

HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS BRANCH

October 22, 2024

ADDENDUM A

TO

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP D25-023

HAWAII ASSESSMENT LITERACY (HAL) PROGRAM

PART I: The following changes are hereby made:

- RFP Section 3.1, Scope of Work, ID No. 1.1.4, Content Review Meetings, shall be revised as follows:

Stimuli, items, art, and rubrics are reviewed by Content Review committees for alignment to item specifications, alignment to appropriate cognitive and language complexity, fairness, accessibility, reasonableness and completeness of rubrics and scoring criteria, age appropriateness, and technology-based presentation.

CONTRACTOR will be responsible for coordinating and convening Content Review committees which include educators who are representative of students across Hawaii. **In addition, CONTRACTOR is responsible for coordinating the Content Review Meetings, which may include, but is not limited to, securing the on-island, in-person meeting site and registration logistics.**

Up to four (4) STATE staff will attend each session as well as appropriate CONTRACTOR staff as specified within Offeror's proposal.

Items are identified as accepted, accepted with revisions, or rejected. Stimuli, items, art, and rubrics are edited during content review by STATE and CONTRACTOR based on feedback from Content Reviews.

The STATE is open to innovative approaches to item review including but not limited to working with the STATE to create a process to conduct student committee item reviews.

For proposal purposes, proposed pricing for these work group sessions will use the following guidelines:

- A separate 2-day session for ELA comprised of up to six (6) educators;
- A separate 2-day session for Mathematics comprised of up to six (6) educators;
- A separate 2-day session for Science comprised of up to six (6) educators;
- A separate 2-day session for Social Studies comprised of up to six (6) educators.

- RFP Appendix D, Contract Minimum and Special Conditions, shall be revised to add the below as No. 17. Ownership of Documents:

17. OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTS

General Conditions paragraph 26 entitled “Ownership Rights and Copyright” is deleted entirely and replaced with the following:

All documents and reports and student data/records developed or generated under this contract shall be the sole property of the STATE. CONTRACTOR retains ownership of any proprietary or copyrighted materials, data, software, technologies, test items, test forms that are previously developed, owned and/or copyrighted by the CONTRACTOR and used or adapted for use under this contract.

PART II: The following is a brief summary of the Pre-Proposal Conference:

The Pre-Proposal Conference was held on October 10, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. HST via WebEx. The meeting provided a brief overview of the RFP with a focus on the Scope of Work. Questions, concerns, and/or clarifications were responded to informally and everyone was thanked for their participation and interest. The questions from the Pre-Proposal Conference and the formal responses are included in Part III, below.

PART III: This addendum is hereby issued to respond to the following questions:

Q1: Will a transcript of the Pre-Proposal Conference be available?

A1: The AI-generated transcript of the Pre-Proposal Conference is available upon request.

Q2: How many teacher-developed items should we anticipate editing prior to content review? How many items should we plan to review at the Content Review Meetings?

A2: The Contractor should anticipate reviewing approximately 200 items per content area prior to each content review meeting and each content review session should expect to review a similar number of items. It is anticipated that 50% (or 100 items) of the standalone items will initially be authored by the Contractor and the remaining 50% (or 100 items) by Hawaii teachers, across various content areas. It is anticipated that 6-9 cluster items for only one content area per year will be developed and reviewed by a Content Review Committee. Refer to Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1, Item Development and ID No. 1.1.3, Stand Alone Item Development.

Q3: Will the developed items be exported into an existing platform?

A3: Yes. The developed items need to be able to be transferred from one database system into another for test delivery. This RFP is for the development of the items, the creation of an item bank to house those items, and the ability to interface with the Department’s current provider’s test delivery system so the items can be exported, ingested and delivered through the existing system. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, Scope of Work.

Q4: Will the Contractor be able to author items?

A4: Yes, the Department expects the Contractor to develop items. All developed items will be put through content review. Refer to Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1, Item Development.

Q5: Please clarify the item cluster development for ELA and social studies.

A5: Item cluster development is typically in science and mathematics content, however the Department would like to include item cluster development for ELA and social studies.

Q6: Where will the Content Review Meetings take place?

