



**Date of Issuance:** 3/25/2022

**Solicitation No.** 2650000396

**Requisition No.** 2650011142

**Amendment No.** 2

Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed:  No  Yes, to: \_\_\_\_\_ CST

Pursuant to OAC 260:115-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.

Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

- (1) **Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted;** or,
- (2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope.

**ISSUED BY and RETURN TO:**

Rhonda Spain  
Contracting Officer  
  
405-522-8104  
Phone Number  
  
Rhonda.spain@omes.ok.gov  
E-Mail Address

**Description of Amendment:**

a. This is to incorporate the following:

On behalf of the State of Oklahoma, the Office of Management and Enterprise Services (OMES) gives notice of the following questions concerning this solicitation, received during the **Q&A period, which closed on 3/24/2022**. All questions OMES Central Purchasing and/or Agency responses are detailed below:

**In addition, the Agency has made the following changes to the solicitation:**

**Attachment A – Solicitation, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under “Purpose” states:**

Solicitation responses for the CCRA's must be provided by separate proposal; additionally, no third-party vendors or sub-contractors of the awarded supplier of the ELA and Math CCRA are allowed for the US History and Science CCRA.

**Change: “No third party vendors” has been stricken.**

**Bidder Instructions, Page 9, N. Section Fourteen: Third Party Vendor Information states:**

Any required additional third-party vendor information shall be inserted in this section.

**Change: There is no requirement for third party vendor information, however, if possible, the Agency would like to have this information.**

## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Bidder Instructions, p.4, 8.1 Preparation of Bid. Can the State confirm how it would like the sections packaged? For example, is a single PDF (to include Section One through Section Fourteen) acceptable as long as Word versions of Section Four and Section Five are also provided?

**OMES CP Response:** Acceptable - a single PDF (to include Section One through Section Fourteen) acceptable as long as Word versions of Section Four and Section Five are provided.

Bidders can also send separate easily identifiable sections (Preference is PDF except for Sections Four and Five) using the Bid Packet format provided. Please also note Section 9 of Bidder Instructions, starting on Page 9, which states:

**Submission of Bid:**

9.1 A Bid shall be submitted via email solely to [OMESCPeBID@omes.ok.gov](mailto:OMESCPeBID@omes.ok.gov). Please note that it is possible a Bidder's email system may have limitations on the size of outgoing email attachments and plan accordingly for the entire Bid to be received by the Bid Response Due Date and Time. A Bid emailed directly to or cc'd to the Contracting Officer will not be reviewed by the Contracting Officer. In person, commercial carrier or facsimile submittals shall not be accepted. The subject line of the email Bid shall contain the following: Attention: [insert Contracting Officer name]; Solicitation Number and Bid Response Due Date and Time. The State is not responsible for incorrect link information or its inability to access a submitted Bid. Receipt of a Bid will generate an automatic notice that the Bid is received; if a Bidder believes a Bid has been sent but has not received a notice of receipt, the Bidder should contact the Contracting Officer at the email or phone number shown on the Bidder Instructions Cover Page. Receipt of the Bid by the State is the responsibility of the Bidder.

2. Bidder Instructions, pg. 5, 8.2 Required Bid Packet Format. Please confirm that as long as sections are labeled with the section number and name that it is unnecessary to include 8.2 and letter in front of each section. For example, the cover page should be referred to as "Section One: Cover Page". It is unnecessary to refer to the cover page as "8.2.A Section One: Cover Page".

**OMES CP Response:** Yes, this is acceptable.

3. Exhibit 1, pages 16-23, A.39-A.61. Can the state confirm that requirements A.39 through A.61 are relevant to the US History and Science CCRA only, and that vendors bidding on the ELA and Math CCRA do not need to respond to requirements A.39 through A.61?

These sections deal specifically with CCRA USH and Science. However, A.61 deals with contingencies, which applies to ELA & math as well.

4. Exhibit 1, p.12, A.26, Number of Tests Administered. For the base contract year (2022–2023 SY) how many 11th grade and 12th grade students should vendors assume for purposes of their cost proposal? How many students by grade should vendors assume in each of the five renewal years?

These are actual counts that will be useful for making estimations of future student numbers. Grades 11 and 12 reflect the number of students that assessed while grades 5-10 reflect enrollment numbers.

SchoolYear	GradeLevel	(No column name)
2018	12	1204
2018	11	44304
2019	12	1683
2019	11	44656

SchoolYear	GradeLevel	(No column name)
2022	5	51161
2022	6	52502
2022	7	54239
2022	8	54717
2022	9	58174
2022	10	52338

5. Exhibit 1, p. 23, A.62, Minimum Required Experience and Successful Completion of at Least Three Similar Programs. Can the state clarify if requirement A.62 applies only to vendors bidding on the US History and Science CCRA or if all vendors need to respond to this requirement?

