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Adjournment

Pursuant to Government Code section 11123(b) the meeting will be held by teleconference at the following teleconference locations that are accessible to the public:
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Persons wishing to address the State Board of Education on a subject to be considered at this meeting, including any matter that may be designated for public hearing, are asked to notify the State Board of Education Office (see telephone/fax numbers below) by noon of the third working day before the scheduled meeting/hearing, stating the subject they wish to address, the organization they represent (if any), and the nature of their testimony. Time is set aside for individuals so desiring to speak on any topic NOT otherwise on the agenda (please see the detailed agenda for the Public Session). In all cases, the presiding officer reserves the right to impose time limits on presentations as may be necessary to ensure that the agenda is completed.

Reasonable Accommodation for any Individual with a Disability

Pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California State Board of Education (SBE), may request assistance by contacting the SBE Office, 1430 N Street, Suite 5111, Sacramento, CA, 95814; telephone, (916) 319-0827; fax, (916) 319-0175.

For more information concerning this agenda, please contact Catherine Barkett, Executive Director of the California State Board of Education, or Deborah Franklin, Education Policy Consultant, at 1430 N Street, Suite 5111, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone (916) 319-0827; fax (916) 319-0175. To be added to the speaker's list, please fax or mail your written request to the above-referenced address/fax number. This agenda is posted on the State Board of Education's Web site: www.cde.ca.gov/be.
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SUBJECT

Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Request for Submission (RFS) for the primary language achievement tests

RECOMMENDATION

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommendation will be provided in a Last Minute Memorandum.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

At the March State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the background and the key concepts of the RFS were discussed. The SBE requested that the full RFS be brought back for approval at a special meeting.

One of the options to be considered is a separate RFS for the designated primary language test (DPLT) and incorporating the initial development and field-testing of the grade 2 standards-based test in Spanish (STS) into the current contractor's 2006 STAR Program scope of work.

Students who are of limited English proficiency and have been enrolled less than 12 months in a California public school are required to take an achievement test (the DPLT) in their primary languages if tests are available.

California Education Code Section 60640(f)(3) requires the CDE to develop and adopt a STS for reading/language arts and mathematics. Once the STS is available for a specific grade level, it will replace the DPLT for that grade level.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The current contract for the DPLT ends with the spring 2005 administration. A new contractor must be selected in enough time to prepare for the spring 2006 administration.
**SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Draft TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFS Released</td>
<td>April 5, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions Due</td>
<td>May 18, 2005 on or before 2:00 p.m. PDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Review</td>
<td>May 23-June 3, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSPI Recommendation to SBE</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE Designation of Contractor</td>
<td>July 7, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Start Date</td>
<td>July 2005 (contingent upon SBE approval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeline and Future SBE Actions**

Future discussions and policy decisions coming to the SBE for approval will include:

- Designation of the contractor in July
- Approval of the final contract and scope of work in September or November
- Approval of STS blueprints for mathematics and reading/language arts – ongoing as grade levels are developed
- Approval of STS performance standards after first full administration

**FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

All costs associated with the RFS are provided for in the proposed 2005-06 budget bill.

**ATTACHMENT(S)**

A last minute memorandum will be posted at [http://www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov) by April 1, 2005.
LAST MINUTE MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 30, 2005

TO: MEMBERS, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Geno Flores, Deputy Superintendent
      Assessment and Accountability Branch

Re: Item #1

SUBJECT: Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Request for Submission (RFS) for the Primary Language Achievement Tests

At its March meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) discussed the background, key concepts and options for the RFS for the Primary Language Achievement Tests—the Designated Primary Language Test (DPLT) and the Standards-based Achievement Test in Spanish (STS). The SBE directed California Department of Education (CDE) staff and SBE staff to continue exploring options and work with the SBE testing liaisons for further input. Below are the legislative requirements, CDE and SBE staff recommendations, and the rationale for the proposed recommendations.

Legislative Requirements for a Designated Primary Language Test and a Standards-Aligned Test in Spanish

California Education Code Section 60640(f)(2) requires the SBE to designate a single primary language test (DPLT) in each language for which a test is available for students in grades 2-11. This is a norm-referenced achievement test in reading/language arts and mathematics given in Spanish (and other languages, if available). Students with limited English proficiency who have been enrolled in a California school for less than 12 months must take this primary language test.

The contract for the current DPLT, the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, 2nd Edition (SABE/2), expires December 31, 2005. The statutory requirement to test students with the DPLT has been extended through 2011. In order to meet the statutory requirements, the SBE must either renew the SABE/2 contract or issue an RFS for a new DPLT for the 2006 and beyond test administrations. CDE does not recommend continued use of the SABE/2, as there are newer and more appropriate assessments available.

In addition to the DPLT, California Education Code Section 60640(f)(3) requires the development of primary language assessments aligned to California’s reading/language arts and mathematics standards. Students must be tested in the state’s dominant primary language of limited-English-proficient students, which is Spanish. The statute requires that as each new grade level of the standards-based test in Spanish (STS) is developed, it will replace the DPLT at that grade level. This replacement process could take up to ten years if the development and funding continues at one grade level per
year. The statute further requires the STS be developed in grade-level order, starting with the lowest grade subject to the STAR program, which is 2nd grade. Also, as required by statute, the state must retain ownership of all test items developed for the STS.

The chart below provides a summary of the elements of the DPLT and the STS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Budget Appropriation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPLT</td>
<td>Norm-referenced, “Off-the-shelf” existing test Spanish and other languages (if available), Grades 2 -11</td>
<td>$1.4 million annually for administration of an existing test Future annual appropriations subject to the Budget Act</td>
<td>Contract needed for spring 2006 test administration Current contract for SABE/2 expires Dec. 31, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>Aligned to California standards, Spanish only Development to begin with 2nd grade</td>
<td>$3 million annually for development Future annual appropriations subject to the Budget Act</td>
<td>Contract needed for development and first administration, spring 2007 Newly authorized test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DPLT and the STS are both part of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, which also includes the California Standards Tests (CSTs) in grades 2-11, the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for special education students in grades 2-11, and the CAT/6 nationally-normed test given in grades 3 and 7.

**Recommendation**

CDE staff, SBE staff, and the SBE testing liaisons met to discuss and explore options and review a draft of the RFS. SBE’s testing liaisons, SBE staff, and CDE staff considered how to best meet the statutory obligations—and ensure that the assessments are of the same high quality as the other STAR assessments.

Based on these discussions, CDE staff and SBE staff now recommend the following:

1. Release a separate request for submission (RFS) for the designated primary language test (DPLT).

2. Amend the current 2006 STAR Program contractor’s scope of work to incorporate the initial development and field-testing of the grade two standards-based test in Spanish (STS).

3. Incorporate the further development and administration of the STS into the RFS that includes all other STAR assessments. This RFS will be brought to the SBE no later than July 2005.
Rationale

There are numerous advantages to this recommendation. Most importantly, it is in keeping with previous SBE actions to bring the STAR standards-based assessments under the same contract. Steps have already been taken to incorporate the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) into the next STAR Program contract. Incorporating the initial development of the STS into the current STAR Program contract, and incorporating the ongoing development and administration of the STS into the RFS for the next STAR Program contract, will increase contract management efficiency and coordination of the STAR Program.

Incongruence across the different standards-based STAR assessments (in such areas as data reporting systems, item bank protocols, and delivery of testing materials) would be avoided if the assessments were under the same contract. There are potential administrative cost savings due to the elimination of duplicative tasks. More importantly, incorporating the STS into the larger STAR Program contract promotes alignment and continuity between the standards-based assessments. Because the STAR contractor has access to the STAR CST item bank of test questions, the contractor may be able to develop the STS for more than one grade level per year. This approach will also help ensure that the STS is of the same high quality as the CST.

Because the DPLT will be an “off-the-shelf” test, the work of the contractor is to administer, score, and report the results for the DPLT. The DPLT contractor will not be developing any new test questions. By separating the selection of the DPLT from the development of the STS, the decision-making process to select the DPLT will appropriately focus on the quality of the available norm-referenced tests and corporate capacity of the contractor to administer the test.

To meet the statutory obligations described above, the SBE must provide for ongoing administration of a DPLT at the same time it provides for the development of the new STS. This recommendation ensures meeting the timeline for implementation and administration of both the DPLT and STS. As the current contract for the other STAR tests (CST, CAPA, and CAT/6) will be expiring in December 2006, folding the further development and ongoing administration of the STS will provide for a smooth transition for our entire STAR Program. The new request for submissions (RFS) for the larger STAR Program contract will be brought to the Board no later than July 2005.

Options Considered but Not Recommended

Translation of the Current Test

Translation of assessments is fraught with problems. Students who take the STS will also take the CST for that grade level. The STS is not a substitute for the CST that students must take in English. For purposes of test security and reliability, the test questions on each test must be different. Even if the CSTs were translated, the number of STS test questions that would have to be developed for test security and reliability would amount to the development of a whole new test, thus eliminating any savings attributable to a straight translation.
Translation of only the mathematics portion could negatively affect the quality of the STS. All STAR assessments are currently developed to meet industry standards for validity and reliability. These psychometric standards are key to developing a high quality and fair test. Tests do not retain their psychometric qualities when they are translated from one language to another. It is more than a matter of grammar and spelling conventions that differ from one language to another, there are also differences in the frequency of occurrence of vocabulary between languages. A word in a mathematic test item that occurs frequently in English and helps make the test item easily understood may occur infrequently in Spanish, thus making the test item on the Spanish translation of the test more difficult to understand. Once the test questions are re-written to compensate for the language differences, those items do not necessarily have the psychometric properties of the original test questions. A second round of reviewing and field-testing would be required and would add substantially to the cost of using a translated test. For this reason, translation of the mathematics portion of the CST is not recommended.

Translation was not considered for the STS in reading/language arts because many of the standards tested on the CST in English/language arts cannot be appropriately tested in Spanish.

The STS in reading/language arts and mathematics will require the development of different test blueprints than are used for the CSTs, as well as test questions to meet the requirements of the new test blueprints.

**Augmentation of an Existing Test**

Another approach to developing the STS is the augmentation of an existing test, which in this case would be a test in Spanish that has already been developed, but not specifically to California standards. This option is similar to the approach taken when the STAR program was just beginning. A nationally-normed, “off-the-shelf” test was augmented with standards-based test questions to meet the SBE-approved test specifications and blueprints. The state owned the test questions that were developed under the contract, but did not own the test questions that were included in the nationally-normed portion of the test. This resulted in the state owning only a partial test. This approach became problematic when the first contract expired and the SBE designated a new contractor, leaving the state without a complete test. An enormous investment of time and money was necessary to create the standards-based tests the CSTs that are wholly owned by the state. For this reason, augmentation of an exiting test is not recommended.

**Attached Draft Request for Submission (RFS)**

In keeping with staff recommendations and SBE testing liaison input, the attached draft RFS is for the DPLT only. The attached RFS does not contain the state forms referred to in the Table of Contents as Attachments 1 and 2.

If the SBE approves the draft RFS as proposed, the next step would be for the SBE to approve an approach for the initial development of the STS. Based on conversations
with the SBE testing liaisons, CDE staff and SBE staff recommend amending the current 2006 STAR Program contractor’s scope of work to incorporate the initial development and field testing of the grade two standards-based tests in Spanish (STS) and incorporating further development and administration of the STS into the RFS with the other STAR assessments. CDE staff believe that the current STAR contractor has sufficient capacity to support this activity and appropriate staff members who have the necessary expertise required to develop the Spanish STS for grade 2.

Upon approval of these recommendations, the amended scope of work to the current STAR Program contract will be brought to the SBE in May for approval. A draft of the larger STAR RFS will be brought to the SBE no later than July 2005.

Attachment 1: Request for Submission Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program Designated Primary Language Test (DPLT) in Reading, Spelling, Written Expression, and Mathematics, Grades 2–11 (2005-08) (71 Pages)
DRAFT

Request for Submission
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program

Designated Primary Language Achievement Test (PLAT) and Primary Language Achievement Test (PLAT) Augmentation in Reading, Spelling, Written Expression, and Mathematics Grades 2 through 11

2005 – 2008

Standards and Assessment Division
California Department of Education
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Approval of a contract initiated as a result of this Request for Submission (RFS) shall be contingent upon funding and program authorization provided to and by the California Department of Education (CDE). Funding is described in Section 4.3. All submissions, with the exception of the primary language achievement test and its technical documentation, submitted in response to this RFS shall become the property of the State of California. All submissions, with the exception of the primary language achievement test and its technical documentation, will be made available in their entirety for public inspection and reproduction. Making a submission is considered to be acceptance of these terms.

1. PURPOSE
This RFS invites the submission of a designated primary language achievement test (DPLT) in any of California’s languages other than English in the subject areas of reading, spelling, written expression, and mathematics for grades 2 through 11.

This test is to be administered as part of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program. The purpose of the PLT-test is to permit students to demonstrate achievement in the subjects of reading, spelling, written expression, and mathematics through a primary language test.

Chaptered legislation also requires that a test in Spanish that is aligned to the California academic content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics be developed to replace the DPLT. Development work on this standards-based test in Spanish (STS) will begin in 2005-06. At least one grade level will be field tested in 2006, and it is anticipated that at least grade 2 will be operational in spring 2007. Students who take the operational grade-level test for the STS will not be required to take the same grade-level test of the DPLT.

In addition to the administration, scoring, standard setting, reporting and analysis of the PLT, bidders

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Legislation
DRAFT

The California Assessment of Academic Achievement is authorized in Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 60600) of the Education Code. The STAR Program is authorized by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) of the Education Code.

Senate Bill 1448, Chapter 233, Statutes of 2004 (SB 1448) amended Education Code Section 60640, and extended the California STAR Program through January 1, 2011 for the California Standards Tests (CSTs). STAR Program testing in grade 2 is extended to the 2006-07 school year (spring administration). New legislation may reinstate grade 2 testing after the 2006-07 school year.

The evaluation of the bidder’s DPLT will include assessing the bidder’s ability to comply with Education Code sections related to the STAR Program.

Additionally, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) and the State Board of Education (SBE) may consider any evaluations of independent experts who have not been employed by a test publisher in the preceding 12 months regarding the suitability of the achievement tests submitted by publishers [Section 60642 (a)].