A6: The Content Review Meetings are anticipated to be held in-person at a location on Oahu. The Contractor is responsible for coordinating Content Review meetings, which may include, but is not limited to, securing the meeting site and registration logistics. Refer to changes made to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1.4, Content Review Meetings, in PART I, above. Offeror should include the costs of in-person Content Review Meetings in their Price Proposal (Appendix C). Offerors may include an option for virtual Content Review Meetings and its respective pricing in their Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). The costs associated with virtual Content Review Meetings should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q7: Will there be review committees for these instructional resources?

A7: The RFP does not include review committees for instructional resources.

Q8: Please confirm the cost options for item authoring.

A8: In regards to item authoring, the Department does not make the distinction between standalone items or item clusters. CONTRACTOR will provide compensation for item authors and reviewers. Item authors and reviewers are paid approximately \$200 per day of training. Item authors are expected to deliver 30 items over the course of a school year. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.1, Item Authoring.

Q9: Please clarify the number of teachers participating in the assessment literacy sessions (RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2, Professional Development).

A9: For Performance Assessment Authoring trainings, there will be approximately 50 teachers. For Assessment Literacy trainings, there are approximately 60 teachers. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.2, Performance Assessment Authoring, and 2.3, Assessment Literacy.

Q10: Should the WIDA test administrator training be included in the RFP (RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.4, Test Coordination/Administration)?

A10: The RFP does not explicitly require the inclusion of WIDA test administrator training. Focus should be maintained on the specifics outlined under RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.4 regarding Test Coordination/Administration. The Department requires support with various training sessions execution, logistics, and reporting as indicated.

Q11: Please confirm that for the Item Authoring Tool, the Department just needs to export the approved items?

A11: Yes, after review and approval, the items get exported out. The Item Authoring Tool is a tool for teachers to use to create items and obtain feedback. The approved items will move to an item bank via the interface with the Department's current provider's test delivery system. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 3, Item Authoring and Test Building Tool – Online.

Q12: Will science and social studies resources be incorporated into the Tools for Teachers system (RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 4, Tools for Teachers)?

A12: The Department expects that the Contractor will assist in working with Smarter Balanced to access the developed tools and resources available for science and social studies within the Tools for Teachers via a partition. Alternatively, the Department is looking for a solution similar to Tools for Teachers to house and make available Department-created resources for Science and Social Studies.

Q13: Could you please clarify a little bit about the resources you want developed for Tools for Teachers? It sounds like Smarter Balanced Tools for Teachers has the math and ELA resources already. Is the Department asking the Contractor to guide development for science and social studies within Tools for Teachers or are you looking for additional ELA and math resources?

A13: The Department is looking for additional ELA and math resources. The Department expects that the Contractor will assist in working with Smarter Balanced to access the additional resources within the Tools for Teachers via a partition specifically for Hawaii. Alternatively, the Department is looking for a solution similar to Tools for Teachers to house and make available the additional Department-created resources.

Q14: In RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 1, 1.1, and 1.1.3, the RFP references the Contractor entering and writing items. Could the Department please provide a breakdown or other guidance as to the quantity of contractor and educator authored items?

A14: The Contractor should anticipate that 50% (or 100 items) of standalone items will initially be authored by the Contractor, and the remaining 50% (or 100 items) by Hawaii teachers, across various content areas per year. Additionally, it is anticipated that 6-9 cluster items for only one content area per year will be developed, with the responsibility for initial development expected to be balanced between the Contractor and Hawaii teachers. This distribution should be considered in the planning and execution of item development tasks. Refer to Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1, Item Development and ID No. 1.1.3, Stand Alone Item Development for more details. An example of standalone item development for Mathematics in Year 1 is as follows:

Grade	Written by Contractor	Written by Teachers
3	15	15
4	15	15
5	15	15
6	13	13
7	13	13
8	13	13
HS	16	16
TOTAL:	100	100

Q15: In RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.2, the RFP references the Contractor supporting the meeting logistics. Does the Department also expect the Contractor to facilitate the meeting, provide actual training materials, etc.?

A15: The Contractor's responsibilities as specified in the RFP are focused solely on supporting the logistics of the training sessions. There is no requirement for the Contractor to facilitate the meetings or provide actual training materials. The Contractor is expected to handle logistical support which may include, but is not limited to, securing venues, arranging equipment, handling registration processes, and ensuring that the physical or virtual environment is conducive for the training sessions as planned by the Department and its partner(s).