**This applies to all vendors.**

6. We are requesting additional clarification on the State's intent regarding: Exhibit 1, Pg. 1, Section A.2: see also Attachment A, Purpose and Number of Awards

- a. We assume that a vendor will not be prohibited from bidding on the US History and Science assessments as a sole Supplier if they are a subcontractor/vendor of the awarded Supplier of the ELA and/or Math CCRA? If this is not correct, please explain.

**This is correct.**

- b. Additionally, we assume that a vendor could be a subcontractor to a Supplier(s) on ELA/Math and the US History and Science CCRAs? If this is not correct, please explain.

**This is correct. A subcontracting situation cannot exist between the off the shelf product vendor and the vendor developing the items for US History and Science. Other components not involved in item development and content could be subcontracted. Possible examples of permissible subcontractors include assessment delivery platforms and scoring.**

7. Bidder Instructions, p.4-5, Sec. 8.1.B Required Bid Structure, How many points possible are associated with each of the evaluation criteria (e.g., mandatory requirements, price, etc.)?

**CP Response: This information is not allowed to be released during the solicitation process.**

8. Bidder Instructions, p.5, Sec. 8.1 Preparation of Bid; Paragraph D. is blank. Please confirm paragraph D should not have any instructions. Note: there are two paragraphs designated as E.

**CP Response: Formatting error. No instructions for the blank Paragraph D.**

9. Bidder Instructions, p.5, Sec. 8.1.E. Can the State clarify whether a VPAT and the Security Certification and Accreditation Assessment are required? This paragraph cross-references subsection 8.2.H, which says "if required."

**CP Response:**

Bidder Instructions - 8.1.E: As referenced in subsection 8.2.H, Section Eight: Response to Specifications and Requirements VPAT; Security Certification and Accreditation Assessment; service level agreements and proposed first draft of Statement of Work, including data migration from the existing system, are **required** to be included in the Bid.

**See Attachment D – STATE OF OKLAHOMA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TERMS,  
Page 3 and 4: 3 Compliance and Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility**

**See Attachment D - STATE OF OKLAHOMA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TERMS,  
Appendix 1 - C. Security Assessment 1.-2.**

10. If a Security Certification and Accreditation Assessment is required, should vendors include it in Section Eight, as noted on page 9 of the Bidder Instructions in Section 8.2.H.v? Or should vendors include the completed security certification document in Section Three: Bid Portions Requested to be Held Confidential? Note: the top of the security certification Excel document indicates “when completed, this security certification accreditation assessment is confidential and protected from disclosure...”.

**CP Response:** It should be included it in Section Eight, as noted on page 9 of the Bidder Instructions in Section 8.2.H.v.

11. Bidder Instructions, p.6, Sec. 8.2.B Required Bid Packet Format, Section Two. The Certificate of Insurance and Workers’ Compensation is not included in the OMES CP Forms attachment. Please confirm that vendors should provide proof of insurance, however there is not specific form included with the RFP that vendors need to use.

**CP Response:** Bidders shall provide proof of insurance (e.g., Declaration of Insurance), no specific form provided. Refer to: Attachment B – State Terms 8. **Maintenance of Insurance, Payment of Taxes, and Workers’ Compensation**

12. Bidder Instructions, p.9, Sec. 8.2.H Required Bid Packet Format, Section Eight. The numbering starts with iii. Please confirm Section Eight should not have requirements numbered i and ii.

**CP Response:** Formatting error; no requirements for i and ii. (List should have been formatted as i – v.)

13. Bidder Instructions, p.9, Sec. 8.2.K Required Bid Packet Format, Section Eleven. The solicitation states “Any required financial and associated information shall be inserted in this section.” We cannot find any requirements for financial information. Please confirm that vendors should respond N/A to this section.

**CP Response:** There are no requirements for submission of financial information at this time.

14. Bidder Instructions, p.9, Section 8.2.M Required Bid Packet Format, Section Thirteen. The solicitation states “Any additional required company information shall be inserted in this section.” We cannot find any requirements for company information. Given the directions on page 8 “...general company information and other similar information should be included in the executive summary and should not be included in other sections of the Bid” is the state in agreement that vendors should respond to Section Thirteen N/A?

**CP Response:** M. Section Thirteen is not applicable to this bid.

15. Bidder Instructions, p.9, Section 8.2.N Required Bid Packet Format, Section Fourteen. The solicitation states “any required additional third-party vendor information shall be inserted in this section.” However, on page 6 vendors are instructed to include any information “regarding subcontractors a Bidder proposes to use in performance of the resulting contract” in Section Two. Can the State clarify what information needs to be included in Section Fourteen: Third Party Vendor Information?

**Please also refer to the first page / top of document referring to changes to solicitation requirements regarding third party vendors.**

This could include the same criteria described for the vendor; however, this information is not a requirement.

