staff. | The Offeror is not liable for disclosure of items or scores by New Mexico educators and PED staff. | IV.S | 76 |
| 81 | Bullet 5 of the RFP states, “Ensuring that copyright permissions will be owned by the PED.” In this context, what does “own” mean regarding third-party copyright permissions?  Bullet 6 of the RFP states, “Ensuring that copyright permission agreements will be sufficiently lengthy to ensure the ability to use items based on the stimuli for many cycles of testing.” How long should third-party-owned passages and stimuli permissions be secured for? | PED will hold the copyright permissions in addition to or rather than the contractor.  10 Years. | IV.S.8 | 77 |
| 82 | Please advise how long the PED anticipates needing to use Leased (licensed) items and third-party-owned passages and stimuli for which permissions are obtained. | PED anticipates using licensed items through school year 2022-23.  PED requests to have permission for the use of third-party & stimuli items for a period of 10 years. | IV.A | 25  Table 11 |
| 83 | The RFP states, “The evidence must include all studies by third parties addressing alignment to standards that deviate only minimally form the CCSS for Evaluation Committee review.”  What is the timeframe for these studies? Does this refer to all studies by third parties within the past year? | The timeframe includes all third-party alignment studies that were conducted on the assessment as it currently exists (i.e., those studies that are still applicable regardless of when the study was conducted). | IV.U.1 | 91 |
| 84 | Does the PED require the vendor to print and ship any assessment manuals to districts and schools, or will these materials be PDF documents downloadable from the online system? | DTC manuals and Test Administrator manuals should be printed and shipped, at a minimum. | IV.V.4 | 93 |
| 85 | Does the PED have preferences regarding the type of manuals offered? | Manuals should address all of the following; at a minimum:   * Early preparation (e.g., IT infrastructure, IEP designations, registration, requesting accessibility features) * Near term preparation (e.g., IT preparations, preparing the testing environment) * Test security (e.g., chain of custody, security agreements, monitoring administration, reporting violations) * Assessment integrity (e.g., appropriate and inappropriate behavior before, during, and after testing) * Test administration (e.g., IT management, progress monitoring, error reporting) * Help desk and FAQs * Crisis management * Post-test procedures: packing, shipping, and disposal of paper-based scorables and non-scorables (including non-secure materials, scratch paper, etc.) | IV.V.4 | 93 |
| 86 | The RFP states, “Offeror must grant the external evaluator free access to observe all aspects of standard setting, standards validation, and/or standards projections, including being notified of and invited to all public meetings, stakeholder meetings and any ad hoc or planned private meetings among Offeror staff or between Offeror staff and PED staff that take place in conjunction with the work.”  Please confirm that the external evaluator will sign a Contractor’s NDA prior to attending any meetings. | Yes, the external evaluator will be required to sign a Contractor’s NDA prior to attending any meetings. | IV.Z.7 | 110 |
| 87 | Please confirm if the vendor needs to print and ship the summative and/or interim reports to schools for distribution to parents. If print reports are required to be shipped, does the PED require the reports in black and white or in color? | Yes, the vendor needs to print and ship the summative reports to schools for distribution to parents. The reports should be in color.  OR  Summative ISRs must be printed and shipped hard copy to districts/schools. Districts can also print additional copies of summative ISRs for their use. Interim reports should include a printable option for LEA use, which could also extend to sharing with parents. Both Summative and Interim results should be available via a secure online portal/data dashboard. See Amendment No. 2. | IV.AA.4  IV.AA.8 | 111-113 |
| 88 | Does this requirement imply that vendors should provide a separate parent/student portal? If so, what information should students and parents be able to access through that portal? | Yes. Portal content of summative and interim results should include but is not limited to:   * Student performance level * Comparisons to other students in school, district, and state * How far student is from a given performance level * Identified skills or concept to target for improvement * Performance over time/growth data | IV.AA.3 | 111 |