Q16: RFP APPENDIX E STATE OF HAWAII'S GENERAL CONDITIONS, Section 26 Ownership Rights and Copyright. Performance of the scope of work will require the use of CONTRACTOR'S proprietary software, technology, materials and other know how. Will the STATE clarify this Section 26 to ensure that CONTRACTOR retains ownership of any proprietary or copyrighted materials, data, software, technologies, test items, test forms that are previously developed, owned and/or copyrighted by the CONTRACTOR and used or adapted for use under this contract.

A16: RFP Appendix D, Contract Minimum and Special Conditions, shall be revised to add the below as No. 17. Ownership of Documents:

General Conditions paragraph 26 entitled "Ownership Rights and Copyright" is deleted entirely and replaced with the following:

All documents and reports and student data/records developed or generated under this contract shall be the sole property of the STATE. CONTRACTOR retains ownership of any proprietary or copyrighted materials, data, software, technologies, test items, test forms that are previously developed, owned and/or copyrighted by the CONTRACTOR and used or adapted for use under this contract.

Refer to changes made to RFP Appendix D in PART I, above.

Q17: Is this procurement based on a fixed price solution or cost reimbursement?

A17: This procurement is structured as a fixed price contract. The Contractor will be compensated based on the delivery of specified services and outputs as outlined in the RFP, rather than reimbursement of incurred costs.

Q18: PDF Page Number 6, Section 1.19.2 - The RFP indicates that unit price shall be given for each good or service and that unit prices shall be the same throughout the contract except to the extent price adjustment is allowed. Will there be any allowance for cost of living adjustments (COLA) across contract years? If COLA is allowed, should these be included in the initial cost proposal or negotiated with the DOE in subsequent contract years?

A18: The RFP does not specifically provide for cost of living adjustments (COLA) across the contract years. All pricing should be inclusive and consider any anticipated increases in costs over the contract period. Offerors are advised to include any such financial considerations in their Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q19: PDF Page Number 13, Section 1 from SOW Table - Will 'off-the-shelf' items and/or item banks need to be reviewed by Hawaii educators to confirm that the items align to Hawaii content standards? If yes, should this content be reviewed in the first contract year? If Hawaii educators do not review the items, will they need to be approved for content by Hawaii Department of Education staff before their inclusion in the bank of items for educators?

A19: Yes, all 'off-the-shelf' items and item banks included in the proposal need to be reviewed by Hawaii educators to ensure they align with Hawaii content standards. This review process should ideally be completed in the first contract year to ensure all materials meet the educational standards and requirements from the outset. 'Off-the-shelf' items are not a requirement of this RFP so Offerors may include an option for 'off-the-shelf' items and their respective pricing in their Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). The costs associated with the purchase, review, and edit of the 'off-the-shelf' items should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q20: PDF Page Number 13, Section 1 from SOW Table - Will 'off-the-shelf' items approved for content alignment by Hawaii need to be edited to meet Smarter Balanced item style specifications?

A20: Yes, any 'off-the-shelf' items that are approved for content alignment by Hawaii will need to be edited to meet the Smarter Balanced item style specifications. This ensures consistency and alignment with the broader assessment frameworks and standards that the Hawaii State Department of Education adheres to. Also refer to Q19.

Q21: PDF Page Number 13, Section 1 from SOW Table - If content is available "off-the-shelf" or from item banks, how much content would the Department like included over the life of contract? Please indicate the target number of items by grade and content area.

A21: The Department does not expect the Contractor to provide 'off-the-shelf' items. However, the Offeror may propose 'off-the-shelf' items to supplement the approximately 200 items per year as described in Section 3.1, ID Nos. 1.1, 1.1.2, and 1.1.3 in order to build items banks sufficiently large to administer adaptive tests.

Q22: PDF Page Number 13, Section 1 from SOW Table - Will the Contractor develop items independently from the educator committees? If so, how many items will the Contractor be expected to develop per grade and content area?

A22: Please refer to the answers to Q2 and Q14, above and to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1, Item Development, ID No.1.1.2, Item Cluster Development, and ID No. 1.1.3, Stand Alone Item Development.

