



DATE: July 9, 2014

TO: All Offerors

FROM: Gaurang P. Pathak
 Manager of Financial Services/Internal Control

SUBJECT: ADDENDUM TO RFP - CONTRACT NO. CSD-2014-17

RFP for Formative Assessment

ADDENDUM #1 Questions & Answers

Questions	Answers
1. Does the district require submission of one original proposal accompanied by four copies; or one original with three copies	One original with three copies
2. Shall proposals be marked as "Original" and "Copy 1" etc.? Or is it preferred that the binder with original signatures also be labeled as a copy (Copy 1)?	Mark "Original", copy 1, 2, 3
3. Please identify the number of administrative personnel to be trained on the assessment as well as the number of educators to be trained	We have approximately 60 school-level administrators, 6 district-level administrators, 4 curriculum specialists, and approximately 10 instructional coaches who will need to be trained initially, The number of teachers who will be using the new formative assessment tool will be between 250 and 300, but we are planning to "turn around" the teacher training in our schools using our own staff, based on the initial administrator training provided by the vendor.
4. Is a MWBE partnership or outreach effort a requirement for this RFP?	No
5. Page 27 refers to Attachments 8 & 9. However, these attachments were not included with the RFP.	Forms at this time are not applicable (N/A)
6. The Christina School District is seeking a formative assessment for use in its Response to Intervention (RtI) process in grades 3-12	Our district is looking for a single assessment package that can be used across the grades specified in the RFP – grades3-12. We have a particular need

Questions & Answers

<p>for the 2014-15 school years. Question: Are you accepting proposals for subsets of grades? (3-8, for example?)</p>	<p>for an assessment appropriate for the high school grades, where our RTI process is less developed at the present time</p>
<p>7. Overview – Paragraph 3, page 2 - If the district elects to deny an exception, then is the applicant still bound to perform the contract despite its exception? Other sections of the RFP suggest that there is an opportunity to negotiate prior to final contract execution (e.g. Section 22. Award of Contract, a. RFP Award Notifications, page 14-15).</p>	<p>The applicant will not be bound to a contract unless the unacceptable exception is waived by the applicant</p>
<p>8. Section 11, Confidentiality of Documents – Paragraph 4, page 11 - Will district give applicant notice and opportunity to appeal district’s determination that information, which applicant claims is proprietary, is not proprietary prior to disclosing information to the public?</p>	<p>All documentation applicant believes proprietary must be noted in accordance with the RFP stipulations</p>
<p>9. Section e.1. General Indemnification – Paragraph 1, page 20 - Does district ever grant limitations on the general indemnification? Specifically, would district consider a limitation to the effect that vendor is not obligated to indemnify the state against claims based acts or omissions of the state its employees and agent?</p>	<p>No, subject to counsel review</p>
<p>10. Section h. Warranty – Paragraph 1, page 22 - Is district willing to consider an alternative warranty that is more consistent with software as a service industry standards?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>11. Section j. Penalties - Paragraph 1, page 22 - What has the district typically negotiated with vendors in similar circumstances?</p>	<p>The District cannot identify what is typically negotiated with vendors in similar circumstances. Negotiations with a potential vendor are based on the exceptions taken to the specifications, terms and conditions outlined in the solicitation. Minor exceptions are considered if they are legally acceptable and in the best interest of the District. Acceptance by the District of any or all exceptions taken in a vendor’s proposal response is not guaranteed. Refer to section 21 on page 14, Exceptions to the RFP and Attachment 3 on page 30.</p>

Questions & Answers

<p>12. Section k. Termination for Cause - Paragraph 1, page 22 - Would district consider adding an opportunity for vendor to cure the alleged performance issue prior to terminating the contract?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>13. Section p. Work Product - Paragraph 1, page 23 - Would district consider taking a license to use the materials and products developed under the contract, in lieu of ownership?</p>	<p>Yes, subject to terms</p>
<p>14. Section II. Scope of Services – Paragraph 2, page 3 - Do all requirements listed in the Scope of Services apply to both the universal screener and progress monitoring tools?</p>	<p>Both the screener and the progress monitoring assessment should optimally conform to the specifications described in the RFP. However, if the applicant can make a strong case for why one or the other (screener or progress monitor) should not need to meet one or more of those specifications, the district will consider that argument.</p>
<p>15. Section II – Scope of Services - Paragraph 2, page 3 - What kind of system is the District looking to export this information to? What kind of information will be imported into the Vendor’s system?</p>	<p>The district contracts with a third party organization to provide an application which integrates much of its data from multiple sources. We would require an automated nightly .csv export of key data fields from the applicant/vendor directly to this third party organization. It is not possible at this stage, exactly which fields of data from the vendor’s system we would require to be included in that nightly data export. However, it would include, at minimum, any composite scale scores, subscale scores, and other key assessment elements from that system which would enable teachers and administrators to evaluate and track students’ performance and progress across time.</p>