| 89 | The following statements regarding curriculum materials and professional learning resources appear to be identical: “Provide access to curriculum materials, a plan for adapting them for New Mexico (including an outline of all components of the curriculum materials and the associated content of the curriculum) and a timeline for handing off the curriculum materials to the Contractor responsible for delivery infrastructure and stakeholder support as described in section I.F.1.”  The RFP also states: “Provide access to professional learning resources, a plan for adapting them for New Mexico (including an outline of all components of the professional learning resources and the associated content of the curriculum), and a timeline for handing off the professional learning resources to the Contractor responsible for delivery infrastructure and stakeholder support as described in section I.F.1.”  Would the PED please clarify the difference between these two statements? | These are inadvertent duplicates subsections of section IV.EE.2. Please respond to only the first. The second may be deleted. | IV.EE.2 | 118 |
| 90 | The RFP states, “Offerors must have the ability to secure a Performance Surety Bond.”  How is the amount of the bond calculated? Would the PED provide an estimate for the carrying costs associated with securing a bond? | We cannot provide an amount that will be required. Offeror needs to confirm that one can be secured if needed. | VI.B | 127 |
| 91 | What is the anticipated transition period when the contract expires? | 3-6 months | Article 7 – Termination Management, number 6 | 138 |
| 92 | Does the Offeror’s obligation exclude third-party claims arising out of negligent acts or omissions of the Procuring Agency, the State of New Mexico, Public Education Department and General Services Department and its employees? | Yes, if the third party claim arises out of negligent actions of the state the offeror’s obligation would be nullified. | Article 8 | 139 |
| 93 | Will all contracted vendors be asked to sign a Contractor’s NDA? | Yes, all contracted vendors will be asked to sign the Contractor’s NDA. | Article 15 – Independent Verification and Validation | 141 |
| 94 | Regarding 26.A, please confirm that the PE250 form is required if a company has 250 employees, regardless if any of them reside in New Mexico.  Regarding 26.B, please advise what the size requirement is for a subcontractor to meet. Is this number specific to employees that reside in New Mexico? | The PE250 form is not needed by subcontractors unless that subcontractor has New Mexico employees. | Article 27 | 143 |
| 95 | PED has indicated that Off-the-shelf products that meet the requirements are acceptable solutions. However, numerous requirements for C1 and C2 are dedicated to the development of new assessments, such as IV.S.10 Item Writing Workshops. Is it acceptable to explain the development processes, research, etc. that an existing off-the-shelf assessment vendor followed? | Yes, as long as they meet the requirements, including requirements for cultural responsiveness. | IV.J | 54 |
| 96 | What does “customizable” mean to the NM PED? What is the minimal amount of customization that would be acceptable to the department? | The amount of customization is negotiable and to be determined. | IV.J | 54 |
| 97 | Will the state consider an existing off-the-shelf interim assessment that can prove sufficient coverage of CCSS without the use of constructed response items? | Yes, so long as evidence is provided that there is sufficient coverage of NMCCSS. | IV.S.10 | 80 |
| 98 | Would PED please clarify the differences between the interim and formative assessments in the vision statement? If they are two different assessment systems, are vendors expected to support the formative assessments? | The RFP solicits Offerors for the creation of interim assessments, not formative assessments. Formative assessment is a process that is carried out by local educators to fit the unique needs of their specific group of students.  The RFP is asking for an Offeror to provide assessment literacy resources that includes understanding of formative processes for purposes of professional development.  The RFP is not asking for offeror(s) to develop formative tools or resources. | IV.F | 35-36 |
| 99 | Page 30, IV.D. Corporate capacity and qualifications: Are the corporate capacity and qualifications to be completed by organizations other than the prime? | Yes. Subcontractors must be able to demonstrate their corporate capacity and qualifications for the work for which they are bid. | IV.D | 30 |
| 100 | Page 30, IV.D.2. Organizational references from similar projects: Should subcontractors also provide the requested business references? | A minimum of three references are required for the Offeror. | Appendix E | 153 |
| 101 | Page 31, IV.D.3. Terminated, expired, and non-renewed projects: Does this section apply only to the prime? | No. This should also be provided for subcontractors regarding work similar to that which is proposed for the subcontractor. | IV.D.3 | 31 |
| 102 | Page 32, IV.E.1.c. Identified key staff: roles, responsibilities, experience, and qualifications: Please clarify that a separate Offeror response box should be included for each key staff person named in the proposal and that the resume should be included within the response box rather than as part of a collection of staff resumes. | This is correct, with the caveat that within the response box, a resume within a collection may be provided as an appendix and may be pointed to within the response box. If this option is exercised, the relevant sections of the resume should still be highlighted. | IV.E.1.c | 32 |
