

HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS BRANCH

October 22, 2024

ADDENDUM B

TO

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP D25-023

HAWAII ASSESSMENT LITERACY (HAL) PROGRAM

This addendum is issued to respond to an additional question and provide clarification on the following responses issued in Addendum A:

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.

Clarification: A2 clarification Indicates that only one content area per year will engage in cluster item development. For staffing and budgetary purposes, can you indicate what content areas will be developed in 2025, 2026, and 2027?

response: For the cluster item development, the content areas planned for development over the next three years are as follows:

2025: Mathematics

2026: Science

2027: Social Studies

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).

Clarification: A19: Indicates that any “off the shelf” items and item banks included in the proposal need to be reviewed by Hawaii educators to ensure their alignment and that this review should ideally be completed in the first contract year. Should additional time for educator review of these items be added to the 2-day Content Review meetings?

response: For proposal purposes, the educator review committees will review approximately 200 items of which 50% will be Contractor provided (written by Contractor and/or off-the-shelf items) and 50% written by Hawaii educators. The 2-day content meetings will include the Content Review committee’s item review. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, ID No. 1.1.4, Content Review Meetings.

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.

Clarification: A36: Indicates the items developed as part of the Professional Development Item Authoring will be made available to Hawaii educators as part of the Item Authoring and Test Building Tool. In contrast, A3 indicates the developed items would be ingested and delivered through the existing system. Please clarify what items would be transferred to Hawaii’s current delivery system and what items would be made available as part of the Item Authoring and Test Building Tool.

response: The intent is to have the developed items in QTI format so that they can be transferred to the existing test delivery system. These items will be developed in the Contractor’s Item Authoring and Test Building Tool and after final review, the items will be delivered to the existing test delivery system.

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.

Clarification: A45: Indicates that the Offeror shall provide training sessions execution, logistics arrangements, and stipend and travel reimbursements for the Assessment Literacy workshops. Please clarify what is meant by training sessions execution. Does the Offeror staff have any role facilitating or presenting as part of the Assessment Literacy trainings, or is the role of the Offeror for these trainings purely logistical like that for the Performance Assessment Authoring as indicated by A15?

response: The role of the Offeror for the Assessment Literacy trainings is primarily logistical, handling the execution of training sessions, logistics arrangements, and stipend and travel reimbursements. The facilitation and content delivery of these trainings will be conducted by Department-selected experts or internal staff trained for this purpose. The Offeror has no role in facilitating or presenting the Assessment Literacy Trainings.

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).

Clarification: A52: Please clarify the response to Q52 versus the response to Q19. The answer to question 52 suggests Department staff will review any "off the shelf" or item bank items whereas A19 suggests this content would be reviewed by Hawaii educators.

response: To clarify, Department staff will be involved throughout the review process. Department staff will conduct the initial review and then Hawaii educators will be involved in the next phase of review of "off-the-shelf" items to ensure alignment with content standards. Final approval and oversight responsibility will rest with Department staff. This multi-phased review process ensures both content standard alignment and administrative approval before items are ingested into the delivery platform or used in any assessments.

Q62: 4.9.2.8 indicates that the Offeror will be responsible for meeting coordination and all expenses for other meetings requested by the State. How should these requests be addressed in the budget? What travel expenses should be included in the budget for these additional meetings?

A62: The Offeror will only be responsible for meeting coordination and expenses as specified in the RFP, and its addenda. There are no additional meetings, other than that specified in the RFP and its addenda, to plan or budget for in the Offeror's proposal.