SB 1448 is available on the California legislative information Web site (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov).

2.2 Regulations

Regulations pertaining to the STAR Program may be found at http://www.calregs.com/ (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 1, Chapter 2, Sub-Chapter 3.75, Article 3, sections 880 through 901).

2.3 Overview

The SBE is authorized to designate the use of an existing primary language achievement test in each language for which a test is available for grades 2 through 11. Legislation requires limited English proficient students (English learners) in grades 2 through 11 who have been enrolled in California public and non-public schools less than 12 months be tested in their primary language. The law also states that school districts may test English learners in grades 2 through 11 who have been in a California public or non-public school 12 months or more in their primary language. These primary language tests are to produce individual student scores that are valid and reliable. English learners must also take the STAR Program norm-referenced achievement test in grades 3 and 7, as well as the CSTs.

The DPLT will be administered during the 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 STAR Program test administrations.
DRAFT

The successful bidder must cooperate fully with CDE and any future successful bidder designated by CDE to allow for a smooth transition to the administration of the STS. In this year’s legislative session, a number of bills have been introduced that may alter which students are required to be tested. Legislation may require the administration of the tests to all English learners receiving primary language instruction. If legislation is passed, the contract will need to be amended.

The following tables provide information on the largest populations of English learners in 2003-04 and the number of English learners tested with the STAR Program DPLT between 2001 and 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% tested in 2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,028,584</td>
<td>8.8% (SABE/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>24,343</td>
<td>no designated test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>18,681</td>
<td>no designated test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>16,349</td>
<td>no designated test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>no designated test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12,884</td>
<td>no designated test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAR Designated Primary Language Assessment, Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, Second Edition (SABE/2)</th>
<th>Number Tested (Grades 2-11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number tested - enrolled less than 12 months (required)</td>
<td>47,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number tested - enrolled 12 months or more (optional)</td>
<td>68,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tested</td>
<td>115,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.** Test Construction

1. Professional Standards Requirements. The DPLT must meet the criteria for test development, administration, and use described in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999) adopted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). All references in this RFS to “professional testing or psychometric standards” are to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999).
Inclusion of Students with Disabilities and Fairness. The DPLT must be unbiased, in full consideration of California's diverse population so that all students may have full access to these tests. Please refer to the Matrix of Test Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications for Administration of California Statewide Assessments available at the following Web site: [http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/documents/matrix5.pdf](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/documents/matrix5.pdf).

B. Test Administration

1. Testing windows must conform to current state law and regulations. The DPLT is currently administered from mid-March through mid-May.

2. The bidder shall estimate the number of students to be tested for the contract period. The bidder should plan on eliminating grade 2 for the 2007 administration and grade 3 for the 2008 administration. This estimate will be the basis for the cost proposal. The bidder is responsible for providing all testing materials, scoring, and reporting for all assessments administered under the contract.

D-C. California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). CDE has initiated a project to develop the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) as required in Senate Bill 1453, Chapter 1002, Statutes of 2002 (SB 1453). The CALPADS project will implement a comprehensive data repository and reporting environment to track statewide longitudinal assessment data and other demographic elements required to meet the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reporting requirements. If CALPADS is implemented such that it affects this contract, an amendment will be negotiated.

E-D. Documentation Considerations. The successful bidder will be responsible for developing, maintaining, and providing to CDE all documentation (including, but not limited to, technical reports) needed to provide for the technical quality of the DPLT.

E. More Information. Information about the current Spanish DPLT (SABE/2), including reports of results, is available on the Internet. To access the information visit CDE’s Web site at: [http://star.cde.ca.gov](http://star.cde.ca.gov).

F. Rights to Reports, Programs, and Documentation. The successful bidder acknowledges that the rights to any report, computer program, documentation for programs, or other material developed by the successful bidder or its subcontractors in connection with this RFS shall belong to the CDE. The CDE reserves the exclusive rights to copyright such materials, publish, disseminate, and otherwise use materials developed under this RFS. The designated achievement test and any materials and proprietary computer programs previously developed by the successful bidder or its subcontractors shall belong to the successful bidder or its subcontractors.
33. **SCOPE OF WORK**

The submission must address all component tasks and requirements and must contain sections corresponding to each component task.

3.1 **Component Task 1. Comprehensive Plan and Schedule for Project Deliverables and Activities**

Section 3.1 must provide a comprehensive plan including a schedule for project deliverables and activities. The comprehensive plan must address all the requirements specified below.

A. **Narrative Schedule.** The comprehensive plan must include a detailed narrative schedule that outlines, both by task and chronologically for the entire contract period, each activity to be performed under this contract. The schedule must describe all activities related to training materials, administration materials, reports, interpretation materials, and logistics, as set forth in the Scope of Work. The chronological schedule must include proposed task initiation and completion dates and hours by task for proposed personnel including all subcontractors.

B. **Progress Reports.** The comprehensive plan must indicate that the bidder will produce monthly progress reports with relevant tasks and activities from the schedule and include progress noted for each. The progress reports must address how any unanticipated issues or problems would be resolved and include a detailed list of invoices submitted and paid. The successful bidder must e-mail the monthly progress report to CDE by 12:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (PDT) on the last Friday of each month and submit a signed hardcopy original by mail. CDE will not approve any invoice for payment on this contract until it has received all monthly progress reports due according to the schedule.

C. **Management Meetings.** The comprehensive plan must provide for quarterly face-to-face, telephone, or videoconference management meetings between the bidder and CDE staff. These management meetings will provide an opportunity to review, discuss, and improve upon task implementation and status. Subcontractors must be included as appropriate to the task. Subcontractors may be included via telephone or videoconference. The bidder and any subcontractors must plan and budget for the cost of sending staff to bi-monthly management meetings.

D. **SBE Meetings and Technical Meetings.** The comprehensive plan must provide for attendance by the successful bidder at the SBE meetings. For the purposes of this submission, the bidder must plan and budget for at least six such meetings per year, to be...
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held in-person in Sacramento. These meetings will provide the opportunity to review, discuss, and improve task implementation.

E. Records and Minutes. The comprehensive plan must indicate that for all meetings including, but not limited to, management meetings, the successful bidder will take minutes and record lists of participants, including institutional affiliation and contact information. The lists of participants must be provided to CDE within ten working days after each meeting using a format approved by CDE. The successful bidder will review contact information for each meeting and update contact information if changed. In addition, the successful bidder must maintain and submit to CDE for approval within ten working days of every meeting all minutes and records.

G. F. Reports. Deliverable reports must conform to professional standards for writing. Reports must be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association: Fifth Edition as well as meet CDE Style Manual (provided to successful bidder) requirements.

H. G. CDE Ownership of Materials. The comprehensive plan must indicate that CDE will exclusively own all materials developed in any form under this contract, including but not limited to, the following: records of meetings, notes, minutes, summaries, and rosters; analyses, reporting, report layouts, report formats, and examiner training; data files, data layouts, data dictionaries, analyses, research findings, research reports, and databases; and help desk logs, help desk summaries, and audit reports.

H. H. CDE Approval Schedule. The comprehensive plan and schedule for project deliverables and activities developed by the bidder must take into account the following CDE approval schedule. CDE must approve all materials and/or deliverables developed in conjunction with this contract. The successful bidder may not disseminate any written information, materials, or deliverables to the field, public, or any other third party without CDE’s written approval in a manner designated by CDE. The successful bidder is responsible for allowing sufficient time for CDE to review the materials and/or deliverables, and if necessary, for the successful bidder to make modifications as directed by CDE, and for CDE to review and sign off on the revised submission. In no case may the successful bidder allow less than ten working days for CDE to initially review the submission. Unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the parties, the successful bidder must make the modification within three working days of receipt of the changes directed by CDE. The successful bidder must allow CDE at least three working days to review the modified submission. A sign-off for any deliverable and/or materials will be provided only when CDE is satisfied with the submission. The successful bidder is responsible for any costs associated with making modifications to materials and deliverables necessary to obtain CDE’s sign-off.

I. Transition. The successful bidder will be required to work with CDE in coordinating the transition from administering the DPLT to administering the STS. The DPLT for a grade will
be eliminated when the STS for that grade is available for operational testing. It is anticipated that the DPLT will be administered to grades 2 through 11 in 2005-06; grades 3 through 11 in 2006-07; and grades 4 through 11 in 2007-08. This schedule may change, as it is dependent on STS development and availability.

3.2 Component Task 2. Program Support Services

Section 3.2 must include a plan to provide support services for the DPLT. No materials or deliverables may be disseminated in any way, including posting, publishing, or distributing, absent CDE approval. The proposal must include the personnel, including subcontractors, required for program support. The plan must address all the requirements specified below.

A. Help Desk. The plan must demonstrate how assistance will be provided to more than 1200 district STAR coordinators. Include a description of the staffing requirements for a customer service/help line, the criteria to be used to select staff, an overview of the training they will receive, and a contingency plan for peak periods.

The minimal services that must be provided include:

- Providing toll-free telephone and fax access.
- Providing e-mail access.
- Providing dedicated staff to respond to questions and concerns between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. PDT Monday through Friday except for the California school holidays specified in Education Code Section 37220(a).
- Providing sufficient staff to ensure that all requests for assistance are handled within 24 hours of when they are received.
- Logging customer concerns for reporting and analysis purposes.
- Providing CDE with an electronic version of the log with ten days prior notice.

Help desk staff must be able to assist district STAR coordinators with testing requirements, accurately completing required forms, ensuring accuracy of information for pre-identified answer documents, monitoring material distribution and retrieval, assisting with data clean up, and assisting with interpreting score reports.

B. Collection and Monitoring of Information. The plan must include a description of how district STAR coordinator contact information, security agreements, and test material orders will be collected, verified, and logged and how electronic access to track this information will be provided.

C. Terminology. The plan must ensure that materials sent to local education agencies (LEAs) use the same terminology and language as that used for other tests within the STAR Program, except where this would be inappropriate for a primary language test series.
D. **Workshops.** The plan must include the development and presentation of 11 regional workshops to assist STAR district and test site coordinators in preparing for test administration. The plan must include a description of the methodology to be used, including the specific media. Media options include but are not limited to videoconferencing, interactive CDs provided to each site, web-based streaming videos, or other conferencing techniques. The plan must describe any materials to be used, present a timeline, and identify the personnel and any subcontractors required to conduct the workshops. Workshop presenters and all workshop materials must be approved by CDE. The successful bidder is responsible for all logistics and costs and for providing materials required to support the proposed workshops.

### 3.3 Component Task 3. Designated Primary Language Test Requirements

In section 3.3, bidders must provide the following information about the primary language achievement test(s) being submitted for review.

A. **Contact Person.** Provide the name, address, direct phone number, fax, and e-mail address of a single point of contact who can respond to specific questions about the proposed DPLT.

B. **General Information about the Proposed DPLT(s):**
   * Title of the test battery (series)
   * Acronym used for test title
   * Edition
   * Availability by required content areas and grades of full and survey/abbreviated batteries
   * Year test battery was normed
   * Copyright year
   * Publisher

C. **Number of Test Questions.** Provide tables that show, by grade and content area, the number of test questions, the working time in minutes, and the preparation time in minutes. This information is to be provided for the full battery tests and the survey/abbreviated battery tests if both are being submitted.

D. **Availability of Test Forms and Results.** If any proposed form has been distributed in California, include a list of schools and/or LEAs that may have received or purchased the tests.

Include a list of states that currently are using or are planning to use the test battery(ies). If statewide results for other states are available, include a chart summarizing the results by state, grade level, and content area tested. If the test battery being submitted will be available for the first time during the 2005-06 school year, provide this information for the
previous edition of this test battery, if available. Provide reference contact information including the name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the person who is responsible for the program in each state cited.

E. Replacement Items. The successful bidder will be required to provide copies of the DPLT for all grades and content areas to California's Statewide Pupil Assessment Review (SPAR) Panel (Education Code Section 60606) for review. The bidder must also ensure that a company representative will be present at the conclusion of the SPAR Panel meeting to hear the panel's comments and recommendations. The successful bidder should expect that this meeting will occur during late summer or early fall 2005.

Indicate if the test publisher has replacement items available and include a discussion of the process that will be used to replace any items that the SPAR Panel finds are not in compliance with Education Code Section 60614. Include in the discussion information about the security of items within any item bank from which replacement items may be drawn and the procedures that will be used to ensure that the replacement(s) allow for using the normative data for the test.

F. Test Development and Technical Manual. Include evidence that the test battery was developed in accordance with all applicable standards for test construction in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1999).

Describe the complete process used to produce, administer, score, report, and analyze test scores for the achievement test battery(ies) being proposed. The bidder must submit copies of the technical manual for the test.

Include a description of the technical characteristics of the test scores, including the ability of the publisher to produce valid, reliable individual student scores.

Address measurement error and any other quantifiable random or systematic influences on test scores to determine whether, across the testing series under consideration, error is acceptable. Standard errors as well as reliability coefficients must be reported.

G. Purpose and Interpretation of Test Scores. Include a discussion about the primary purposes and uses of the test battery(ies) and a description of how the test scores are intended to be interpreted and used. Identify the constructs that the test is intended to measure. Do not include information for grades and content areas that California does not assess.

H. Test Levels/Grade Levels. Discuss how the test levels for the battery(ies) fit the grade levels being tested. It is highly desirable that a different test level be available for every grade 2 through 11, so that students will not be tested with the same test level for two consecutive years.
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I. **Alignment to California Content Standards in English-Language Arts and Mathematics.** Describe the methodology used to show the alignment of the proposed tests with California’s content standards for each grade and content area to be tested. Include a summary table that presents the:

- percentage of California content standards addressed by the test to be administered at each grade
- percentage of items on the test to be administered at each grade that are aligned with California’s content standards

The alignment of the proposed test and the content standards must be limited to each grade level or course. For example, the match with the grade 2 content standards must be made only with the test that will be administered at grade 2, the match with the grade 3 content standards must be limited to the test items on the grade 3 test, etc.

J. **Norms.** Include a description of the norms as they relate to characteristics of the norming sample, quality and age of the empirical data, accuracy of data for subgroups, the window for which empirical norms are available, and the windows for any interpolated norms.