| 103 | Pages 35-37, IV.F. (Assessment system vision and design) and Pages 38-39, IV.H. (Assessment system key characteristics): Page 35 describes the intent of the K-2 assessments to be diagnostic interims whereas page 39 describes other characteristics of the interim assessments including monitor within- and across-year longitudinal trend data for criterion- and norm-referenced performance, support the calculation of student growth, and predict student performance on the summative assessments. Which of the characteristics of the interim assessments listed on page 39 apply to the K-2 interim diagnostic assessments? | All of them to the extent possible, pending on solution being proposed | IV.H | 39 |
| 104 | Page 80, IV.S.10. Item writing workshops: If customized item development is part of the proposed solution, is item development through item writing workshops required? | Yes, item writing committees will be composed of New Mexico educators. | IV.S.9.b.ii | 79 |
| 105 | Page 82, IV.S.11.b. Internal review: Please clarify the expectation for PED review subsequent to internal review and prior to the what is meant by Initial Review. Is that review internal to PED prior to the initial review by the content review committee? | That review is the contractor’s internal review of items and stimuli produced by item writers and stimulus writers before those stimuli and items are reviewed by committees of educators. | IV.S.11.b | 82 |
| 106 | Page 82, IV.S.11.c.i. Identifying and recruiting review committee facilitators: Is it PED's intent that committee facilitators should not be Offeror staff members, such as by recruiting and utilizing New Mexico educators to serve as committee facilitators? Or, can an Offeror propose using its staff members in committee facilitation roles? | Committee facilitators may be Offeror staff members. | IV.S.11.c.i | 82 |
| 107 | Page 87, IV.S.11.e.v. Committee workshop logistics: In the final dot point, it says, "Participants shall be seated in rounds with at least two groups of five for each grade level per content area." Is PED open to other proposals for numbers of groups and/or numbers of participants for each grade level per content area? | Yes | IV.S.11.e.v | 87 |
| 108 | A response box was not provided in the RFP. We’ve inserted one for our reply, please advise on the applicable service group(s). Is it A10 and D5, like the previous two sections? | **For IV.Y.3.c**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A10.* | |  |   Noted in Amendment No. 2. | IV.Y.3.c | 104 |
| 109 | The RFP references instructions for completing the cost proposal, provided as Attachment B in a separate Microsoft® Word document. We cannot locate Attachment B. Could you please provide this document? | The instructions for completing the cost proposal is located at <http://bit.ly/NM_SPD_24665>. |  |  |
| 110 | Will any of the high school summative tests be required for graduation? If so, which tests will be required for graduation? | It has not been determined if the assessment will remain a graduation requirement. | IV.L | 56 |
| 111 | Please provide the RFP for the COTS data management solution. The RFP no longer appears on the procurement Web site. | The RFP has closed and can now be found as “Historic Information 90-924-19-24339 Referenced in Assessment RFP.pdf” at: <http://bit.ly/NM_SPD_24665> | IV.K.2 | 54 |
| 112 | The PED defines specific requirements for workshops and webinars for the first year of implementation of a new system. Please define any requirements PED has for subsequent years. | PED would require a minimum of 2 webinars and 2 in person trainings following the implementation year. This answer is only relevant to the information provided in Section IV.V.5. | IV.V.5 | 94 |
| 113 | Please confirm that lines 171 and 176 of the budget workbook should be labeled “Handscored extended CR” | In the cost proposal workbook there are two places where there are two consecutive rows labeled “Handscored short CR”. The second of each set of such consecutive rows should be labeled “Handscored extended CR.” | Budget Workbook |  |
| 114 | Is the Offeror responsible for mileage reimbursement, stipend/reimbursement, or lodging for attendees at the face-to-face training meetings? | The Offeror is responsible for the following, located on page 87, along with other items in the bulleted list:  Hosting the meeting (including procuring meeting space and all logistics)   * Travel and lodging costs at state rates for Offeror staff and participants as needed. Mileage reimbursement rates are established by the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) and can be found at: http://www.nmdfa.state.nm.us/ * Communicating reimbursable expenses and limits to committee members * Paying up to $125 daily stipends for review committee members who attend review workshops OR substitute reimbursement. | IV.S.11.e.v | 87 |
