



National Center and State Collaborative

**National Center and State Collaborative GSEG Project  
Summative Assessment  
RFP #2012-11-01**

There is an amendment to RFP #2012-11-01, Section 4.4.1(a) that has been posted on the [www.ncscpartners.org](http://www.ncscpartners.org) website. It relates to Question 1 below.

**NOTE:** The "Intent to Bid Form" can be found under the Procurement Tab on the [www.ncscpartners.org](http://www.ncscpartners.org) website. Two-thirds of the way down the page will be a sentence "Organizations interested in bidding should indicate their intent by November 20th, 2012, by completing this form." The actual form can be found by clicking on the link.

**Questions Received November 14, 2012**

**Question 1: Sec. 4.4.1, General Information, Paragraph a, Page 56. Text of Passage being questioned: "The term of the contract between the successful bidder and edCount Management shall be for one year with one possible extension for a period of one year." Question:** The RFP provides for a one year contract with a possible one year extension. The RFP also requires that services and deliverables be provided through 2015. Should vendors price for and expect a contract from 2013 through 2015?

**Response:** *The RFP will be amended to state that the contract shall be for one year with two one-year options through 2015. Pending issuance of the amendment, Vendors should plan on pricing deliverables that span multiple years as outlined in the deliverable table through 2015. The contract will be renewable annually through 2015 provided the work performed during the contract period is acceptable.*

**Question 2: Sec. 5.2.1, Paragraph 2 and Table, Page 66. Question:** We would like some clarification on which information should go behind each specified tab, specifically for Tabs 4, 5, and 6 that all include responses to requirements 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. **Can you please clarify which requirements belong under which tab, or reorder the tabs to reflect the order of the RFP?**

We are assuming 3.1 belong under General Requirements? Does 3.2 also belong under General Requirements or should 3.2 be under Technical Requirements (then putting it out of numerical order within the response)? We are assuming that 3.3 belongs under the Management Requirements tab. Does 3.4 belong under Technical Requirements? Or does 3.4 need to be included in Management Requirement?

Or does the order of the tabs need to be rearranged to:



National Center and State Collaborative

**Tab 4 General Requirements (Includes 3.1)**

**Tab 5: Technical Requirements (Includes 3.2)**

**Tab 6: Management Requirements (Includes 3.3 and 3.4)**

**Response:** Based on statement on page 16, “General Topics section describes technical requirements that must be addressed in the Vendor response to this RFP. The Management and Technical Topics address specific requirements and describe deliverables to be produced . . .”; therefore:

*Tab 4, General Requirements, should address sections of the RFP up to and including section 3.1.*

*Tab 5, Management Requirements, should address 3.3 and 3.4.*

*Tab 6, Technical Requirements should address requirements in 3.2.*

**Question 3:** Regarding the many RFP requirements/deliverables that call for a plan to be provided and/or developed, do in depth details of these plans need to be included as part of the vendors proposal response or to be provided during delivery?

**Response:** The in depth details will be provided during delivery. However, vendors should provide information that addresses the process that will be followed and a supporting rationale for that process.

**Question 4:** When can the Vendor expect the technology platform to be available?

**Response:** NCSC expects to have an interim solution for computer based presentation of items in the spring of 2013. A platform that will support pilot testing will be available by January 1, 2014.

**Question 5: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 25. Text of Passage being questioned:** “... approximately 2/3 of the constructed responses items will be scored by the test examiner during the test administration and the results will be recorded in the NCSC computer based testing system.” **Question:** Please confirm the scores (results) of the externally scored items will be entered into the NCSC computer based testing system and that the vendor will not be required to provide a scoring system.

**Response:** The Vendor will be responsible for designing, managing, implementing, and evaluating/documenting the external scoring of items. This will be accomplished primarily through centralized scoring. Also, as noted, NCSC wishes to explore distributed scoring, which will require the Vendor to design and manage a process that produces



National Center and State Collaborative

*reliable and valid scores. However, NCSC expects that the technology system used to support these activities will not be the responsibility of the Vendor.*

**Question 6: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 25. Text of Passage being questioned:** Pilot Scoring Vendor Response, “The Vendor will receive scoring rubrics for all constructed response items.” **Question:** Will we also receive training sets or is the Vendor expected to create the training sets?

**Response:** *The Vendor should expect to create training sets.*

**Question 7: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 25. Text of Passage being questioned:** Pilot Scoring Vendor Response, “The Vendor will receive scoring rubrics for all constructed response items.” **Question:** If the Vendor must create training sets, how will the responses needed for RF be provided to us (how meaning hardcopy responses or online responses)? How many people do you see attending Rangefinding and do you foresee how long it will take?