Q23: PDF Page Number 13, Section 1 from SOW Table - Should sample items be submitted as part of the proposal? If so, what are the number of sample items expected and the grades and/or content areas to be addressed?

A23: Offerors are encouraged to submit sample items as part of their proposal, however, there is no requirement to do so. Should an Offeror choose to submit sample items, the suggested range is 2-3 sample items per content area and grade level to demonstrate the Offeror's capability to develop high-quality assessment materials.

Q24: PDF Page Number 14, Section 1.1.1 from SOW Table - Which content areas and grades will require item specification document development from scratch? Which content areas and grades will require item specification document refinement and/or enhancements?

A24: Item specification document development from scratch is required for newly introduced standards or subjects that have not been previously covered. This includes any new areas identified by the Department during the scope of the contract. Currently, it is anticipated that new item specification documents will be needed for high school Social Studies; specifically, U.S. History and Civics.

For existing content areas, item specification documents will require refinement and/or enhancements to align with updated standards and educational goals. Specific details regarding the grades and content areas for both new development and refinement will be provided to the Contractor as they become available.

Q25: PDF Page Number 14, Section 1.1.2 from SOW Table - Should the Offeror submit samples of item clusters as part of the proposal? If so, what are the number of sample item clusters expected and the grades and/or content areas to be addressed?

A25: While not mandatory, submitting samples of item clusters as part of the proposal is recommended. This allows the Department to assess the Offeror's understanding and capability in developing complex assessment items. If submitting samples, include 2-3 sample item clusters, representing a range of content areas and grade levels to showcase the depth and breadth expertise.

Q26: PDF Page Number 14, Section 1.1.2 from SOW Table - The RFP indicates that 12 teachers from across the state attend each item cluster writing session. Please clarify if that is 12 teachers for each content area or across content areas? How would these teachers be divided across grade levels?

A26: The attendance of 12 teachers refers to the total for one content area for each item cluster writing session. These teachers will be strategically divided across grade levels to ensure a representative mix of expertise and perspectives, aligning with the content areas being developed during each session. The specific allocation across grade levels will be coordinated based on the subject matter and the Department's educational priorities.

It is anticipated that only one content area will hold an Item Cluster Development writing session each year. For example, 12 teachers of mathematics will attend the session in Year 1, 12 teachers of science will attend the session in Year 2, and so forth.

Q27: PDF Page Number 14, Section 1.1.2 from SOW Table - For item Cluster Development, the RFP indicates that content-specific item clusters including stimuli, items, and initial art are planned and drafted by the CONTRACTOR'S content specialists in collaboration with STATE test development specialists. Later in the same section the RFP indicates that during item cluster writing workshops, stimuli, items, and rubrics are written by educators with oversight by STATE test development specialists and support from CONTRACTOR content specialists. Please clarify whether the CONTRACTOR is responsible for drafting stimuli, items, and art prior to item cluster writing workshops, or are the educators expected to draft stimuli, items, and art as part of the item writing workshops. If the CONTRACTOR is responsible for bringing draft stimuli, items, and art to the item writing workshops, please indicate the target number of draft stimuli/items we should anticipate preparing by content area/grade.

A27: The Contractor's content specialists are responsible for initially drafting the stimuli, items, and art prior to the item cluster writing workshops. This initial draft serves as a baseline for further refinement and development during the workshops, where educators, with oversight by STATE test development specialists and support from Contractor content specialists, will finalize the stimuli items and rubrics. This collaborative approach ensures the production of high-quality, educationally valid items.

Q28: PDF Page Number 14, Section 1.1.2 from SOW Table - How many item clusters should we plan on being developed by committees by grade and content area? Note: We will use this number to budget for item editing after development by educators.

A28: It is anticipated that each 12-person committee will be divided into three groups: elementary, middle, and high school. Each group will develop approximately 2-3 item clusters for a total of 6-9

item clusters. This estimate should be used as a basis for budgeting item editing processes post-development. The final numbers may vary based on the specific requirements and adjustments made during the contract term.

Q29: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.3 from SOW Table - Should the Offeror provide sample items for the End-of-Course (EOC) courses as part of the proposal? If so, what are the number of sample items expected?