| 115 | Please provide the Help Desk call volume by month for July 2018 – June 2019) for the current ELA and Math 3-8 program. | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Month** | **Calls Offered** | **Emails Contacts** | **Web Contacts** | **Chats Contacts** | **Total Contacts** | |  | **Queue Interactions** | **Email Offered** | **Web Offered** | **Chat Offered** |  | | October | 96 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 110 | | November | 211 | 0 | 6 | 35 | 252 | | December | 90 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 102 | | January | 19 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 32 | | February | 75 | 1 | 3 | 24 | 103 | | March | 157 | 0 | 3 | 35 | 195 | | April | 894 | 2 | 15 | 145 | 1056 | | May | 193 | 2 | 3 | 39 | 237 | | June | 15 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 23 | | IV.EE.3 | 119 |
| 116 | How many students will require braille, large print, and Spanish translations? | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Content/Grade Grade/** | **Large Print** | **Braille** | **Spanish** | | ELA 3 | 6 | 3 | NA | | ELA 4 | 7 | 1 | NA | | ELA 5 | 4 | 3 | NA | | ELA 6 | 8 | 1 | NA | | ELA 7 | 8 | 2 | NA | | ELA 8 | 3 | 6 | NA | | ELA 11 | 6 | 1 | NA | | Math 3 | 7 | 3 | 645 | | Math 4 | 7 | 1 | 479 | | Math 5 | 5 | 2 | 155 | | Math 6 | 8 | 1 | 163 | | Math 7 | 8 | 2 | 206 | | Math 8 | 3 | 3 | 222 | | Alg 2 & Geo | 10 | 1 | 367 |   The above chart shows the number of assessments taken in the Spring 2018 administration. |  |  |
| 117 | Is there a specific requirement for the number of mathematics tools that should be created?  Are these tools available only for paper testers?  What is the anticipated quantity needed for each of these tools? | There is not a specific requirement for the number of mathematic tools. The tools should be available to both online test-takers as well as paper testers. See Table 15 in Amendment No. 2 for quantity of paper tools. | IV.H.3 | 42 |
| 118 | Should the vendor plan to print and ship all required manuals, or does the state prefer manuals that are developed and print-ready accessible? | DTC manuals and Test Administrator manuals should be printed and shipped, at a minimum. | IV.V.4 | 93-94 |
| 119 | In Table 9, and on page 24, the platform and operations for local summative and interim assessments are mentioned. Can the State provide more details regarding this component of the bid? i.e., what are the different types of assessments offered locally, what is the function of the vendor in dealing with local assessments with districts and schools, etc. The lack of detail currently will make this component very difficult to price and compare among vendors. | The interim assessments, offered on the same testing platform as the grades 3-8 summative math and language arts assessments, would be developed by the contractor, with modules that local school districts and charter schools could adopt as they saw fit. The modules could be administered in a time frame that fits their instructional calendar. The contractor would not be responsible for developing local assessments, only providing a platform for assessments developed and/or offered locally. | IV.A | 23-24 |
| 120 | Please confirm how vendors are to organize/submit confidential/ proprietary information.   * 11.C.8 says proposals should have their proprietary/confidential information “readily separable” from the proposal. * III.B.1 says the information should be “blacked out.” * III.C.1 says it should be placed in the “Confidential Information Binder.”   If the state wants vendors to black out confidential information, and vendors submit an appendix that is entirely confidential (e.g., financial statements or sample items), do vendors need to black out the entire document? | Offerors should provide a redacted version (information blacked out and not omitted or removed) for the public file. One redacted original should be submitted and one (1) electronic copy of the proposal containing ONLY the Redacted Technical Proposal on a separate USB flash drive. In addition to the redacted version, an offeror must provide one original unredacted proposal and 5 hard copies of the unredacted proposal for evaluation purposes. When the file is made public, the unredacted version will be kept confidential. | III.B.1 | 22 |
| 121 | The text leading up to Tables 11 and 12 indicates that there are 16 labels starting with A, however Table 12 only shows A1-A12. Please confirm that Table 12 is correct, and there are no additional categories for A.  Also, there are several references in the OFFEROR RESPONSE boxes to category D9, which does not exist in Table 12. What are the references to D9 referring to? | Correct. See Amendment No. 2  All references to service group D9 should be replaced with D7. See Amendment No. 2 | IV.A | 23 |
| 122 | The RFP requests that the Offeror “precisely and clearly identify any proprietary information requests,” as part of the Executive Summary. Please give an example of what a proprietary information request means in this context. | For example, if the Offeror requests its financial statement remain proprietary, it must be so indicated in the executive summary. | IV.C | 30 |