A.62 Minimum Required Experience and Successful Completion of at Least Three (3) Similar Programs. A.62.1 The supplier must have at least five years prior experience in working on projects similar in size, scope, and technical requirements. A.62.2 The supplier must submit documentation demonstrating previous successful experience with at least three such programs and specify any experience in Oklahoma. To substantiate the supplier’s successful completion of similar programs, appropriate contact names, current telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses must be included in the proposal. A.62.3 The proposal must include a list of current state or agency assessment contracts including a summary of scope and the time period the contract is in effect.

16. Attachment C., p.5, C.9 Exception to Ownership Rights, states that the STATE expects a COTS product to be utilized. Is this only with respect to the ELA and Math?

Oklahoma does not expect ownership rights of off the shelf products for ELA and Math. The other subjects (CCRA US History and science) will require customized development and Oklahoma would retain ownership rights.

17. Reference: Exhibit 1, Page 3 of 23, A.5.10: The supplier shall provide a digital benchmarking platform containing custom items aligned to the Oklahoma Academic Standards for U.S. History and the science assessment. The online platform shall allow districts to select items by standard, administer assessments, and score assessments in real time. Reporting shall be available on demand for the student, classroom, teacher, district and state level. This requirement is optional for the ELA and Math off the shelf options.

Related Question(s):

a. Is this a mandatory requirement?

Yes, it will be considered as a cost option.

b. If so, please articulate the number of custom items to be developed that are aligned to the Oklahoma Academic Standards for U.S. History and the science assessment?

We are looking for recommendations to help envision how this could look for Oklahoma. In general, we will need sufficient items to make claims about student skills, knowledge, and abilities as they relate to the standards for the assessed subjects.

This is not intended to be predictive of student outcomes on the state summative assessment used for accountability purposes.

For science there are 33 standards assessed on the Grade 11 CCRA assessment. For US History there are 8 standards but those can be sub-divided into 80 different accessible points. For both subjects we would expect assessment over a subset of all possibly assessed content while ensuring all standards are assessed to the maximum feasible extent.

c. Do any items currently exist?

Yes, there are a limited number of items that are currently available to the public that could be used. There are also a limited number of DNU items that could possibly be revised and used. These sources of items would not be sufficient to supply the full bank. They likely make up less than 30 percent of what would be needed.

d. What is the timeline for item development and implementation?

The timeline would be negotiable based on logistical considerations but operational within 1.5 -2 years of contract initiation would be preferred. We would expect ongoing development over the span of the contract.

e. Is there any interest in licensed content?

Licensed content may be possible for US History depending on alignment judgements. Licensed content is not acceptable for science due to the specifics of the Oklahoma assessment model (cluster of 3 items that uses a phenomenon and assesses one standard) and NGSS alignment requirements.

f. Are there any other psychometric requirements associated with this benchmarking platform?

There is no plan to make this part of the accountability system. In that regard the psychometrics do not need to be as stringent. However, it does need to support claims of students' knowledge, skills and abilities in relation to specific standards.

18. Exhibit 1, Section A.56.1, pg. 21: How many test administrators will participate in the online training modules each year? How many test proctors will participate in the online training modules each year?

Last year there were 7,078 TAs and 2,604 TP modules completed.

19. Exhibit 1, p.4, A.8.4. In response to the following requirement "The contracted supplier shall be responsible for 15% of the total cost for all TAC meetings," please clarify what amount should vendors include in Section Nine: Pricing, to allow the State to compare bids? In a previous solicitation the State instructed vendors to assume \$1,409 per year.

Some of the logistics have changed. Please estimate 2,000.

20. Exhibit 1, p.13, A.29. Please confirm that the College-and-Career-Readiness Assessment Advisory Work Group meetings are one-day each, twice a year, and that the State will provide a list of participants to the vendor.

These would be one day meetings and OSDE will provide a list of potential participants.

21. Exhibit 1, p.13, A.29. Please confirm that vendors should assume \$170 per day for honorarium/substitute teacher reimbursement for the 20 member participants in the College-and-Career-Readiness Assessment Advisory Work Group meetings.

\$150 was the current rate but please increase it to \$170.

22. Exhibit 1, p.13, A.29. In reference to the College-and-Career-Readiness Assessment Advisory Work Group requirement, the RFP states "The supplier shall be responsible for facilities and travel costs for relevant State staff and members of the district advisory work group." To allow for comparison across bids, is it possible for the State to provide a specific cost that all vendors should include in their proposal for the meeting facility and travel costs? If not, we will need to know the number of State participants (RFP specifies 20 member participants), and for travel we can assume a flat amount for reimbursement (e.g., \$50 per person for travel)?

Travel reimbursement is based on mileage and a per diem are included for non-provided meals. We do not have the ability to determine a cost in advance. Please state the assumptions and criteria you establish to make your estimate, and that will allow for comparability.

b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**)

Date

Authorized Representative Name  
(**PRINT**)

Title

Authorized Representative  
Signature