A major consideration is the appropriateness of the norming sample. California has a diverse Spanish-speaking student population. If the norming sample was weighted, subgroup representation should be reported both in terms of unweighted and weighted frequencies. Reports of the norming study(ies) must include precise specifications of the population sample and the sampling procedures. The bidder must submit copies of the spring norm tables for the test.

Specify the grades for which empirical norms are available only when students mark responses in test booklets, mark responses in test booklets or on separate answer sheets, or mark responses only on separate answer sheets.

K. **Accommodations for Disabled Students.** Describe any empirical data from the norming sample and/or special studies conducted to show whether accommodations required for students with disabilities to access the tests affect the inferences that can be made from the scores received. Specifically address the effects of having the test read aloud, braille and large-print presentations, the use of additional time or breaks, and the use of aids such as translation glossaries/word lists, math manipulatives, number charts, or calculators. Include information about including the scores from accommodated tests in summary data for schools, districts, counties, and the state. The bidder will also provide information on interpreting accommodated test scores.

3.4 **Component Task 4. Test Form Construction**
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Section 3.4 must contain a plan that addresses the construction of all test editions, forms, and versions needed for use.

B. A. Test Form Construction. The plan must address the following requirements:

1. Produce regular booklets in at least 12-point font. Large-print booklets must be produced in 20-point Arial font.

2. Produce test booklets that comply with Universal Design Principles.

3. Provide space in consumable test booklets to collect student demographic and identification data. A test booklet must be provided for each eligible student in grades 2 through 11.

B. Answer Documents. Answer documents must correspond to the test booklets and provide space to collect student demographic and identification data required by state regulations. CDE will annually provide the specific demographic information that must be included on student answer documents. The plan must include a description of the process that will be used for producing pre-identified answer documents. If appropriate, include information about the different methods, if any, that will be used for producing answer documents that will be hand-coded at the time of testing from those that will be pre-identified.

Scoring must result in a single complete record that includes demographic data and test scores for each student tested.

D. C. Forms Design and Production for Students with Disabilities. The plan must include a timeline for the design and production of forms for students with disabilities, as well as for the review and approval by CDE. The plan must indicate how the materials will be developed using Universal Design Principles and must address the following requirements.

1. Produce a braille version of all test forms, using uncontracted braille for grades 2 and 3 and contracted braille for grades 4 through 11. The braille version must produce scale scores equivalent to the non-braille version. The successful bidder must determine the numbers of such tests to be produced for each test administration.

2. Produce a large-print version of the test to accommodate students with disabilities who have an IEP or Section 504 Plan that require such an accommodation. The large-print version must be 20-point Arial font. The successful bidder must determine the numbers of such tests to be produced for each test administration.

3. Produce test coordinator instructions and test examiner directions to accompany the braille version and large-print version.
3.5 Component Task 5. Test Materials Production, Ordering, and Packaging

Section 3.5 must include a plan for test materials production, obtaining orders from LEAs, and packaging for delivery. The plan must include the bidder’s estimated number of test-takers for each test administration. The same estimated number of test-takers must be used in both the plan and cost proposal. The plan must indicate that the successful bidder will be responsible for all arrangements, including personnel, subcontractors, and costs associated with this task.

A. Test Materials Production. The plan must provide for the production of all test materials required. The bidder must plan and budget for a ten percent overage for every school testing and a five percent overage for every LEA based on the total LEA order for each grade. For purposes of this RFS, the successful bidder is responsible for providing all requested test materials regardless of whether the number of actual test-takers exceeds the number of test-takers identified by the bidder in the cost proposal.

All eligible students in grades 2 through 11 shall receive a DPLT test booklet, answer document, when applicable, and practice test. Any tools required for the tests, such as cardstock rulers, must also be provided by the successful bidder. This includes all materials for English learners tested at LEA option.

Include a description of the quality control procedures employed to ensure that all testing materials are correctly printed and collated.

B. Ancillary Test Materials. The plan must include the production of all ancillary test materials, including but not limited to directions for administration manuals, a district and test site coordinator’s manual, and any special instructions for testing students with special needs. These materials will become public documents and must be provided in paper versions, as PDF versions, and as HTML versions for web posting. Minimum quantities of the paper versions of materials are as follows: one district and test site coordinator’s manual for each LEA and school where tests are being administered and braille and large-print manuals by request. The electronic versions of the directions for administration and coordinators manual must be posted by February 1 of each year.

C. Pre-ID Process. The plan must describe the Pre-ID process to be used. Pre-ID data includes all required student demographic data plus optional fields for LEA use. The successful bidder will be expected to provide a standardized process for LEAs to submit pre-ID data. The process must be consistent with that used across all state testing programs. Beyond providing the required file formats, the successful bidder is to develop a means for importing delimited data into the required format. The bidder may use a PC application, on-line application, or other means for enabling all LEAs to submit their files.

1. Describe procedures to be used to verify the completeness and accuracy of demographic information submitted by LEAs in pre-identification files. LEAs must have
the option of submitting pre-identification data in various formats, including fixed-length, comma-delimited, and Excel spreadsheets.

3.2. Describe procedures to be used to load the demographic information submitted by LEAs onto a secure, interactive, Internet-accessible database.

4.3. Describe a validation process that assures correct and complete codes. The process must include flagging of errors and omissions in a way that is clear to LEAs.

5.4. Describe procedures to be used to notify LEAs within two working days of receipt that the data are incomplete or inaccurate, and procedures that LEAs can use to correct the data by interacting with the secure Internet-accessible database. Editing procedures should allow LEAs to make global corrections to files and submit them for batch processing. Optionally, LEAs must be able to submit corrected pre-identification files.

5. Describe procedures to be used to supply LEAs with pre-identification labels within ten working days of receiving an accurate pre-identification file from an LEA.

6. Demonstrate the capacity to modify pre-ID files and student data file records during the contract period to conform to CDE requirements. CDE’s current pre-ID file requirements are specified in the “2005-06 Pre-ID Common File Layout” available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/pid.asp. Student data record and aggregate data file requirements will be provided upon request, but are also subject to modification over the contract period to conform to CDE requirements.

1.D. Ordering. The plan must:

1. Describe the annual process of contacting the LEAs and collecting the completed test security agreement. The successful bidder must ensure that LEAs do not receive test materials until the district coordinator has been identified and a signed test security agreement has been received for that coordinator. See Title 5, Section 888, of the California Code of Regulations for the DPLT test security agreement.

2. Describe the procedures for obtaining orders for all testing materials, including braille and large-print versions, needed for the administration of the DPLT. The plan must include a ten percent overage for every school testing and a five percent overage for every LEA testing.

3. Provide for tracking and logging orders, including verifying the information submitted to ensure compliance with California law and regulations (see Section 2.1 and 2.2), contacting LEAs that do not submit orders by the deadline, and procedures to accommodate late or additional orders and changes to orders.
4. Title 5, Section 894.c (2) of the California Code of Regulations allows the contractor to bill LEAs for excessive orders of materials. Excessive orders of materials is defined as the difference between the sum of the number of tests scored and 90 percent of the tests ordered by the LEA. The contractor must maintain detailed records of the number of tests ordered for each LEA. The contractor is responsible for designing and implementing procedures needed to implement billing for excess orders of materials.

5. DPLT materials may be used for grades 1 and 12 but at the LEA’s expense. The successful bidder is responsible for ensuring that LEAs placing separate DPLT materials orders for students who are English only and Fluent English Proficient (FEP) (e.g., dual immersion programs) and all students in grades 1 and 12 are charged directly. Materials and scoring for students in grades 1 and 12 and for English only and FEP students in grades 2 through 11 are not to be included in any STAR Program reports or costs.

C. E. | Packaging. The plan must include a description of how testing materials will be packaged and labeled for shipping.

1. Include information about the quality control procedures that will be used to ensure that packages are correct and that test sites receive the exact quantity of materials ordered. It is essential that any automated packaging have rigorous quality control standards so that test sites receive exact quantities of materials.

2. Test materials must be packed and labeled by school, and shipped to the district STAR coordinator for distribution within the LEA. Braille and large-print materials may be packaged separately, but are to be shipped with the regular test materials.

3.6 Component Task 6. Delivery and Collection of Test Materials

Section 3.6 must provide a plan for the timely and efficient delivery and collection of all test materials. The plan must indicate that the successful bidder will be responsible for all arrangements, including personnel, subcontractors, and costs associated with this task.

The successful bidder is responsible for shipping the testing materials to LEAs within statutory and regulatory requirements and for arranging the return, without cost to the LEA, of all scorable and non-scorable secure materials from LEAs within statutory and regulatory requirements. The successful bidder is also required to ensure the security of the testing materials during transit, to have procedures in place to confirm the delivery of the materials to and pick up of the materials from LEAs, and to have procedures for confirming that all secure materials packaged and shipped for each test site are returned.
Testing windows must conform to current state law and regulations. The DPLT is currently administered from mid-March through mid-May.

The 2006 DPLT administration window for English learners in grades 2 through 11 is March 13 through May 19, with make ups through May 26. The successful bidder is not required to provide materials for LEAs to begin testing earlier than March 13; however, the successful bidder may approve testing to begin on February 27, 2006, for LEAs that request testing earlier than March 13. The earliest LEAs may begin testing is February 27, 2006.

A. Delivery of Test Materials. The plan must include a description of the procedures and tracking processes to be used to ensure that schools receive complete and accurate shipments within each LEA's designated testing period. The plan must:

1. Describe inventory control procedures to ensure that shipping errors are quickly detected and remedied. Include information about the packaging and staging area for preparing shipments and the checks that will be made to ensure that deliveries are made within the statutory and regulatory requirements.

2. Include a proposal for handling shipments for LEAs that may have multiple testing periods.

3. Describe the delivery methods that are proposed. Any delivery carrier used must have the capacity for electronic tracking of every shipment. CDE must have access to the electronic tracking system and bidder may propose if this would be available to LEAs.

4. Describe the process for verifying that a fully executed security agreement has been received from each district STAR coordinator prior to shipping testing materials into the LEA.

5. Propose a method for assigning unique identifiers to examiner's manuals that include test questions to be read aloud by the test examiner, and to student test booklets by grade or test level. The secure documents for each test site are to be packed and logged out using the unique identifiers as security controls. All materials returned from each test site are to be logged in with the materials received and returned verified.
6. The successful bidder will ensure that testing materials are delivered to each LEA no more than 250 nor fewer than 10 working days before each LEA’s first scheduled test date for each administration period. Single school districts and charter schools are to receive the test materials no more than 10 or fewer than 5 working days before the first day of testing for each administration. Describe procedures, if necessary, for providing appropriate materials for students with IEPs that call for test variations such as Braille and large print. These materials may be labeled and packaged separately, but must be included in the same shipment with other testing materials.

B. Collection of Test Materials. The plan must describe procedures to ensure the collection of completed answer documents and all secure materials. The plan must include a description of procedures to be used by LEAs to inventory all materials and pickup and shipping procedures for all completed answer documents.

1. Include a description of the procedures that will be used for having all scorable and non-scorable secure materials picked up from LEAs. LEAs are to return all scorable and non-scorable secure materials within 5 working days after the last day for each test administration period.

2. Include information about how the returned materials will be processed as they are received in the scoring/processing center and how the quantities returned will be verified against the quantities shipped. Include the process that will be used to notify LEAs of discrepancies between the quantities of materials shipped to them and the quantities returned and the process for resolving any discrepancies.

3. The successful bidder will be responsible for storing all secure documents until discrepancies between the quantities of materials shipped to and returned by LEAs are resolved.

4. In addition, the plan must describe procedures for the collection and secure destruction of secure materials (including unused tests and examiner’s manuals) to be conducted by the successful bidder once each year following the end of the testing period.

3.7 Component Task 7  Processing, Scoring, and Analysis

Section 3.7 must include a plan for the processing, scoring, and analysis of results for the DPLT.

A. Test Processing.

1. The plan must include a recommended process for editing all answer documents for completeness of student demographic data, including: name, grade, birth date, and gender. Describe the process recommended and the process that will be used to obtain
the missing data from district STAR coordinators. Be specific regarding the notification procedures, timelines for supplying the missing information, and the process for adding the data received to the students’ records before test processing continues.

2. CDE Data Definitions. Demonstrate the capacity to modify pre-ID files and student data file records during the three-year period to conform to California School Information Services (CSIS) methodology.

CDE has been developing the CSIS for the uniform collection and transfer of student data. The system provides uniform definitions of demographic groups along with student numbers. CDE staff meets annually with CSIS staff and other CDE divisions to determine the student data to be collected for the STAR Program. The CDE also standardizes pre-ID files and student records across testing programs that may require adjusting the student data being collected.

3. State County-District-School (CDS) File. Include a procedure that indicates how regularly updated CDS files will be maintained and used for all test ordering, processing, and reporting.

California maintains a master file of all public schools, districts, and county offices of education. Each county is assigned a two-digit code, each district a five-digit code, and each school a seven-digit code. The CDS Master File is maintained and available from CDE and will be the control document for determining all acceptable administration sites. All county, district, and school names must be taken from the CDS Master File. Names submitted to the successful bidder by the school site are not to be used. CDS codes not matching the CDS Master File must be reconciled with CDE. Because this is a dynamic file, the successful bidder and CDE will determine a “final version” for use in the pre-ID process and for processing answer documents and reporting results. Subsequent changes to the file can be made through mutual agreement between the successful bidder and CDE.

The successful bidder must match all CDS codes and school/district names to the CDS master file provided by CDE. All reports and data files prepared by the successful bidder must use the CDS codes and names (including the structure and format) in the CDS Master File.

4. Answer Document Imaging. Include a recommendation for electronically capturing and storing the answer documents that may reduce the requirement for storing the paper documents. All original scored documents will be stored until at least October 30 of each year.

5. Mark Discrimination Report. Include a process for producing an electronic Mark Discrimination Report that will be used to identify possible testing irregularities that may
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have occurred within specific testing groups. The procedure recommended should provide for identifying testing groups with possible testing irregularities as each group’s answer documents are scanned and scored. As soon as this report is completed and verified by CDE, the successful bidder should arrange to pull and ship the students’ original answer documents to CDE in a secure manner. Documents for each identified testing group must be packaged together with the carton(s) clearly labeled.