| 123 | Please confirm that the date in the first line of Table 19 should read October 1, 2019, not 2020. | Yes, this should be October 1, 2019. Please see Amendment No. 2. | IV.L | 56 |
| 124 | The RFP indicates that there is a 3-week assessment window in the fall for high schools on a block schedule and seniors needing to retake the grade 11 assessment for graduation credit. It is our assumption that the college entrance exam will be serving as the grade 11 assessment under this new contract. Will the college entrance exam be used as a graduation requirement? Please clarify whether the fall assessment window will actually be required under this new contract. | It has not been determined if the assessment will remain a graduation requirement. If it does remain, a fall window will be required under this contract and PED recognizes that windows may be more limited with a high school college entrance exam.  Assuming that a fall administration uses a voucher for a regular administration paid for by the state, all data from that fall administration provided after a spring administration would need to be returned to the state.  If the high school assessment does not follow an end-of-course model, fall block schedule will not require a fall window. | IV.L | 56 |
| 125 | Section IV.S.8.a.i starts with “with the exception of the college admission assessment,” but then lists D2 in the OFFEROR RESPONSE box. Please confirm that D2 is listed in error.  This also applies to section IV.S.9.a. | Correct. Please see Amendment No. 2. | IV.S.8.a.i  IV.S.9.a | 77  79 |
| 126 | There is no OFFEROR RESPONSE box following subheading IV.Y.3.c.  Should vendors add a response box? | **For IV.Y.3.c**   | **Offeror RESPONSE** | | --- | | *Applicable to service group(s) A10.* | |  |   Noted in Amendment No. 2. | IV.Y.3.c | 104 |
| 127 | Does the content for the “guide to answering questions of interest (questions identified via stakeholder feedback)” already exist? Is this like an FAQ document? | This does not already exist. It is to be developed by the Offeror. | Table 22 | 123 |
| 128 | Article 3C. Taxes:  will the Contractor be reimbursed for applicable New Mexico gross receipts taxes associated with this contract? | The agency should provide the awarded contractor(s) proof of tax exemption. PED will pay the taxes for any services that are not tax exempt. | Article 3 | 136 |
| 129 | What will the required amount of the performance bond be for this contract? | We cannot provide an amount that will be required. Offeror needs to confirm that one can be secured if needed. | VI.B | 127 |
| 130 | Second paragraph, page 28 states “Therefore, the cost proposal workbook is structured to group costs into the groups shown in Table 12..”.  However, nowhere in the cost proposal workbook, or the instructions to the cost proposal workbook, is there any reference to any of the Service Groups shown in Table 12.  Rather, the cost proposal workbook seems to be organized around the deliverables associated with the “Category of Service” descriptions described across the top of Table 12.  Is PED expecting the Offeror to complete a separate cost proposal workbook for each of the 8 service groups (or each of the service groups that the Offeror elects to bid) in order to provide discrete costing for each? | Columns AK and beyond indicate what service groups each line item is applicable to. |  |  |
| 131 | Second paragraph, page 28 states “Offerors may distinguish their cost proposals via discounts for awarding multiple groups”.  There is no apparent format in the cost proposal workbook to show or apply these discounts, so how would PED like the Offeror to structure these? | Add new rows in the cost proposal. |  |  |
| 132 | First sentence, page 59 references a “Primary Contract”, but this is not a defined term.  Which contract is presumed to be the “Primary Contract”?  Is it the contract containing Service Group A? | Yes. | IV.O | 59 |
| 133 | Will the evaluation of the cost proposals be based only on the total costs for the initial 5 year contract period on the Base tab in the Cost Workbook? | All 10 potential contract years will be included in cost proposal evaluation. Some service groups only involve cost options, so cost options will also be evaluated. |  |  |
| 134 | On page 3 of the Model Instructions, it talks about a “Standard Pricing” tab in the Workbook. Should this actually refer to the “Base” tab? | The following language:  ‘It may be appropriate to modify the lines on the "Standard Pricing" worksheet’  should be replaced with the following:  ‘It may be appropriate to modify the lines on the "Base" and/or “Cost Options” worksheets’  See Amendment No. 2. | Cost Proposal instructions |  |
| 135 | The annual unit volume on the lines for Online Summative Administration is 75,000 for ELA grades 3-8 and Math grades 3-8. Is this correct? This would only be approximately 12,500 per grade. | Given that Table 15 has been amended, please replace these numbers with those provided in Table 15 as needed. | Cost Proposal |  |