**Response:** *The Vendor will be responsible for training sets and range finding and should propose a process to accomplish these tasks.*

**Question 8: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 26. Text of Passage being questioned:** Pilot Scoring Vendor Response, “The Vendor should expect to provide sufficient scoring capacity to centrally score 80% of all constructed response submissions in pilot. Assume the distributed scoring pilot will apply to approximately 20% of the externally scored constructed response content.” **Question:** Does the 80% apply to the 744 Constructed Response items or does it apply to the 80% of the 252 Constructed Response items?

**Response:** *Assume approximately one third of the items will be constructed response. Further assume that one-third of this subset will be scored externally. Of that one-third, assume approximately 80% of the items will be scored centrally and the remaining 20% will be scored via distributed scoring.*

*It may be instructive to think about this per grade/content test. If we assume 30 items are on the test, assume 10 of these items are constructed response. Of those 10, assume the examiner scores 7 during the test event and the remaining 3 will be externally scored either through a centralized process or distributed process. We estimate that 80% of districts/schools will take advantage of centralized scoring and the remaining 20% will pursue distributed scoring. We stress that all of these estimates are for planning*



National Center and State Collaborative

*purposes and may change over the course of the project. However, the Vendor should base plans and cost estimates on these assumptions.*

**Question 9: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 26. Text of Passage being questioned:** Pilot Scoring Vendor Response, “. . . investigate the feasibility of having educators in each state review and score the work of other students at different schools within that state.”

**Question:** Does this mean that you just want the Vendor to investigate or to cost it? Can the Vendor give an alternative plan?

**Response:** *The vendor should produce a plan and cost estimate based on designing and implementing distributing scoring as described in the RFP and clarified in this document. The Vendor may, however, propose an alternative plan and rationale for that plan.*

**Question 10: Sec. 3.2.3.3, Page 26. Text of Passage being questioned:** Pilot Scoring Vendor Response, “. . . investigate the feasibility of having educators in each state review and score the work of other students at different schools within that state.”

**Question:** If the Vendor were to use educators does the Vendor need to hire and pay the teachers that participate in the “distributed study”?

**Response:** *The Vendor should not plan to compensate teachers participating in distributed scoring.*

**Question 11: Sec. 2.1.3.4, Paragraph 2, Page 13. Text of Passage being questioned:** The Design Patterns and Task Templates described above represent:

- Two (2) subject areas (English language arts and mathematics)
- Seven (7) grade levels (3–8 and 11)
- Ten (10) tasks per grade level and subject
- Four (4) items per task

**Question:** What was the item development plan based upon?

**Response:** *The item development plan was based on an estimate of the number of items necessary to support census field testing in spring 2015 and create a minimum of two intact forms available following the grant. Each form should address 10 target CCCs for each grade and content area tested.*

**Question 12: Sec. 2.1.3.4, Paragraph 5, Page 13 Table 2 and Section 3.2.1 Paragraph 2, Page 19. Text of Passage being questioned:** Draft Test Design, Specifications, and



National Center and State Collaborative

Blueprint. **Question:** How many levels of blue prints and test designs should the vendor create?

**Response:** *The Vendor should propose a solution and supporting rationale. .*

**Question 13: Sec. 2.1.3.4, Paragraph 5, Page 13 Table 2 and Section 3.2.1 Paragraph 2, Page 19. Text of Passage being questioned:** Draft Test Design, Specifications, and Blueprint. **Question:** How many tasks and items would a student need to take out of the 10 tasks and 160 items?

**Response:** *Assume a form addresses each of the ten tasks. Assume approximately 30 items per test. However, this estimate will be investigated and possibility adjusted over the course of the project. See section 3.2.1.*

**Question 14: Sec. 2.1.3.4, Paragraph 5, Page 13 Table 2 and Section 3.2.1 Paragraph 2, Page 19. Text of Passage being questioned:** Draft Test Design, Specifications, and Blueprint. **Question:** What assurance do we have that the bank at each grade level is representative and has adequate coverage?

**Response:** *NCSC will work with the item development Vendor to ensure the bank is sufficient. Acknowledging that the work of the summative assessment development and administration vendor and the item development vendor will occur contemporaneously, NCSC expects there will be opportunities for review, feedback, and collaboration between all parties to ensure mutually shared goals are achieved.*