A29: Providing sample items for End-of-Course (EOC) assessments as part of the proposal is advisable but not required. If included, these samples will help demonstrate the Offeror's capability in crafting high-stakes assessment items tailored to the EOC format. If submitting samples, suggest including 2-3 samples for each type of item (e.g., multiple choice, constructed response, and performance task).

Q30: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.3 from SOW Table - How many standalone items should the Contractor develop by grade and content area for each year?

A30: The Contractor should plan to develop approximately 100 standalone items per content area each year. This quantity ensures sufficient coverage and variability within the item banks to eventually support adaptive testing environments.

Q31: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.3 from SOW Table - For the standalone item development, which item types should the Contractor plan to develop?

A31: The Contractor should plan to develop a variety of item types for standalone item development, including multiple-choice, constructed response, and performance task items.

Q32: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.3 from SOW Table - Does the STATE want Hawaii teachers to develop standalone items or are the standalone items developed solely by the Contractor?

A32: The STATE expects a collaborative approach to standalone item development. While the Contractor is anticipated to develop approximately 50% of the standalone items, Hawaii teachers are anticipated to develop the other 50%. This partnership ensures that the items are pedagogically sound and reflect the local educational context and needs.

Q33: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.3 from SOW Table - How many standalone items should we plan on being developed by committees by grade and content area? Note: We will use this number to budget for item editing after development by educators.

A33: Refer to answers to Q2 and Q14.

Q34: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.4 from SOW Table - The RFP indicates that the STATE is open to innovative approaches to item reviews. Is the STATE interested in seeing cost options for virtual content review meetings?

A34: Given the current flexibility in work environments and the potential for cost savings, the STATE is interested in considering cost options for virtual content review meetings. Proposals should outline potential cost benefits, logistical setups, and how virtual environments would be managed to maintain the quality and effectiveness of reviews.

Offeror should include the costs of in-person Content Review Meetings in their Price Proposal (Appendix C). Offerors may include the option for virtual Content Review Meetings and its respective pricing in their Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal), however, the costs associated with virtual Content Review Meetings should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q35: PDF Page Number 15, Section 1.1.4 from SOW Table - Section 2.1 of the RFP indicates that social studies and additional grade levels may be phased in over the course of the contract whereas Section 1.1.4 indicates that proposed pricing should include work group sessions for social studies. Please provide guidance on in which fiscal years should pricing for social studies be reflected in the budget?

A35: Pricing for social studies should be included in the budget starting from the second fiscal year of the contract. This allows for the initial year to focus on setting up structures and processes with other content areas before incorporating social studies.

Q36: PDF Page Number 16, Section 2.1 from SOW Table - Is it expected that the items developed by teachers as part of the Professional Development Item Authoring be edited/revised by the CONTRACTOR? Will the items developed as part of the Professional Development Item Authoring be submitted to Content Review as outlined in 1.1.4 Content Review Meetings? Will the items developed as part of the Professional Development Item Authoring become part of the bank of items made available to Hawaii educators as part of the Item Authoring and Test Building Tool – Online as referenced in Section 3 of the SOW Table?

A36: Yes, items developed as part of the Professional Development Item Authoring Program will be edited and revised by the CONTRACTOR to ensure they meet the required standards and specifications before being finalized for use. Those items will also be submitted to Content Review Meetings and be made available to Hawaii educators as part of the Item Authoring and Test Building Tool.

Q37: PDF Page Number 16, Section 2.1 from SOW Table - Will items developed in the item authoring professional development program be used on the EOCs?

A37: While items developed in the professional development program are primarily for instructional use and formative assessments, select items that meet the rigorous standards required for EOC assessments might be considered for inclusion, pending further review and validation.

Q38: PDF Page Number 16, Section 2.1 from SOW Table - Does the Department have a desired number of facilitators per content area that should be budgeted for item authoring sessions with educators?

A38: The Department recommends budgeting for at least three facilitators per content area to ensure adequate support and oversight during item authoring sessions. This number may be adjusted based on the specific needs and scale of each session.

Q39: PDF Page Number 17, Section 2.2 from SOW Table - Where will the content developed through the Performance Assessment Authoring Training ultimately be housed?

A39: Content developed through Performance Assessment Authoring Training will be housed within the Department's designated online platform, ensuring it is accessible to educators for instructional purposes and further development.