| 136 | Will the state clarify what additional funding has been set aside for the new elements of the assessment program? | There are several new components that are optional because PED does not have an expected range of cost and thus cannot confirm whether costs will be within the range of appropriations for statewide assessment. In addition, funding for statewide assessment can vary significantly based on many factors outside PED control. Being optional allows for response to potential changes in appropriations over time. | IV.F | 35 |
| 137 | Will PDE clarify how districts will opt-in to participate in the interim assessment? Will it be the responsibility of the assessment provider to recruit districts or will the State provide a list of participants? | If an interim system is procured, PED would announce this to LEAs via memorandum and other forms of communication. LEAs will be able to use the interim system through this procurement.  LEAs will not be required to use the state procured interim system. | IV.F | 35 |
| 138 | PDE has estimated a total of 20,000 students across grades 3 – 12 students participating in all years (1 – 10) of the contract. This number is a small fraction of the estimated 75,000+ students that participated in the summative assessments in spring 2018 shown in Table 15 of the RFP. Does the state anticipate that participation could grow higher than 20,000 students total?  The estimated quantities (100, 100 – 249, 250 – 999, 1000+) seem like small populations numbers given the anticipated participation. Will PDE confirm that the participating population could be this small? | Table 15 has been amended. Please see Amendment No. 2. There are approximately 175,000 students participating in assessments at grades 3-8 and 11. | Cost Proposal Workbook |  |
| 139 | Is there an additional internal blueprint that specifies item cognitive complexity as well as additional requirements for how items should sample from the content domain under the categories (e.g., Reading: Literary Text? High level blueprints imply to us that you have another internal blueprints with increased specificity. | Detailed TAMELA blueprints are owned by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), LLC and are licensed by CCSSO, LLC exclusively to New Meridian. They are available exclusively through a content sublicensing agreement with New Meridian. Offerors should contact New Meridian to discuss sublicensing terms for TAMELA content and design. | IV.K.1 | 54 |
| 140 | 1. Please clarify the meaning of New Meridian assets in this context. Will the forms already be built, or with the new Vendor need to contract with New Meridian to secure the previous item bank?  2. What are the operational item types, N counts by standard and Blueprint category (e.g., Reading: Literary Text) from New Meridian bank and NM FT bank? | 1. “New Meridian assets” are owned by CCSSO, LLC and are licensed by CCSSO, LLC exclusively to New Meridian. New Meridian assets include complete content packages for pre-built TAMELA forms in Year 1. Selected vendor will sublicense the TAMELA content packages from New Meridian; New Meridian will support provisioning of content packages to vendor’s test administration system.  In subsequent years, selected vendor will sublicense selected test items from New Meridian to meet selected vendor’s transitional test blueprint requirements. New Meridian will support provisioning of selected content packages to vendor’s test administration system.  2. The high-level TAMELA blueprint and item type descriptions are available here:  <https://webnew.ped.state.nm.us/bureaus/assessment-3/spring2019mathela/>  The New Meridian item bank is robust and has sufficient items to meet a selected vendor’s transitional test blueprint requirements. | IV.F | 35 |
| 141 | 1. Please define what is intended by a diagnostic interim assessment in terms of grain size and span of the curriculum.  2. What are the desired level of reporting for monitoring learning? | Per RFP, *Diagnostic interim assessments for early learning in grades K-2 that do not resemble standardized assessments but are instead reflective of sound practice for monitoring learning and facilitating differentiated teaching of early learners;*  2.   Student, school and district level reports are desired.  Student level should be as fine grain as possible. | IV.F | 35 |
| 142 | *Section IV.M.2. Principles for proposal development* appears to not allow changes to the state’s standard terms and conditions, while *section II.C.15. Contract terms and conditions* provides a means a process for providing any exceptions. Will the state clarify that exceptions may be taken following *II.C.15. Contract terms and conditions*? | Exceptions may be taken, following II.C.15, however, The General Services Department discourages exceptions from the contract terms and conditions as set forth in the RFP. Such exceptions may cause a proposal to be rejected as nonresponsive. | II.C.15 | 17 |