Include a recommendation for the format of an electronic Mark Discrimination Report that the CDE will use to follow up on possible testing irregularities.

The report will be based on the average number and percent of student responses that were changed from wrong to right within each testing group. The bidder is to provide the criteria that they recommend using to identify testing groups for follow up and the file/report formats that should be used to report this information to the CDE.

Include a recommendation for identifying answer documents that are pattern marked and recommend how pattern-marked documents should be scored and the results reported.

California’s Education Code and the regulations and policies related to testing, scoring, and reporting have no provision for invalidating the test results for any student. The bidder should recommend how to report individual student results for pattern- and/or randomly marked documents and how to treat these results in school, district, county, and state summary reports.

6. Security of Test Materials. Recommend procedures for ensuring the security of test materials by including how discrepancies between the secure materials shipped and the secure materials returned by LEAs will be resolved. Secure test materials include all test booklets and any examiners’ manuals that include test questions.

The successful bidder will be required to provide the CDE with an electronic file showing the final resolutions of the discrepancies no later than September 20 of each year. The bidder will propose a description for this report.

B. Scoring and Quality Assurance. The submission must include a scoring and quality assurance plan that describes how the bidder will score all students’ test documents within a timely manner and implement quality assurance activities throughout the entire process of scoring, analysis, and reporting. The scoring and quality assurance plan must address the requirements listed below.

A1. General Scoring. The scoring and quality assurance plan must specify the process for scoring all student answer documents in the most expedient way. Include the timeline for scoring and identify the personnel and any subcontractors who will be
involved in this process. The scoring plan must include a timeline for when the bidder will return DPLT student level reports and electronic student data files to the LEAs. The scoring plan must include a description of how scored answer documents will be associated with the following elements: a single, accurate CDS code, a Charter School number (if applicable), a district name, and a school name. All elements must conform to CDE’s official CDS code and name records.

E.2. Quality Control and Assurance. The scoring and quality assurance plan must describe procedures to ensure that all assessment materials are correctly and reliably scored. The plan must describe the facilities, personnel, equipment, processes, procedures, and safeguards necessary to ensure that all test materials, including answer documents, test booklets, administration materials, and ancillary materials, are handled securely. This component of the scoring and quality assurance plan must address the following elements.

2.a. Describe quality control checks at all phases of production related to scanning student answer documents and creating data files from the results. The plan must specify quality control measures for the scoring and handling of all items including, but not limited to, verification of the scoring program, calibration of scanners, handling misfed documents, editing, and resolution procedures for questionable answer documents (for example, with multiple marks, poor erasures, or incomplete data), and aggregating scores at the school, district, county, and state levels.

2.b. Describe the handling of answer documents to ensure that all test results are correctly attributed to the students, schools, districts, counties, and subgroups for which aggregate test results are obtained.

3. Include the processes that will be used to provide all scoring specifications to CDE for review and approval.

4. Include recommendations for excluding student scores from summary reports due to testing modifications that were used, patterned or random marking of documents, or other anomalies that may invalidate student scores.

5. Include evidence that the scanning/scoring programs will have the capacity to capture and include codes in electronic student records that indicate answers that were changed from wrong to right or right to wrong.

6. Include recommended procedures and processes that will enable CDE staff to work with the successful bidder to analyze all data submitted, including pre-ID files and preliminary Internet files with accompanying student data files, to ensure that complete and accurate data are being processed.
C. Analysis of Test Results. The submission must include a plan for analysis of test results. The plan must address all of the following requirements:

1. Overall Analysis. List and describe all analyses necessary to provide results at the individual student, school, district, county, and state levels.

2. Braille Tests. Describe how these tests were calibrated, scaled, and equated with the print versions. Braille tests must produce reliable and valid scale scores with the same cut points as the non-braille versions.

3.8 Component Task 8 Reporting Test Results to LEAs

Section 3.8 must include a plan for reporting results for each test. The bidder must also provide a plan for minimizing the time for returning results to LEAs. The successful bidder will be responsible for producing paper reports of results at the individual student level as well as summary reports at the school, district, county, and state levels, using student demographic data collected through pre-ID files and/or student answer documents to aggregate results for subgroup reports (see table in 3.8 B 4). Results must be reported as a group to LEAs and to CDE as described below.

A. Overall Reports. The plan must describe the preparation, production, printing, and delivery of all required reports to the LEAs. The plan must include a description of how scored answer documents will be associated with the following elements: a single, accurate CDS code, a Charter School number (if applicable), a district name, and a school name. All elements must conform to CDE official CDS code and name records.

C-B. Production and Distribution of Paper Score Reports. The reporting plan must describe reporting procedures for the DPLT that meet all requirements listed below.

1. Student-Level Reports. The bidder will propose a student level report that must be in the language of the test. The successful bidder must provide two copies of student reports to each LEA. One copy will be packaged for the district and the second copy for the school where each student was tested. Adhesive labels with information appropriate for student cumulative record folders must be produced and provided to each LEA, packaged by school.

2. Summary Reports.

   a. School-level reports must be produced by grade and must include the number of students tested, the number of valid scores, the average scale score, the standard deviation of the scale score, and normative data.
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4-b. District summary reports must be comparable to school-level reports. Districts must receive summary reports no later than August 8 of each year.

6-c. County-level reports comparable to the school and district reports must be produced. County offices of education must receive county-level reports no later than August 8 of each year.

d. A state-level report comparable to the school, district, and county reports must be produced. CDE must receive state-level reports no later than August 8 of each year.

e. Include sample sets of score reports that are proposed for use in California.

f. Include evidence of the bidder’s ability to produce custom reports. Provide current and/or former clients for whom custom reports were developed and samples of the reports.

3. Describe a plan for distributing reports to LEAs.

- Each shipment of reports for schools, districts, and counties will include a diagram showing how the reports are packaged to assist the LEA with report distribution.

- All reports will be assembled by grade, school, and district.

- School sets of reports will be packed in separate envelopes or cartons, labeled for each school, and shipped to the LEA for distribution to schools.

4. The successful bidder will be responsible for printing, packaging, and distributing the following reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>No. Copies</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Aggregation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Report</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Record Label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Roster with Results, by grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary, by grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>School + State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent Charter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State + E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State + E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Summary, by grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>School + State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent Charter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State + E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>No. Copies</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Aggregation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports for the following Subgroups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disability Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Econ. Disadvantaged/Not Econ. Disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English learners in CA Schools less than 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English learners in CA Schools 12 months or More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Electronic (E) Student Data File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Electronic Student Data File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Electronic Student Data File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 copy for parent/guardian and 1 copy for current teacher
** County Offices of Education only for schools operated by the county

NOTE: Independent Charters are treated as districts for aggregation purposes.

5. **Report Verification.** Specify a procedure that will be implemented for LEAs to notify the successful bidder that complete and accurate reports or files were or were not received. The successful bidder shall remedy or correct any inaccurate or incomplete reports and files and submit a report to the CDE and the LEA detailing the resolution of each inaccurate or incomplete report. If the error was caused by the successful bidder and LEA notification is received no later than July 26, the file will be corrected for inclusion in the August 15 Internet file.

C. **Electronic Student Data Files.** The reporting plan must describe procedures for producing and delivering student-level data files to the LEAs and to CDE.

The successful bidder must provide a CD-ROM for use by CDE and each LEA.

The delivery of electronic reports will conform to file specifications developed by the successful bidder in consultation with CDE. Coordinated and synchronous reporting requires that multiple reports associated with the same delivery date all use the same core data. For example, the delivery of a preliminary student file, Internet site, and research files must be synchronous and built on the same raw data.

Conformity with the CDS Master Files is a requirement that guarantees that all test sites throughout the state are accounted for and properly reported. The CDS Master File is
maintained and available from CDE and will be the control document for determining all acceptable administration sites. All county, district, and school names and codes must be taken from and/or conform to the CDS Master File.

E.D. Interpretation Guidelines. The reporting plan must describe interpretation guidelines for individual student score reports. The guidelines should be clear and easily understood by students, parents, and teachers and must satisfy the following requirements.

1. The guidelines in English must be made available in Microsoft Word, PDF, and HTML formats to be placed on a Web site maintained by the successful bidder for CDE.

2. The successful bidder also must, as appropriate, produce correct and accurate versions in Microsoft Word, PDF, and HTML formats of these guidelines in the languages for which tests are available. The language of each version must be clearly identified in English on the document.

3. The bidder’s reporting plan must specify how the bidder will provide assistance to district test coordinators with the interpretation and use of summary test results for program evaluation and accountability.

H.E. Narrative Report Specifications. The reporting plan must indicate that all narrative reports submitted by the bidder will include an Executive Summary, the full text, and appendices containing all relevant data tables. The Executive Summary must be written to stand alone as a document suitable for public distribution. All final narrative reports and all electronic deliverables must be provided in Microsoft Word, PDF, and HTML format for distribution and possible posting on the successful bidder’s DPLT web site. The successful bidder must also submit Microsoft Excel spreadsheet versions of all tables and technical appendices.

3.9 Component Task 9. Reporting Test Results to the CDE

Section 3.9 must include a plan to develop an Internet site and deliver test-result data. The plan must address the following required tasks.

A. Internet Site. The plan must demonstrate the capacity to develop a turnkey Web site that displays the STAR primary language test results for each year. The successful bidder will host the Web site. After 2006, CDE has the option of eliminating the requirement that the bidder host the web site. CDE will inform the bidder by November 1 as to whether this requirement is eliminated for the subsequent year.

1. The site is to conform to functional specifications approved by CDE. The technical characteristics of the site include:
   - SQL Server
   - Site designed using a dynamic structure
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- Site includes both report pages and downloadable research files
- FTP transmission/reception capability
- Meets state/department accessibility standards
- Site tested by successful bidder meeting stated performance standards
- Client software interfaces commonly used

CDE will provide site specifications to the successful bidder.

Note: The technical requirements may change as industry, CDE, and State standards change.

2. Describe how the Internet site, developed and hosted by the successful bidder, will be populated with accurate data.

These data will need to include summary files of grade-level test results aggregated by schools, districts, counties, and the state. Data must include the number of test-takers, the average scale score, and derived scores as appropriate for the DPLT.

Additionally, summary data files will need to include demographic reports for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Gender
  - Males
  - Females
- English Learner 12-Month Status
  - Mandated testing—students identified as “less than 12 months”
  - Optional testing—students identified as “12 months or more”
- Special Education Services
  - Students with Disabilities
  - Students with No Reported Disabilities
- Economic Status
  - Economically Disadvantaged Students
  - Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students
- Special Program Participation
  - Program Participation—Receiving Title 1 Services
  - Program Participation—Migrant Education
  - Program Participation—Indian Education
  - Program Participation—Gifted and Talented
  - Program Participation—EL in ELD
  - Program Participation—EL in ELD and SDAIE
  - Program Participation—EL in ELD and SDAIE with Primary Language Support
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- Program Participation—EL in ELD and Academic Subjects through Primary Language
  - Other EL Instructional Services
  - None

- Ethnicity
  - African American
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Asian
  - Filipino
  - Hispanic or Latino
  - Pacific Islander
  - White (not Hispanic)

- Parent Education
  - Not a High School Graduate
  - High School Graduate
  - Some College (Includes AA Degree)
  - College Graduate
  - Graduate School/Post Graduate
  - Parent Education – Declined to State

B. Internet Reports. The plan must specify how the bidder will produce online reports with data summarized at four levels (state, county, district, school), including one report for the State of California, and reports for all participating schools, every county, and every school district within the state. Reports will be available for each subgroup identified in Section 3.9 A 2. Research files for the same summary data will be posted online for public access. The Internet file and its associated research files must include results for all English learners in grades 2 through 11 tested with the DPLT. The Internet reports and the associated research files must be synchronous with the student data file provided to CDE. The plan must include the development of text web pages that describe the test and reports with sample mockups. Report formats and web pages are to be submitted to CDE for approval.

C. Research Files. The plan must specify how the bidder will produce a state-level research file that contains all county, district, and school results. The successful bidder will produce county-level research files that contain each county’s summarized data, district, and school results. These research files are to contain all the populations outlined in Section 3.9 A 2 including the suppression of results where the reported group totals 10 or fewer students; or where the number of student reports in any individual cell may result in the identity of an individual student. Compressed (zipped) research files must be produced in fixed-length ASCII and comma-delimited format (including column names) files.

1. The plan must specify how the bidder will create and provide an Access 2000, or a more recent version of Access, database shell that can be used to import comma-delimited research files along with all instructions for use of the database shell. The
successful bidder will create a load utility that will facilitate the easy importation of comma-delimited research files into the database shell. The load utility must be provided in a format for posting on the bidder’s web site.

c. In the event that errors are discovered on the posted web site, the successful bidder will be required to repost corrected data. The corrected posting will include summary data and research files.

D. Internet Administrative Functionality. The plan must demonstrate the capacity to incorporate extensive administrative functionality into the Internet design allowing for inclusion of notes on report pages and the selective exclusion of report pages. The administrative functionality must allow for these changes to be made for individual schools, districts, counties, and statewide, as well as by subgroup.

E. CDE Web Delivery Requirements. The plan must demonstrate the capacity to deliver the required data files, research files, and reports according to a strict schedule as determined by CDE.

The successful bidder will post a preliminary Internet site and its associated research files (Site Mockup) at a secure password-protected web site by July 12, 2006. CDE will review the site and data and provide required changes by July 18, 2006. CDE may choose to delay this posting depending on test data availability.

The Internet site and its associated research files must be posted at a secure, password-protected web site by Friday, August 4, 2006, and available for school and district access by Thursday, August 10, 2006, and available for public access on Tuesday, August 15, 2006. Years two and three will have similar reporting dates. If CDE decides to eliminate the Internet Reporting site requirement for years two or three, the bidder will be required to deliver summary data files containing all requisite data according to a similar schedule. The format of these files will be approved by CDE.

F. Secure Web Site. The plan must demonstrate the capacity to provide a secure Web site. The secure Web site will be used for CDE access to required reports and data whose dynamic nature limits the utility of hard copy reports. The Web site will also be used to preview web applications and data and to transfer data between and among the successful bidder and CDE.