Q40: PDF Page Number 17, Section 2.2 from SOW Table - Which content areas will participate in the Performance Assessment Authoring trainings? Will the 50 participants be approximately evenly distributed across subject areas?

A40: Teachers of mathematics, science, ELA, and social studies will participate in the Performance Assessment Authoring Trainings, reflecting the Department's commitment to comprehensive assessment development across curricula. The approximately 50 participants will primarily be distributed across mathematics, science, and ELA; social studies will focus on the high school level and have fewer participants.

Q41: PDF Page Number 17, Section 2.2 from SOW Table - Are there existing Performance Assessment specifications, or will the Contractor develop specifications for the educator developers?

A41: Existing performance assessment specifications will be used; the Contractor will not be required to develop performance assessment specifications.

Q42: PDF Page Number 17, Section 2.2 from SOW Table - Is there a targeted number of educator-authored Performance Assessments produced through this process annually? What is the expectation of the Contractor for final editing of the educator-authored Performance Assessments?

A42: The Contractor is not expected to edit the educator-authored performance assessments.

Q43: PDF Page Number 17-18, Section 2.3 from SOW Table - Which content areas will participate in the Assessment Literacy trainings?

A43: Assessment Literacy trainings will include all key content areas such as mathematics, science, ELA, and social studies to ensure educators across disciplines are well-equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge.

Q44: PDF Page Number 17-18, Section 2.3 from SOW Table - Will the four Assessment Literacy trainings be the same session offered four times to different educators or a series offered to an on-going cadre of educators?

A44: The four Assessment Literacy trainings will be offered as a series to an ongoing cadre of educators, allowing for progressive development of skills and deeper understanding over time.

Q45: PDF Page Number 17-18, Section 2.3 from SOW Table - Will Offeror be developing new Assessment Literacy trainings, or will they replicate previous trainings using established materials? If the later, would it be possible to provide an agenda from a previous training?

A45: The Offeror is not expected to develop new Assessment Literacy trainings. The Offeror shall provide training sessions execution, logistics arrangements, and stipend and travel reimbursements as described in RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 2.3, Assessment Literacy.

Q46: PDF Page Number 21, Section 5 from SOW Table - Is there a desire for the Instructional Resources authored as outlined in the section 5 (Instructional Resource Authoring Tool) to become a part of the Smarter Balanced Tools or be maintained in the Contractor's system?

A46: The STATE prefers that the Instructional Resources developed be integrated into the Smarter Balanced Tools to leverage existing platforms and ensure wider accessibility and consistency, unless there is a compelling reason to maintain them separately in the Contractor's system.

Q47: In section 1 from the Scope of Work Table, the RFP indicates that Offerors may include "off-the-shelf" item banks to build the bank. Should the Contractor include these costs as part of the base contract offering? As an option?

A47: 'Off-the-shelf' items are not a requirement of this RFP so Offerors may include an option of 'off-the-shelf' items and their respective pricing in their Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). The costs associated with the 'off-the-shelf' items should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q48: In section 1 from the Scope of Work Table, the RFP currently includes Smarter Balanced interim items as part of the Department's authoring bank. Should the CONTRACTOR include Smarter Balanced interim items as part of the base contract offering? As an option?

A48: The Contractor should not include the Smarter Balanced interim items as part of the Department's authoring bank. The Offeror may include these items and their respective pricing as an option in their Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). The cost(s) associated with this option should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q49: In section 3 from the Scope of Work Table, approved items will move to a (separate) item bank for secure test administration. Please confirm that no test administration costs should be included within the Hawaii Assessment Literacy Program scope?

A49: The Offeror may propose a proprietary system for test delivery of the items developed as part of the Hawaii Assessment Literacy Program. This solution and its associated costs for the test delivery system should be included in Offeror's Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). The cost(s) associated should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q50: In section 3 from the Scope of Work Table, approved items will move to an item bank for secure test administration. What are the tasks and requirements associated with moving items to an item bank for secure test administration? For example, will the CONTRACTOR be required to have content exported in a specific format? Will the CONTRACTOR be required to conduct quality control reviews in the administration item bank? Will accessibility resources be added to the content before export?