3.10 Component Task 10. Documentation and Electronic Data Management

Section 3.10 must include a plan for documentation and electronic data management. The documentation and electronic data management plan must address all of the following requirements:
B-A. **Documentation.** The documentation and electronic data management plan must describe how data dictionaries for every data file and system will be established, maintained, and submitted to CDE. Data dictionaries must include the names, formats, values, attributes, and descriptions of every data element. Every data element in the data dictionary must adhere to CDE’s preferred variation for that data element unless otherwise approved by CDE. Data dictionaries must be provided to CDE at least 20 working days prior to the delivery of associated data files and systems.

C-B. **Security.** The documentation and electronic data management plan must identify a system that ensures that documentation and all electronic files and data are developed, used, and maintained in a secure manner, protecting the confidentiality of all students tested, including all materials, records, and files. LEAs may obtain secure documentation and data files via the successful bidder’s secure Internet Web site using password login and data encryption.

D-C. **Secure Data Exchange.** The successful bidder must coordinate and cooperate with organizations and agencies approved by CDE in the exchange of data using a secure Internet site and data encryption.

E-D. **Confidentiality.** The documentation and electronic data management plan must describe the means by which the confidentiality of individual student results will be maintained in a manner consistent with Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations. At a minimum, protection of student privacy precludes access to individual student results by anyone or any organization other than the student, parent or guardian, school, or LEA. All procedures must recognize the sensitive nature of individual student information and test scores. The successful bidder also will be responsible for producing, using, and maintaining all Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest forms for all aspects of test administration.
4. GENERAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION

4.1 Bidder Eligibility

Public or private corporations, agencies, organizations, or associations may submit submissions in response to this RFS. Bidders should have at least 36 months experience in the administration of large-scale assessments.

The bidder must be legally constituted and qualified to do business within the State of California (registered with the Secretary of State). Bidders must submit a current Certificate of Good Standing issued by the California Secretary of State. (See also, Section 5.2G.) For information and to obtain a certificate, contact the Secretary of State at 1500 11th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. Allow sufficient time to obtain the certificate. It may take the Secretary of State’s office two weeks or more to process the request.

With the exception of bidders whose legal status precludes incorporation (i.e., public agencies, sole proprietorships, partnerships), bidders that are not fully incorporated by the deadline for submitting submissions shall be disqualified.

If the bidder’s legal status precludes incorporation, include a separate paragraph in the cover letter stating clearly the bidder’s legal status.

4.2 Definitions

- “Content standards” shall mean the mathematics and English-language arts content standards adopted by the SBE that are available on the Internet at www.cde.ca.gov.
- “Assessment” shall mean “any systematic method of obtaining information from tests and other sources, used to draw inferences about characteristics of people, objects, or programs”, as defined in Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1999).
- "Bidder” shall mean each and every public or private corporation, agency, organization, or association with experience in the administration of large-scale assessments submitting a submission by the acceptance deadline.
- “Fiscal year” means the state fiscal year July 1 through and including June 30.
- “Local Education Agencies” shall include school districts, county offices of education, independent charter schools, and California Youth Authority.
- "Specifications" shall mean the minimum specifications required by CDE for a task, subtask, or activity. Specifications provided in this RFS represent a comprehensive outline of the detail required in the bidder's submission for successful accomplishment of a task.
- "Subcontract" shall mean each, any, and all contracts and each, any, and all opportunities for a contract that are known or anticipated by the bidder to be issued to support the accomplishment of any task described in this RFS.
• “Subcontractor” shall mean each and every company contracted with by a bidder that is anticipated or proposed to perform work in support of the accomplishment of any portion of work described in this RFS. Subsidiaries that are separately incorporated must be clearly identified as such and must be treated as subcontractors.

• “Variation” is a change in the manner in which a test is presented or administered, or in how a test-taker is allowed to respond, and includes, but is not limited to, accommodations and modifications.

• “Working days” shall mean days Monday through Friday, exclusive of CDE-observed holidays.

4.3 Contract Funding and Time Period

Time Period
CDE anticipates that work described in this RFS shall start July 2005 and continue through December 31, 2008. The beginning date of the contract is contingent upon approval of the contract and scope of work by the SBE.

Funding
Contract funding is contingent upon yearly appropriation in the annual Budget Act. The amount of money available for 2005-06 is estimated to be $1.4 million. It is anticipated that this will be an annual appropriation.

This contract is valid and enforceable and the State is obligated to pay only if sufficient funds are made available by the Legislature for fiscal years 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. In addition, this contract is subject to any additional restrictions, limitations, or conditions included in the Budget Act or other statute enacted by the Legislature which may affect the provisions, terms, or funding of this contract in any manner. If sufficient funds are not made available, the State may cancel the contract with no liability occurring to the State and the Bidder shall not be obligated to perform or the contract may be amended to reflect the reduced amount.

4.4 Cost of Preparing a Submission

The costs for preparing and delivering the submission are the sole responsibility of the bidder. The State of California will not provide reimbursement for any costs related to the bidder’s involvement in the RFS process, including any travel expenses.

4.5 Intent to Submit
The bidder is encouraged to submit an Intent to Submit (See Attachment 4). The Intent to Submit form is due by April 15, 2005, not later than 12:00 p.m. PDT. An Intent to Submit form submitted by regular postal service, express courier, or otherwise hand-delivered must be sent to the Standards and Assessments Division at the following address:

California Department of Education
Standards and Assessment Division, STAR Office
Attention: Vicki Perez
1430 N Street, Suite 5408
Sacramento, CA 95814

Any Intent to Submit submitted by facsimile must be sent to (916) 319-0969, Attention: Vicki Perez.

Transmission by electronic mail shall not be accepted. It is the bidder’s responsibility to ensure that the Intent to Submit reaches the Standards and Assessment Division in Suite 5408.

4.6 Questions and Clarifications

Bidders may submit questions, requests for clarification, concerns, and/or comments (hereinafter referred to collectively as “questions”) regarding this RFS. All questions must be submitted in writing. The bidder should include its name, e-mail address, and telephone number with its submission of questions. The bidder should specify the relevant section and page number of the RFS for each question submitted. CDE will respond to all questions that are in proper form and received by 12:00 p.m. PDT on April 15, 2005. CDE will post its responses by 5:00 p.m. PDT on April 22, 2005, on CDE’s Web site.

All questions must be submitted either by e-mail, facsimile, or mail (express or standard). Address e-mails to vperez@cde.ca.gov, send facsimiles to Attention: Vicki Perez at (916) 319-0969, or mail to:

California Department of Education
Standards and Assessments Division, STAR Office
Attention: Vicki Perez
1430 N Street, Suite 5408
Sacramento, CA 95814

4.7 Time Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DEADLINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFS Released</td>
<td>April 5, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. SUBMISSION SPECIFICATIONS

#### 5.1 General Requirements

Each bidder submission shall describe the bidder's experience, its qualifications to conduct the required activities, and its approach to completing the tasks. One original (clearly marked as original), twelve (12) copies of the submission with all required components, and ten (10) copies of the test forms submitted for the DPLT, with related technical manuals and norm books, must be submitted. The submission should comply with all format and content requirements detailed in this section. All submissions should be clearly labeled on the outside of the envelope or package with the following submission title:

**SUBMISSION FOR THE STAR PROGRAM DESIGNATED PRIMARY LANGUAGE TEST (DPLT)**

Submissions sent by regular postal service, express courier, or otherwise hand-delivered must be directed to CDE at the following address:

California Department of Education
The submission must be received by 2:00 p.m. PDT, May 18, 2005, at the California Department of Education. Transmission by electronic mail (modem/internet) or facsimile (fax) shall not be accepted. It is the bidder’s responsibility to ensure that the submission is received by CDE by the deadline.

If the submission is hand-delivered on May 18, 2005, deliver it to designated CDE staff in the lobby of 1430 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 between 10:00 a.m. PDT and 2:00 p.m. PDT on May 18, 2005.

CDE staff cannot assist bidders in meeting the requirements of this RFS. Submissions received at the address noted above after the time and date specified shall not be accepted and shall be returned to the sender unopened and marked “LATE RESPONSE.”

The successful bidder’s final contract, as approved by the SBE, is a public document. All submissions pursuant to this RFS will become the property of the State of California with the exception of previously developed tests and technical manuals submitted for selection. Pursuant to the Public Contract Code, all submissions and cost proposals will be made available in their entirety, except for tests and technical manuals submitted for selection, for public inspection, and for reproduction. Making a submission is considered to be acceptance of these terms.

5.2 Submission Sections

All submissions shall be reviewed for technical soundness, management capabilities, and responsiveness solely on the basis of the information submitted. Bidders are strongly encouraged to follow the submission format and content requirements detailed in this section.

For evaluation purposes, the submission must be presented in a narrative format demonstrating the ability to meet all qualifications and requirements specified in this RFS. The submission must be clearly organized and easy to follow. All pages of the submission, including pages with charts, must be numbered sequentially. The submission must use the section and subsection headings specified in the RFS.

The bidder must prepare and submit a submission that includes all of the following components: Cover Letter, Table of Contents, Scope of Work, Management and Staffing, Related Capacity and Experience, Requirements for all Subcontractors, Cost Proposal, all Required Attachments, and Tests with related technical manuals submitted for selection review. The submission should be submitted in this order and additional sections are NOT to
be included. Do not attach pamphlets, letters of support (except from any proposed subcontractors), or other items that are not specifically requested for in the submission.

A. **Cover Letter.** The Cover Letter must:

1. Acknowledge that the rights to any hard copy/electronic material, report, or other material developed by the bidder or its subcontractors in connection with this agreement shall belong to CDE, with the exception of previously developed tests and technical manuals.

2. Attest to the bidder’s eligibility in terms of being legally constituted and qualified to do business in California (See Section 4.1 of this RFS), if applicable. Use the bidder’s true corporate name, indicate any fictitious name under which the organization is doing business (“doing business as”), or, in the case of an entity whose legal status precludes incorporation, clearly state the bidder’s legal status in a separate paragraph.

3. Identify acceptance of the contract terms and requirements as specified in Section 7 of this RFS. No additional contract terms or requirements may be added or substituted unilaterally by the bidder.

4. The Cover Letter contained in the ORIGINAL submission must be signed by the representative who is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the bidder to perform the work described. The authorized representative signing this letter must indicate position title and certify that he or she is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the organization. The mailing address, telephone number, e-mail address, and fax number of the authorized representative who signed the cover letter must be included.

B. **Table of Contents.** The submission should include a Table of Contents, which should identify by page number, all the section and subsection headings in the submission.

C. **Scope of Work.** Each submission must include a narrative plan to manage and accomplish the scope of work, including all tasks, as specified in Section 3 – Scope of Work.

D. **Management and Staffing.**

1. **Management Plan:** To be successful, this project requires an effective management plan that enables the approved bidder to complete tasks on schedule and within budget. The management plan should include clearly identified procedures for:
   a. Managing project personnel, subcontractors (if any), and fiscal resources;
   b. Ensuring adherence to schedule and deadlines;
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c. Ensuring high-quality products and outcomes;
d. Identifying potential problems early and resolving those problems in a timely manner;
e. Maintaining close communication with CDE; and
f. Monitoring and controlling project expenditures.

2. Management Staff: The proposed management team must include at a minimum (1) Project Manager and (2) Fiscal Manager. The submission must describe in detail the professional qualifications of the individual members of the proposed management team who will be working on this project. In addition, the submission must include resumes for the proposed management team and for each contract participant who will exercise a major administrative, policy, or consultant role, as identified by the bidder.

3. Staff Organizational Plan: Additionally, the bidder must include in its submission a staff organizational plan. This plan shall specify by task, all job positions assigned to each task, the approximate number of hours that will be devoted to the specified task by each job position, and the responsibilities of each job position regarding the specified task. In addition, for each job position included in the staff organizational plan, identify the supervisor who has approval authority over that position’s work (e.g., organizational chart).

E. Related Capacity and Experience

1. Capacity: This section must describe the bidder’s capacity and ability to perform and administer all tasks related to this RFS. If the bidder will be subcontracting a portion of the work, this section must include a description of the subcontractor’s capacity and ability to perform the portion of work in which the subcontractor will be involved. This section must also include a description of the bidder’s and, if any, subcontractor’s, facilities, equipment, and technical capacity, including a description of all software and hardware that will be used in the performance of the work described in the bidder’s submission.

2. Experience: This section must describe the bidder’s prior experience in conducting projects of a similar nature and scope. The section must describe the length of experience in the administration of large-scale assessments (e.g., testing 80,000-100,000 students) and describe this experience. Additionally, if the bidder will be subcontracting any portion of the work, this section must describe the subcontractor’s prior experience in performing the subcontracted portion of work.

F. Requirements for all Subcontractors (See Section 4.2 for the definition of subcontractor.)

1. Portion of Work: This section must include a short description of the proposed work for each subcontractor.
2. **Letters of Agreement:** The bidder must submit letters of agreement from all proposed subcontractors.

G. **Attachments:** This section of the submission must include the following completed attachments:

1. The Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (attached to this RFS as Attachment 1) must be signed and dated with an original signature in the submission marked as original.

2. The State Drug-Free Workplace Certification (attached to this RFS as Attachment 2) must be signed and dated with an original form signed in the submission marked as original.

3. A current original Certificate of Good Standing issued by the California Secretary of State, if applicable (See Section 4.1).

### 5.3 Cost Submission

The resulting contract will be a cost reimbursement contract based on actual, documented expenses. The evaluation panel will review the cost proposal for compliance with the standards and requirements in the RFS. SBE and CDE will negotiate the final contract costs with the successful bidder. Approval of a final contract shall be contingent upon funding and program authorization provided to and by the CDE. The contractor is responsible for providing: 1) administrative tasks for the DPLT; and 2) scoring, and reporting for three complete DPLT administrations based on the number of anticipated test-takers as identified by the bidder in the cost proposal. If the number of test takers exceeds the number of anticipated test takers identified by the bidder in the cost proposal, the contractor will be responsible for all costs associated with the increased number of test takers (including, but not limited to, production, packaging, distribution, scoring, analysis, and reporting) and will receive no additional compensation. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work and all related overhead or indirect costs. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal. A contract amendment will only be allowed in the following circumstances: (1) SBE/CDE requests additional new work outside the scope of this RFS, or (2) there is a change in scope due to legislative or Department of Finance action.

The cost proposal must include costs for the administration of the DPLT during three test administration cycles. Each test administration cycle must include all costs necessary for the test to be administered, scored, and reported in the cycle. Three test administration cycles for this RFS are as follows:

- 2006 Spring Test Administration (July 2005 – December 2006, grades 2 - 11)
- 2007 Spring Test Administration (July 2006 – December 2007, grades 3 - 11)
The bidder’s submission must include: 1) a cost proposal summary by fiscal year conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 3; 2) a cost proposal by task for each administration conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 4; and 3) cost proposal detail by task and subtask for each administration conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 5.

1) Cost Proposal Summary by Fiscal Year (Appendix 3). The bidder must provide a total cost proposal summary conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 3 identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing all costs broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs for each test administration by fiscal year in which the costs will be incurred (refer to schedule detailed in Section 3.1 A), including total costs per administration, fiscal year costs across administrations, and total costs for all three administrations.

For purposes of this RFS, Administrative and Program Support Costs include costs for Tasks 1 and 2 and DPLT Costs include costs for Tasks 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of this RFS.

For purposes of this RFS, a fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30. The fiscal years in this RFS are:
- 2005-06: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006
- 2006-07: July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007
- 2007-08: July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
- 2008-09: July 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008

2) Cost Proposal by Task (Appendix 4). The bidder must provide a cost proposal conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 4 identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing fixed costs, variable costs, and variable rates for all tasks set forth in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs, including a total per pupil cost for each category, for each separate test administration.

3) Cost Proposal Detail (Appendix 5). The bidder must provide a cost proposal detail conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 5 providing cost detail by subtask (Task 1A, Task 1B, etc.) within each task as specified in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs for DPLT, and b) DPLT Costs per each test administration. At a minimum the detail must include:
- Detailed labor/staff costs, including hourly or billing rates and number of hours (must agree with the hours in the Management and Staffing section)
- Detailed operating expenses (e.g., facility, equipment, etc.)
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- Identify, if applicable, which details within a task are being provided by a subcontractor
- Travel costs (must not exceed those established for CDE’s nonrepresented employees, computed in accordance with and allowable pursuant to applicable Department of Personnel Administration regulations) (Appendix 2)

6. MONITORING ACTIVITIES

CDE and all authorized state control agencies must have access to all internal and external reports, documents, data, and working papers used by the contractor and subcontractors in the performance and administration of this contract. CDE shall have the right to monitor all aspects of the contractor’s performance.

The contractor must provide all duly authorized representatives of CDE or the State with full access to any and all contractor and subcontractor procedures relevant to the tasks outlined in the Scope of Work.

CDE’s Project Monitor and the contractor’s Project Manager must communicate on a quarterly basis, as needed and scheduled by CDE, to review progress and performance (See Section 3.1C). The review criteria will include, but not be limited to, problems encountered under the contract, future performance under the contract, and any other subject relating to completion of tasks under this contract. In addition, monthly progress reports must be prepared by the contractor, submitted to CDE for review, and finalized and distributed by the contractor as requested by CDE (See Section 3.1B).

With each invoice for reimbursement, the contractor must attach a written progress report including a summary of activities completed, a list of deliverables produced, and outstanding issues for decision by CDE.

The contractor must retain and update records and accounts on a monthly basis and must be able to prepare and submit statistical, narrative, and/or financial and program reports and summaries related to this contract as requested by CDE.

Unless otherwise requested by CDE, the contractor must prepare reports and summaries in the format herein described. The contractor's name must appear only on the cover and title page of reports and summaries. Covers and title pages must read as follows:

California Department of Education
Standards and Assessment Division
Title of Report or Summary
by (Contractor’s Name)
Contract #_____
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The State reserves the right to use and reproduce all reports, summaries, and data reports developed pursuant to this agreement.

7. CONTRACT TERMS AND REQUIREMENTS

7.1 Compensation

Progress payments shall be made in arrears, on a monthly basis, upon receipt of an itemized invoice and a hard-copy monthly progress report (See Section 3.1B) of activities performed during the invoice period with original signature(s).

CDE shall withhold from the payment of each invoice an amount equal to ten percent of the payment. Upon the completion of all component tasks for a test administration, SBE may approve, upon recommendation of CDE, releasing to the contractor the 10% withheld during the contract or a lesser amount if warranted by the contractor's performance [Education Code Section 60643(e)(4) and (5)]. The contractor must submit a final invoice for the payment of the released funds.

Variable costs will be reimbursed at the per pupil rate identified in the bidder’s cost proposal for each pupil tested, not to exceed the anticipated number of test-takers identified in the cost proposal. If the number of test-takers exceeds the number of anticipated test-takers identified in the cost proposal, the contractor is responsible for all costs associated with the increased number of test-takers (including, but not limited to, production, packaging, distribution, scoring, analysis, and reporting) and will receive no additional compensation.

All travel costs shall be reimbursed at rates not to exceed those established for CDE’s nonrepresented employees, computed in accordance with, and allowable pursuant to, applicable Department of Personnel Administration regulations (See Appendix 2).

7.2 Staff Replacements

Changes to any of the contractor’s professional project personnel or management team (e.g., project manager or fiscal officer) requires formal approval by CDE’s Contract Monitor. The staffing change may not occur until the contractor receives written approval of the change by CDE’s Contract Monitor.

7.3 Ownership of Materials, Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, and Trade Secrets

All materials developed under the terms of this agreement will become the property of CDE. CDE reserves the exclusive right to copyright such material, and to publish, disseminate, and otherwise use materials developed under the terms of this agreement. Copyright for CDE must
be noted on all materials produced for the purposes of this contract, including, but not limited to presentation materials. The contractor acknowledges that the rights to any report, computer program, documentation for programs, exams, exam items, or other material developed by the contractor or its subcontractors in connection with this agreement shall belong to CDE. CDE acknowledges that any materials and proprietary computer programs previously developed by the contractor or its subcontractors shall belong to the contractor or its subcontractors.

The contractor warrants that it has secured or shall have secured any necessary rights, clearances, and/or licenses with respect to all materials and elements embodied in or used in connection with the performance of this contract, and that all included material shall neither violate nor infringe upon the copyright, service mark, trademark, privacy, creative, or other rights of any person, firm, corporation, or other third party.

CDE reserves the right to review any materials potentially for sale to determine if they are outside the scope of work. The contractor must seek review and approval from CDE before proceeding to produce for sale any materials related to this contract.

7.4 Retention of Records

The contractor must maintain accounting records and other evidence pertaining to costs incurred, with the provision that the contractor must keep them available during the contract period and thereafter for five full years from the date of the final payment. The contractor shall keep all compliance forms for inspection during the term of the contract and for five years thereafter. CDE and its designees must be permitted to audit, review, and inspect the contractor’s activities, books, documents, records, and papers during progress of work and for five years following final payment.

7.5 Ownership and Disposition of Equipment

Equipment purchased under the provisions of the contract is the property of the State and shall be used for its intended purpose during the term of this agreement. An inventory of all equipment purchased under the contract shall be maintained. After termination of the agreement, equipment shall be disposed of in accordance with instructions from CDE.

7.6 National Labor Relations Board Certification

By signing the contract, the contractor swears under penalty of perjury that no more than one final unappealable finding of contempt of court by a federal court has been issued against the contractor within the immediately preceding two-year period because of the contractor’s failure to comply with an order of a Federal Court which orders the contractor to comply with an order of the National Labor Relations Board. (Not applicable to public agencies).

7.7 Anti-trust Claims (Government Code sections 4552-4554)
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In submitting a bid to a public purchasing body, the bidder offers and agrees that if the bid is accepted, it will assign to the purchasing body all rights, title, and interest in and to all causes of action it may have under Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 USC Section 15) or under the Cartwright Act (Chapter 2) commencing with Section 16700 of Part 2 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code, arising from purchases of goods, materials, or services by the bidder for sale to the purchasing body pursuant to the bid. Such assignment shall be made and become effective at the time the purchasing body tenders final payment to the bidder.

If an awarding body or public purchasing body receives, either through judgment or settlement, a monetary recovery for a cause of action assigned under this chapter, the assignor shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for actual legal costs incurred and may, upon demand, recover from the public body any portion of the recovery, including treble damages, attributable to overcharges that were paid by the assignor but were not paid by the public body as part of the bid price, less the expenses incurred in obtaining that portion of the recovery.

Upon demand in writing by the assignor, the assignee shall, within one year from such demand, reassign the cause of action assigned under this part if the assignor has been or may have been injured by the violation of law for which the cause of action arose and (a) the assignee has not been injured thereby, or (b) the assignee declines to file a court action for the cause of action.

7.8 Recycled Paper Certification (Public Contract Code Sections 10308.5/10354)

By signing the contract, the contractor agrees to certify in writing to CDE, under penalty of perjury, the minimum, if not exact, percentage of recycled content, both postconsumer material and secondary material as defined in Public Contract Code Sections 12161 and 12200, in materials, goods or supplies offered or products used in the performance of the contract, regardless of whether the product meets the required recycled product percentage as defined in Sections 12161 and 12200. The contractor must certify that the product contains zero recycled content.

7.9 Air or Water Pollution Violations (Government Code Section 4477)

By signing the contract, the contractor swears under penalty of perjury that the contractor is not: (1) in violation of any order or resolution not subject to review promulgated by the State Air Resources Board or an air pollution control District; (2) subject to a cease and desist order not subject to review issued pursuant to Section 13301 of the Water Code for violation of waste discharge requirements or discharge prohibition; or (3) finally determined to be in violation of provisions of federal law relating to air or water pollution. This provision does not apply to public agencies.
7.10 Child Support Compliance Certification (Public Contract Code Section 7110)

By signing this agreement, the contractor acknowledges that (a) it recognizes the importance of child and family support obligations and shall fully comply with all applicable state and federal laws relating to child and family support enforcement including, but not limited to, disclosure of information and compliance with earnings assignment orders as provided in Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 5200) of part 5 of Division 9 of the Family Code; and (b) to the best of its knowledge it is fully complying with the earnings assignment orders of all employees and is providing the names of all new employees to the New Hire Registry maintained by the California Employment Development Department.

7.11 Computer Software Copyright Compliance

By signing this agreement, the contractor certifies that it has appropriate systems and controls in place to ensure that state funds will not be used in the performance of this contract for the acquisition, operation or maintenance of computer software in violation of copyright laws.

7.12 Prohibition Against Outside Agreements

The contractor and subcontractor(s) must not enter into agreements related to products and/or services of this contract without the prior approval by the State of a work submission and budget for the work proposed.

7.13 Confidentiality

The contractor shall not disclose data or documents or disseminate the contents of documents or reports without express written permission from CDE’s Contract Monitor. Contractor shall not comment publicly to the press or any other media regarding its data or documents, or CDE actions on the same, except at a public hearing, or in response to questions from a legislative committee.

The contractor must immediately notify CDE if a third party requests or subpoenas documents related to this contract.

7.14 Correspondence

Correspondence prepared by the contractor relating to the logistics of tasks to be performed by the contractor under the scope of work of this contract or correspondence of an informational
nature related to the program supported by this contract which is prepared by the contractor must be reviewed by CDE prior to mailing or distribution. As a standard business practice, the contractor must "copy" CDE’s Contract Monitor on each final letter, e-mail, and memorandum prepared by the contractor under the scope of work of this contract.

### 7.15 News Releases

The contractor must not issue any news releases or make any statement to the news media in any way pertaining to this contract without the prior written approval by CDE, and then only in cooperation with CDE.

### 7.16 CDE Approval of Deliverables

All approvals, orders for correction, or disapprovals from CDE must be in writing. If CDE rejects a deliverable or product as unacceptable, the contractor shall make required corrections within the time frame required by CDE.

Failure of the contractor to obtain prior CDE approval of deliverables or products shall not relieve the contractor of performing the related contract responsibilities and providing related required deliverables or products to CDE. The contractor must accept financial responsibility for failure to meet agreed-upon timelines and quality standards. CDE shall have no liability for payment of any work, of any kind whatsoever, which commences without prior CDE approval. Refer to Appendix 1 -Checklist of Major Project Deliverables (This is not meant to be a comprehensive list and does not supersede the Scope of Work).

### 7.17 Privacy, Security, and Confidentiality

If, in the course of carrying out this work, the contractor gathers or processes personal (private) information, the contractor must provide written assurance that the data will be managed in accordance with all applicable federal and California state privacy laws including, but not limited to: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1984 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g) and Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), and California Education Code sections 49069 to 49079. Examples of personal information include, but are not limited to: name, telephone, e-mail account, address, date of birth, and social security number.

In addition, the contractor will be expected to demonstrate that it has taken specific steps to ensure the data are kept secure and confidential as evidenced by, at a minimum, the following:

- Each and every employee, subcontractor or other person who has access to personal information is required to sign a statement that they understand that the information is personal and they will take steps to ensure that unauthorized personnel do not gain access to personal data.
- Personal data, while being transmitted electronically, must be encrypted.
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- Any repository for the data will be locked and have access restricted to those personnel that have a legitimate need to access the data and have signed a confidentiality agreement. Any security breach must be reported to CDE immediately.

CDE considers mailing information (including e-mail address) to be personal (private). As such, if the contractor asks a person for his or her mailing information, the contractor must make it clear to the person providing the information whether the information will be shared with any organization other than CDE and the contractor. In addition, the contractor will provide the person providing the mailing information an “opt-out” (i.e. the person can elect to not have his or her mailing information shared with organizations outside of CDE and the contractor).

7.18 Union Organizing and Activities

A. By signing this agreement the contractor hereby acknowledges the applicability to this agreement of Government Code Section 16645 through Section 16649.

1. Contractor will not assist, promote, or deter union organizing by employees performing work on a state service contract, including a public works contract.

2. No state funds received under this agreement will be used to assist, promote, or deter union organizing.

3. Contractor will not, for any business conducted under this agreement, use any state property to hold meetings with employees or supervisors if the purpose of such meetings is to assist, promote, or deter union organizing, unless the state property is equally available to the general public for holding meetings.