A50: Tasks associated with moving items to an item bank for secure test administration include ensuring the items meet technical and content standards, performing quality control checks, formatting items to comply with the test delivery system requirements, and ensuring that all items have appropriate metadata for reporting and analysis purposes.

Q51: ID No. 1. Please provide the number of assessment items that will be ingested into the authoring platform. Are these Hawaii owned items? What subject areas do they cover?

A51: No items will be required to be ingested to the item authoring platform.

Q52: ID No. 1. In reference to vendor provided items that are “off the shelf” and licensed; would the state like to have a process whereby Department staff reviews and approves the items before they are ingested into the delivery platform and made available to teachers?

A52: Yes. If the Offeror provides ‘off-the-shelf’ items the Department staff will review and approve the items before they are ingested into the delivery platform. Costs associated with this option should be included in Offeror’s Proposed Solution (refer to RFP Section 4.11, Proposed Solution/Technical Proposal). These costs should not be included in the Price Proposal (Appendix C).

Q53: ID No. 1. Is there a total number of test items that the Department estimates will be authored over a one year period?

A53: Refer to answers to Q2 and Q14.

Q54: ID No. 2.1. What is the total number of teachers and staff members that will require licenses and access to the authoring system, could include Department staff?

A54: The total number of licenses required for the authoring system, including Department staff, teachers, and other educational personnel, is estimated to be around 300 to ensure adequate access for item development, review, and professional development activities.

Q55: ID No. 4.2. Is there current content that will need to be ingested into the platform for development of instructional resources? If so, what is the number of total resources?

A55: There are currently no instructional resources that need to be ingested into the platform for development of instructional resources.

Q56: ID No. 4.2. Is there a total number of instructional resources that the Department estimates will be authored over a one year period?

A56: The Department estimates that approximately 100 to 150 new instructional resources will be authored over a one-year period, aimed at supporting diverse teaching strategies and enhancing educational content delivery across all subject areas.

Q57: ID No. 4.2. Would the State like to have a process whereby Department staff reviews and approves the instructional resources before they are ingested into the delivery platform and made available to teachers?

A57: Yes, a review and approval process by Department staff is necessary for all instructional resources before they are ingested into the delivery platform. This process ensures that the resources meet educational standards and are pedagogically sound.

Q58: Once items are reviewed and approved by the Department, how frequently will items be exported and migrated to the computer-based online delivery system?

A58: Once reviewed and approved, items will be exported and migrated to the computer-based online delivery system on a quarterly basis to ensure a steady flow of new content and updates to existing materials.

Q59: Given that HI Common Core ELA standards are being updated and implemented in Fall 2025 and this RFP project is designed for kick-off in January 2025, do you anticipate that we will be using the updated HI CC ELA standards beginning in January 2025, even though HI educators may not have had an opportunity to become fully familiar with them?

A59: Yes, the Department anticipates that the updated HI Common Core ELA standards will be used for item and resource development beginning in January 2025.

Q60: Section 3 (Scope of Work) ID No. 5 includes the following elements as part of the instructional resource authoring tool: a) curated instructional resources, b) professional development modules, c) community collaboration space, d) accessibility and accommodation guides. However, the phased implementation (Section 2.4) plan does not include elements b-d. Are these elements aspirational or intended to be included in this RFP and its implementation plan in Section 2.4?

A60: All elements of the Instructional Resource Authoring Tool, including professional development modules, community collaboration space, and accessibility and accommodation guides are intended to be included in this RFP and detailed in the Instructional Resource Development plan (Section 2.4). Phase 2 includes a-d for Instructional Resource Development.

Q61: Section 3 (Scope of Work) ID No. 4 includes use of the Smarter Balanced Tools for Teachers, which has an instructional resource authoring system for the site. In ID No. 5, there is a description of an instructional resource authoring tool that includes: a) curated instructional resources, b) professional development modules, c) community collaboration space, d) accessibility and accommodation guides.

a. Would posted videos and discussion guides satisfy element b or is the RFP anticipating an interactive professional learning system?

b. Would combining elements b and c with the item authoring system (as opposed to the instructional resource system) be acceptable to the Department?

A61: Videos and discussion guides will satisfy element b, professional development modules. The Department prefers elements b, professional development modules and c, community collaboration space be included in the instructional resource system but will consider proposals that include these features in the item authoring tool, or in both systems.