4. If the contractor incurs costs or makes expenditures to assist, promote, or deter union organizing, the contractor will maintain records sufficient to show that no reimbursement from state funds has been sought for these costs. The contractor shall provide these records to the Attorney General upon request.

B. The contractor hereby certifies that no request for reimbursement or payment under this agreement will seek reimbursement for costs incurred to assist, promote, or deter union organizing.

7.19 Standard Agreement Provisions

If awarded the contract, the successful bidder must accept the provisions as follows:

A. The contractor agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the State, its officers, agents, and employees from any and all claims and losses accruing or resulting to any and
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all contractors, subcontractors, material-men, laborers, and any other person, firm, or corporation furnishing or supplying work services, materials, or supplies in connection with the performance of this contract, and from any and all claims and losses accruing or resulting to any person, firm, or corporation who may be injured or damaged by the contractor in the performance of this contract.

B. The contractor, and the agents and employees of the contractor, in the performance of the agreement, shall act in an independent capacity and not as officers or employees or agents of State of California.

C. The State may terminate this agreement and be relieved of the payment of any consideration to the contractor should the contractor fail to perform the covenants herein contained at the time and in the manner herein provided. In the event of such termination the State may proceed with the work in any manner deemed proper by the State. The cost to the State shall be deducted from any sum due the contractor under this agreement, and the balance, if any, shall be paid the contractor upon demand.

D. Without the written consent of the State, this agreement is not assignable by the contractor either in whole or in part.

E. Time is of the essence in this agreement.

F. No alteration or variation of the terms of this contract shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated herein, shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

G. The consideration to be paid the contractor, as provided herein, shall be in compensation for all of the contractor’s expenses incurred in the performance hereof, including travel and per diem, unless otherwise expressly so provided.

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

Each submission shall be evaluated to determine responsiveness to the general requirements and components, as well as format and content requirements, as described in this RFS. The CDE will prepare a report of the evaluation results and submit the SSPI’s recommendation to the SBE for their consideration. A copy of the recommendation will be provided to the SBE Executive Director.

Each bidder’s submission will be evaluated by separate panels comprised of CDE staff members and other testing experts to determine the quality and degree of responsiveness to the requirements in this request for submission. The evaluation process is designed to determine the quality of the bidder’s submission related to:
The DPLT.

The bidder’s capacity for administering, scoring, and reporting the DPLT and producing accurate results in a timely manner.

The panels’ focuses will be to determine if the bidder meets the experience and organizational qualifications to implement and manage a large-scale testing program. Bidders are asked to comply with all submission format requests in this document to facilitate the panels’ abilities to make the fairest possible comparisons between and among the submissions received.

Evaluation Panels. To assist in the SSPI recommendation process, two panels of experts will independently evaluate the bidder’s responsiveness to the general requirements described in the RFS. The two panels are for: 1) the evaluation of the technical qualities of the DPLT; and 2) the evaluation of the DPLT’s alignment to the English-language arts and mathematics content standards and the evaluation of the administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting of the test. To provide the SSPI with the most qualified individuals, panel members will consist of CDE staff, content experts in reading/language arts and mathematics who are bilingual and biliterate, and testing experts.

During the evaluation panel meetings, the panel members will:

- Individually evaluate the requirements for the component they are reviewing.
- Work together to arrive at a consensus on the number of points to be assigned to each requirement.
- Prepare a brief statement of each submission’s strengths and weaknesses.

Panel Findings. CDE staff will compile the panels’ findings. One member from each panel plus a third member will review the findings of the panels, review cost proposals and evaluate them, and prepare a final report for the SSPI and provide a copy to the SBE Executive Director.

Cost Proposal. The cost proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the standards and requirements in the RFS.
9. FORMAT AND CONTENT REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Bidder’s Name: ____________________________________________

Part 1 – Format and Content Requirements. This part is rated on a check (✓) basis. Not receiving a check (✓) will result in the submission’s consideration and review without that particular component.

______  Submission Intent to Submit Form (Appendix 7) was received by the specified deadline, **April 15, 2005 by 12:00 p.m. PDT** as specified in RFS Section 4.5.

______  One clearly marked ORIGINAL submission and 12 copies received by the specified deadline: **May 18, 2005, by 2:00 p.m. PDT** at the Standards and Assessment Division of the California Department of Education as specified in RFS Section 5.1.

**Cover Letter**

A. As specified in RFS Section 5.2, the original and copies of the submission contain a Cover Letter that:

______  1. Acknowledges that the rights to any hardcopy/electronic material, report, or other material developed by the bidder or its subcontractors in connection with this agreement shall belong to CDE.

______  2. Attest to the bidder’s eligibility in terms of being legally constituted and qualified to do business in California (See Section 4.1). Uses the bidder’s true corporate name, indicates any fictitious name under which the organization is doing business (“doing business as”), or, in the case of an entity whose legal status precludes incorporation, clearly states the bidder’s legal status in a separate paragraph.

______  3. Identifies acceptance of the contract terms and requirements as specified in Section 7 of this RFS. No additional contract terms or requirements may be added or substituted by the bidder and no modifications or corrections to stated contract terms and requirements can be made.
4. Cover letter is signed by the representative who is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the bidder to perform the work described. Cover letter indicates position title and certifies that he or she is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the organization/bidder. (A copy of the Cover Letter also must be included in each copy of the submission submitted.)

Table of Contents

B. As specified in RFS Section 5.2, the submission should include a Table of Contents, which identifies by page number, all the section and subsection headings in the submission.

Scope of Work

C. Each task identified in Section 3, Scope of Work, must be addressed and timelines provided for the accomplishment of each task.

Component Task 1 – Comprehensive Plan and Schedule for Project Deliverables and Activities

Component Task 2 – Program Support Services

Component Task 3 – Designated Primary Language Test Requirements

Component Task 4 – Test Form Construction

Component Task 5 – Test Materials Production, Ordering, and Packaging

Component Task 6 – Delivery and Collection of Test Materials

Component Task 7 – Processing, Scoring, and Analysis

Component Task 8 – Reporting Test Results to LEAs

Component Task 9 – Reporting Test Results to the CDE

Component Task 10 – Documentation and Electronic Data Management

Management and Staffing

D. As specified in Section 5.2, the submission contains a Management and Staffing section. The bidder’s submission must:

1. Include a management plan.

2. Describes and identifies a management team that includes resumés for:

   a. Project Manager
b. Fiscal Manager

3. Staff Organizational Plan

**Related Capacity and Experience**

E. As specified in Section 5.2, the submission contains a Related Capacity and Experience section. This bidder’s submission must:

1. Describe the bidder’s and subcontractor(s) capacity.
2. Describe the bidder’s and subcontractor(s) experience.

**Requirements for Subcontractor(s)**

F. As specified in Section 5.2, the submission contains a Subcontractor(s) section. This bidder’s submission must:

1. Include a short description of the proposed work for each subcontractor.
2. Include a letter of agreement from all proposed subcontractors.

**Required Attachments**

G. Required forms as specified in Section 5.2 submitted with each copy of the submission (check each one submitted):

1. Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (Attachment 1) completed with an original signature on the form included in the ORIGINAL submission.
2. State of California Drug-Free Workplace Certification (Attachment 2) completed with an original signature on the form included in the ORIGINAL submission.
3. Certificate of Good Standing issued by the California Secretary of State, if applicable.

**Cost Proposal**

H. As specified in Section 5.3, the submission includes a Cost Proposal section. The bidder must:

1. RFS Section 5.3(1): Cost Proposal Summary by Fiscal Year. The bidder must provide a cost proposal summary identifying the number of anticipated test takers and providing all costs broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs for DPLT, and b) DPLT Costs, including totals costs per
administration, fiscal year costs across administrations, and total costs for all three administrations.

The anticipated number of DPLT test takers is provided for each of the three test administrations.

The total Administrative and Program Support Costs are provided for each of the three test administrations.

The total DPLT Costs are provided each of the three test administrations.

The total costs per fiscal year across administrations are provided for each fiscal year (2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09).

The total cost for all three administrations is provided.

2. **Section 5.3(2): Cost Proposal by Task.** The bidder must provide a cost proposal identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing fixed costs, variable costs, and variable rates for all tasks set forth in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs for DPLT, and b) DPLT Costs.

The number of test takers provided for each test administration is identical to the number provided in the Cost Proposal Summary by Fiscal Year.

Fixed costs are provided for each task in the RFS for each of the three test administrations.

Variable costs are provided for each task, as applicable, in the RFS for each of the three test administrations.

Variable cost rates are provided for each task, as applicable, in the RFS for each of the three test administrations.

The total costs per task are provided for each of the three test administrations.

The total per pupil costs are provided for Administrative and Program Support Costs for each of the three test administrations.

The total per pupil costs are provided for DPLT Costs for each of the three test administrations.
3. **Section 5.3(3): Cost Proposal Detail** (Appendix 5). The bidder must provide a cost proposal detail providing cost detail by subtask (Task 1A, Task 1B, etc.) within each task as specified in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs for DPLT, and b) DPLT Costs.

Costs are provided for each subtask in the RFS for each of the three test administrations broken down by Administrative and Program Support Costs and DPLT Costs.

Labor costs are provided.

Billing Rates are provided for labor costs.

The number of hours for labor costs is provided.

The billing number of hours in the cost proposal detail agrees with the hours in the Management and Staffing section of the submission.

All staffing titles used in the cost proposal detail correspond to the staffing titles used in the submission.

Subcontractor detail costs are provided.

Travel detail costs are provided.
Part 2 – Evaluation. A review panel will be convened to evaluate the submissions using a consensus process. All submission sections, except the Table of Contents and attachments, will be evaluated.

### Section 3.1 Component Task 1 – Comprehensive Plan and Schedule for Project Deliverables and Activities

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.1 Component Task 1 (and related subsections) of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How does the comprehensive plan and project deliverables schedule ensure the successful and timely completion of the tasks outlined in the submission?
- How effectively does the bidder demonstrate it will provide timely and accurate communication with CDE in the form of various reports and meetings?
- How well does the bidder’s proposal incorporate CDE’s approval schedule?
- How adeptly does the bidder’s plan indicate how it will cooperate with CDE in the transition to the STS?

Consensus score: ______ out of 10 points possible

### Section 3.2 Component Task 2 – Program Support Services

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.2 Component Task 2 (and related subsections) of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How effective is the bidder’s plan in addressing the staffing and overall strategy to provide support services to district STAR coordinators?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to develop and maintain a help desk?
- How effectively has the bidder demonstrated the ability to collect, verify, and maintain critical information on district coordinators, as well as ensure consistency in terminology in areas shared with the STAR Program?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to conduct workshops?

Consensus score: ______ out of 10 points possible
### Section 3.3 Task 3 Designated Primary Language Test Requirements

When evaluating the bidder’s proposed primary language test for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.3 Component Task 3 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- Has the bidder provided the general information requested by A, B, C, and D contained in Section 3.3 Component Task 3 of the RFS?
- How well does the submission address the bidder’s ability to provide replacement items if a test item is rejected by the SPAR panel?
- Does the bidder’s technical manual provide sufficient evidence that the test battery(ies) was developed in accordance with all applicable standards for test construction in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999)?
- How well does the bidder explain how the test scores are intended to be interpreted and used?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate that the test levels for the primary language test fit the grade levels being tested (2-11)?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate an alignment of the proposed tests to the California English-language arts and mathematics content standards?
- How effectively is the norming sample described and illustrated to be appropriate for California?
- How adequately does the submission provide empirical data from the norming sample and/or special studies to indicate whether accommodations required for students with disabilities affect the inferences that can be made from the scores received?

**Consensus score: _____ out of 20 points possible**

---

### Section 3.4 Task 4 – Test Form Construction

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.4 Component Task 4 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to construct test booklets and answer documents?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce test materials for students with disabilities?

**Consensus score: _____ out of 10 points possible**
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Section 3.5 Component Task 5 – Test Materials Production, Ordering, and Packaging

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.5 Component Task 5 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce all testing materials?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce ancillary test materials?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to develop and implement a pre-identification process?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to develop a system for ordering test materials?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to package test materials?

Consensus score: ______ out of 15 points possible

Section 3.6 Component Task 6 – Delivery and Collection of Test Materials

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.6 Component Task 6 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to deliver and collect materials in a timely manner?

Consensus score: ______ out of 10 points possible

Section 3.7 Task 7 – Processing, Scoring, and Analysis

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.7 Component Task 7 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to process tests?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to score all students’ test documents within a timely manner and implement quality assurance activities throughout the entire process of scoring, analysis, and reporting?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to analyze test results?

Consensus score: ______ out of 25 points possible
Section 3.8 Task 8 – Reporting Test Results to LEAs

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.8 Component Task 8 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to prepare, produce, print and deliver all required reports to the LEAs?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce and distribute paper score reports?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce and deliver student level data files to the LEA and CDE?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce interpretation guidelines for individual student score reports?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to deliver narrative reports consistent with the requirements in the submission?

Consensus score: ______ out of 10 points possible

Section 3.9 Task 9 – Reporting Test Results to CDE

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.9 Component Task 9 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to provide a turnkey Web site that displays the STAR DPLT test results?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to produce online reports consistent with the requirements in the submission?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to generate a state-level research file?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to incorporate extensive administrative functionality into the Internet design?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to deliver reports and data files in accordance with a timeline consistent with the requirements in the submission?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to provide a secure Internet site?

Consensus score: ______ out of 10 points possible
### Section 3.10 Task 10 – Documentation and Electronic Data Management

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 3.10 Component Task 10 of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to establish and maintain data dictionaries?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to maintain the security and confidentiality of all data consistent with the requirements of the submission?
- How well does the bidder demonstrate the ability to use a secure Internet site and data encryption for a secure data exchange?
- How well does the bidder’s plan demonstrate the ability to maintain the confidentiality of individual student results?

Consensus score: _____ out of 10 points possible

### Section 5.2 – Management and Staffing

When evaluating the bidder’s plan for this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 5.2(D) of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- How effectively does the bidder’s management plan illustrate the ability to complete tasks on schedule and within budget?
- To what extent does the proposed management team and project staff possess professional qualifications and experience to carry out the tasks of this project?
- How well does the bidder’s staff organization plan specify how it will meet all needs in ensuring completion of all tasks?

Consensus score: _____ out of 15 points possible
Section 5.2 – Related Capacity and Experience

When evaluating this section, please consider carefully the following questions and the information requirements contained in Section 5.2 (E) of the RFS before assigning the consensus score.

- To what extent do the bidder and the bidder’s proposed subcontractor(s) have the facilities, equipment, and technical capacity to perform the work required by this project?
- To what extent does the prior experience described by the bidder and the bidder’s proposed subcontractor(s) illustrate their capacity in projects of a similar nature and scope?

Consensus score: ______ out of 20 points possible

The cost proposal evaluations will be based on Appendices 3, 4, and 5.
# Score Tally Sheet for Content (Sections 3.1 – 5.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.1 Task 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.2 Task 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.3 Task 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.4 Task 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.5 Task 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.6 Task 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.7 Task 7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.8 Task 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.9 Task 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.10 Task 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.2 Management/Staffing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.2 Capacity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cost Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Proposal</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.3(1): Total Cost for all three administrations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.3(2): Per Pupil Cost for DPLT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Final Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Score</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Proposal Score</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Checklist of Major Project Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RFS Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative schedule</td>
<td>3.1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly progress reports</td>
<td>3.1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly management meetings</td>
<td>3.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and minutes</td>
<td>3.1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help desk</td>
<td>3.2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>3.2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test form construction</td>
<td>3.4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer documents</td>
<td>3.4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille and large-print test forms and examiner instructions</td>
<td>3.4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test materials</td>
<td>3.5A,B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ID process</td>
<td>3.5C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of test materials</td>
<td>3.6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark discrimination report</td>
<td>3.7A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of test materials</td>
<td>3.7A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring process</td>
<td>3.7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of test results</td>
<td>3.7C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student level reports</td>
<td>3.8B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary reports</td>
<td>3.8B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report verification</td>
<td>3.8B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic student data files</td>
<td>3.8C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation guidelines</td>
<td>3.8D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet site</td>
<td>3.9A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary data files</td>
<td>3.9A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet reports</td>
<td>3.9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research files</td>
<td>3.9C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet site and associated research files</td>
<td>3.9E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Web site</td>
<td>3.9F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is not an exhaustive list of project deliverables.

[June 3, 2009 Note: This document was posted April 2005 for the State Board of Education as part of the April 2005 Agenda.]
CALIFORNIA STATE TRAVEL PROGRAM

CONDITIONS OF TRAVEL
Each State agency determines the necessity for and the method of employee business travel. Effective 1/1/92, reimbursement shall not be made for meal and lodging expenses incurred within 50 miles of home or headquarters. Authority to approve exceptions was delegated to appointing powers as follows: to approve meals and/or lodging for employees on travel status away from, but within 50 miles of home or headquarters. Delegation does not extend to the approval of meals or lodging at either the home or headquarters location.

SHORT-TERM TRAVEL

LODGING REIMBURSEMENT RATES – IN STATE
Applicable when State business requires an overnight stay and the employee uses a good, moderately priced commercial lodging establishment (hotel, motel, bed and breakfast or public campground) that caters to the short-term traveler, and for day trips of less than 24 hrs.

HINTS: Use the 2003 LODGING TRAVEL GUIDE! http://www.catravelsmart.com/default.htm or http://www.capitolweekly.com. These are full of good lodging establishments priced within State rates. Present the TAX WAIVER FORM when you check in. They are not required to waive the tax. KEEP YOUR RECEIPTS.

LODGING REIMBURSEMENT – receipt required
Statewide, Except as below, * up to $84.00 + tax
*San Francisco, Alameda, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties up to $140.00 + tax. Counties of Los Angeles and San Diego: $110.00 + tax.

Note: Get a confirmation number when you make your reservations and use it when you check in. Travelers who do not provide a lodging receipt are eligible to claim meals/incidentals only as appropriate to the time frames of travel. (See below for rates and time frames.)

MEALS AND INCIDENTALS (each 24 hr. period)
Breakfast: ACTUAL EXPENSE UP TO $ 6.00
Lunch: “ 10.00
Dinner “ 18.00
Incidentals “ 6.00
Note: YOU must retain all meal receipts for audit by the state or the IRS.

TIMEFRAMES:
FIRST DAY: TRIP OF MORE THAN 24 HOURS:
Trip begins at or before 5pm: may claim dinner
Trip begins at or before 11am: may claim lunch
Trip begins at or before 6am: may claim breakfast

FRACTIONAL DAY: AFTER 24 HOURS OF TRAVEL:
Trip ends at or after 8am: may claim breakfast
Trip ends at or after 2pm: may claim lunch
Trip ends at or after 7pm: may claim dinner

FRACTIONAL DAY-TRIP OF LESS THAN 24 HOURS:
Trip must begin at or before 6am AND end at or after 9am in order to claim breakfast.
Trip must begin at or before 4pm AND end at or after 7pm in order to claim dinner.
No lunch or incidentals may be claimed. IF THERE IS NO OVERNIGHT STAY, THESE MEALS ARE TAXABLE.

NOTE: Full meals included in airfare, hotel, and conference fees, or otherwise provided may not also be claimed for reimbursement. The same meal may not be claimed more than once on any date. Continental breakfasts of rolls, coffee, and juice are not considered full meals.

CONFERENCES/CONVENTIONS: Rooms that are contracted by the sponsors for the event, and that have an approved Excess Lodging Request Form (STD 255C).
- STATE SPONSORED:
  Appointing power delegated to approve lodging with receipt: up to $110 + tax
- NON-STATE SPONSORED:
  Appointing power delegated to approve lodging with receipt up to the rate contracted for the event.

OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL
Lodging w/receipt: actual expense (subject to department approval)
Meals/incidentals: same rates/requirements has in-state reimbursement (Provide Blanket Number!)

OUT-OF-COUNTRY TRAVEL
Lodging w/receipt: actual expense (w/appvl.)
Meals/incidentals: as published by the U.S. Govt. for dates and places traveled. Call DPA for rates.

MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT RATES
All privately owned vehicle mileage driven on State business is subject to advance approval by the appointing authority. The rate claimed shall be considered full reimbursement for all costs related to the operation and maintenance of the vehicle, including both liability and comprehensive insurance.

Automobile 34 cents per mile
Spec. Vehicle w/cert up to 37 cents per mile
Private aircraft up to 50 cents per mile
Bicycle up to 4 cents per mile

If dropped off and picked up at a common carrier and no parking expense is claimed, mileage to and from the common carrier may be claimed at the above appropriate rate times twice the number of miles you actually occupy the vehicle (pays for each round trip).

TRANSPORTATION
Reimbursement for transportation expenses will be only for the method of transportation that is in the best interest of the State, considering both direct expense and the employee’s time. The Department of General Services, Office of Fleet Management, manages the State car fleet and enters into contracts with airlines for reduced city pair rates and with rental car vendors for guaranteed daily rates for use on State business. When an employee chooses a method of transportation that is more costly than the normal method of travel, (driving a personal vehicle instead of flying) reimbursement will be the lower amount.
The bidder must provide a total cost proposal summary conforming to the model displayed in Appendix 3 identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing all costs broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs for each test administration by fiscal year in which the costs will be incurred, including total costs per administration, fiscal year costs across administrations, and total costs for all three administrations.

**Bidder Name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Anticipated Number of Test Takers per Administration</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005 - June 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2006 - June 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007 - June 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2008 - December 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2006 Administration (grades 2 through 11)**

- Anticipated Number of Test Takers
- Administrative and Program Support (Tasks 1 and 2)
- DPLT Costs (Tasks 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10)

**Total per 2006 administration:** $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ 

**2007 Administration (grades 3 through 11)**

- Anticipated Number of Test Takers
- Administrative and Program Support (Tasks 1 and 2)
- DPLT Costs (Tasks 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10)

**Total per 2007 administration:** $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ 

**2008 Administration (grades 4 through 11)**

- Anticipated Number of Test Takers
- Administrative and Program Support (Tasks 1 and 2)
- DPLT Costs (Tasks 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10)

**Total per 2008 administration:** $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ 

**Total per fiscal year:** $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ 

**Total cost for all three administrations:** $
The bidder must provide a cost proposal identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing fixed costs, variable costs, and variable rates for all component tasks set forth in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs, including a total per pupil cost for each category, for each separate test administration. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work and all related overhead or indirect costs. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal.

### Bidder Name:

#### 2006 Administration (grades 2 through 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFS Section</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated Number of Test Takers for 2006 Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable Cost Rate Per Pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Costs (A + B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Per Pupil Cost (Column D divided by # test takers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administrative and Program Support Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Fixed Costs</th>
<th>Variable Costs</th>
<th>Variable Cost Rate Per Pupil</th>
<th>Total Costs (A + B)</th>
<th>Total Per Pupil Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Task 1: Comprehensive Plan and Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Task 2: Program Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DPLT Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Fixed Costs</th>
<th>Variable Costs</th>
<th>Variable Cost Rate Per Pupil</th>
<th>Total Costs (A + B)</th>
<th>Total Per Pupil Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Task 4: Test Form Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Task 5: Test Materials Production, Ordering, and Packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Task 6: Delivery and Collection of Test Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Task 7: Processing, Scoring, and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Task 8: Reporting Test Results to LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Task 9: Reporting Test Results to CDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Task 10: Documentation and Electronic Data Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bidder must provide a cost proposal identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing fixed costs, variable costs, and variable rates for all component tasks set forth in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs, including a total per pupil cost for each category, for each separate test administration. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work and all related overhead or indirect costs. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal.

### Bidder Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 Administration (grades 3 through 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Number of Test Takers for 2007 Administration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Program Support Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPLT Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COST PROPOSAL BY TASK
SUBMISSION FOR THE STAR PROGRAM
DESIGNATED PRIMARY LANGUAGE TEST (DPLT)

The bidder must provide a cost proposal identifying the number of anticipated test-takers and providing fixed costs, variable costs, and variable rates for all component tasks set forth in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs, including a total per pupil cost for each category, for each separate test administration. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work and all related overhead or indirect costs. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal.

Bidder Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 Administration (grades 4 through 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFS Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Program Support Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPLT Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COST PROPOSAL DETAIL
SUBMISSION FOR THE STAR PROGRAM
DESIGNATED PRIMARY LANGUAGE TEST (DPLT)

The bidder must provide a cost proposal detail providing cost detail by subtask (Task 1A, Task 1B, etc.) within each task as specified in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs per each test administration. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal.

Note: This appendix is provided for formatting purposes only. Expand and include as many rows and pages as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder Name:</th>
<th>Administration Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(submit separate cost proposal for each test administration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFS Section</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>Labor Costs</th>
<th>Billing Rate</th>
<th># Hours</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Subcontractor Costs</th>
<th>Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Administrative and Program Support Costs**

3.1 Task 1
   A. Narrative Schedule
   B. Progress Reports
   C. Management Meetings
   D. SBE Meetings and Technical Meetings
   E. Records and Minutes
   F. Reports
   G. CDE Ownership of Materials
   H. CDE Approval Schedule
   I. Transition
   **Subtotal**

3.2 Task 2
   A. Help Desk
   B. Collection and Monitoring of Information
   C. Terminology
   D. Workshops
   **Subtotal**

Total Administrative and Program Support Costs

**DPLT Costs**

3.4 Task 4
   A. Test Form Construction
   B. Answer Documents
   C. Forms Design & Production for Students w/Disabilities
   **Subtotal**

3.5 Task 5
   A. Test Materials Production
   B. Ancillary Test Materials
   C. Pre-ID Process
   D. Ordering
   E. Packaging
   **Subtotal**

3.6 Task 6
   A. Delivery of Test Materials
   B. Collection of Test Materials
   **Subtotal**

3.7 Task 7
   A. Test Processing
   B. Scoring and Quality Assurance
   C. Analysis of Test Results
   **Subtotal**

3.8 Task 8
   A. Overall Reports
   **Subtotal**
COST PROPOSAL DETAIL
SUBMISSION FOR THE STAR PROGRAM
DESIGNATED PRIMARY LANGUAGE TEST (DPLT)

The bidder must provide a cost proposal detail providing cost detail by subtask (Task 1A, Task 1B, etc.) within each task as specified in Section 3 of this RFS broken down by a) Administrative and Program Support Costs and b) DPLT Costs per each test administration. The total contract bid amount is for all tasks specified in the scope of work. No costs, direct or indirect, shall be omitted from the cost proposal.

Note: This appendix is provided for formatting purposes only. Expand and include as many rows and pages as necessary.

Bidder Name: 
Administration Year: (submit separate cost proposal for each test administration)
Web Site Resources

California Legislative Information (Senate Bill 1448) - http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

California Code of Regulations - http://www.calregs.com

[Note: This link is not longer valid as of June 3, 2009]


Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Results - http://star.cde.ca.gov

California Department of Education - http://www.cde.ca.gov

[Posted by the California Department of Education
State Board of Education Agenda Item 01 Addendum Attachment 1
This note added on June 3, 2009]
SUBMISSION FOR THE STAR PROGRAM
DESIGNATED PRIMARY LANGUAGE TEST (DPLT)
INTENT TO SUBMIT FORM

This Intent to Submit Form is due by mail or fax no later than 12:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (PDT) on April 15, 2005 at:

California Department of Education
Standards and Assessment Division
Attention: Vicki Perez
1430 N Street, Suite 5408
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax: 916-319-0969

I/We intend to submit for a contract for California’s Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program Designated Primary Language Test (DPLT).

Name of Firm: __________________________________________

Individual Contact: ______________________________________

Address: ________________________________________________

                        Street Address       City       Zip

Phone #: ____________________________      FAX #: ____________________________

E-mail address: __________________________________________

The purpose of this Intent to Submit Form is to provide CDE information to plan adequately for the review of the submissions.

________________________________________________________
Signature of Applicant’s Representative        Date

Title of Applicant’s Representative
**SUBJECT**
PUBLIC COMMENT. Public Comment is invited on any matter not included on the printed agenda. Depending on the number of individuals wishing to address the State Board, the presiding officer may establish specific time limits on presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Public Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**
Listen to public comment on matters not included on the agenda.

**SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION**
N/A

**SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**
N/A

**FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**
N/A

**ATTACHMENT(S)**
None