

March 13, 2018

# ADDENDUM #2 – Request for Proposals for the Independent Evaluation of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CN170400)

To all Prospective Bidders:   
  
This addendum hereby revises RFP CN170400, as follows:

Page 1, Cover Page

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

California Department of Education Request for Proposals (RFP) Independent Evaluation of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) - CN170400

Contract Term: July 1, 2018 – December 31, 2020

RFP Release Date: February 6, 2018

California Department of Education

Assessment Development and Administration Division

Attention: Jeff Eres

1430 N Street, Suite 4409

Sacramento, CA 95814

916-319-0347

## Page 11, Section 3, Scope of Project

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

As set forth in Sections 5.1 (Technical Proposal Requirements) and 5.3 (Cost Proposal Requirements), the bidder must plan and budget for the costs of all tasks/subtasks and activities. The Technical Proposal may not contain any cost information.

The proposed term of the contract to be awarded under this RFP is from July 1, 2018 through December 31, 2020. The term of the contract July 1, 2018 through December 31, 2020 covers three fiscal years, and a total of 30 months. (Refer to RFP Section 4.8 for the definition of *fiscal year*.) The fiscal years defined in this RFP are as follows:

* 2018–19: July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019
* 2019–20: July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020
* 2020–21: July 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020

This RFP seeks proposals addressing four main tasks:

Task 1 – Coordination and Communications with the CDE

Task 2 – Reports, Invoices, and Data File Requirements

Task 3 – Alignment Studies

Task 4 – Impact on Instruction Study

## Page 12, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 1.3 State Board of Education Meetings

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

1.3 State Board of Education Meetings

The Technical Proposal must include a plan to provide periodic presentations at the SBE meetings, at CDE’s request. The successful bidder must plan to attend at least two SBE meetings each fiscal year. These meetings require in-person attendance and are held at the CDE headquarters located in Sacramento, California, unless otherwise announced. The successful bidder must present evaluation findings to the SBE and members of the legislature, as required. The successful bidder must also respond to questions from Board members and other interested stakeholders. The bidder must budget for these meetings and include all costs in the cost proposal. Do not include any cost information in the Technical Proposal.

## Page 13, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 1.5 CAASPP Contract Annual Planning Meetings

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

1.5 CAASPP Contract Annual Planning Meetings

Each year the CAASPP contractor is required to hold an annual planning meeting. The planning meeting provides a detailed overview of all of the CAASPP activities to be undertaken during the upcoming year. These have generally been two-day meetings held in Sacramento, California. The meeting provides a forum for the CDE and the CAASPP contractor to discuss concerns regarding particular activities, processes, project scope, and schedule. Improvements to the system are described and reviewed as well. The Technical Proposal must acknowledge and ensure the successful bidder will attend each CAASPP annual planning meeting that takes place each Spring, for Fiscal Years: 2018-19, and 2019-20.

## Page 20, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 2.5 Alignment Study Reports

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

2.5 Alignment Study Reports

The Technical Proposal must ensure that the successful bidder prepare stand-alone alignment study reports for the CAST and the CAA for Science to the CDE by June 1, 2020 for the CDE to submit as part of the U.S. Department of Education Assessment Peer Review. The bidder must submit twelve hard copies of the stand-alone reports. The Technical Proposal must, in the alignment study report, describe the methods and procedures used to conduct the alignment study, the number of panelists and their characteristics, alignment study results, and any documents (other than test forms) used as part of the alignment study. The bidder’s proposal must acknowledge that the bidder will comply with Task 1.6 for the CDE Approval Schedule Requirements.

## Page 20, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 2.6 Case Study Report

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

2.6 Case Study Report

The Technical Proposal must ensure that the successful bidder prepare a stand-alone report on the Impact of Instruction and Student Learning Case Studies, as described in Task 4, for educators, administrators, and policy makers documenting the findings of the case studies. The Technical Proposal must ensure that the successful bidder prepare the case study report by September 30 each year starting 2019. The successful bidder must submit twelve hard copies of the stand-alone reports. The Technical Proposal must ensure that the report provide sufficient detail about the cases studied to inform the development of instructional practices in other schools and LEAs. The bidder’s proposal must acknowledge that the bidder will comply with Task 1.6 for the CDE Approval Schedule Requirements.

The successful bidder is responsible for all costs related to the case study, including, but not limited to, labor, travel, per diem, and either a $100 honorarium or the cost for a substitute teacher for participants (exclusive of outside observers, evaluators, or CDE staff). Substitute teacher costs are not determined by the CDE but are determined and may vary by the LEA.

## Page 20, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 2.7 Comprehensive Final Report

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

2.7 Comprehensive Final Report

By September 30, 2020, the successful bidder must prepare a comprehensive final report and executive summary that will include recommendations based upon the findings of the evaluation. The Technical Proposal must ensure that the report includes, at a minimum, an executive summary, background, evaluation questions, literature review, study design, data collection procedures, analyses, findings, contextual factors, recommendations for the CDE regarding the improvement of the CAASPP System, and implications of the findings for the future. The Technical Proposal must ensure that the final report will describe the procedures used to collect and analyze the data, describe any limitations of the findings, and any challenges related to conducting the evaluations. Any surveys or other instruments developed to conduct the evaluation must also be included in the report.Thebidder must submit twelve hard copies of the stand-alone reports. The bidder’s proposal must acknowledge that the bidder will comply with Task 1.6 for the CDE Approval Schedule Requirements.

## Page 21, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 3 Alignment Studies

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

TASK 3 – ALIGNMENT STUDIES

This section of the Technical Proposal must acknowledge the bidder’s commitment to completing all the requirements specified below in Task 3 and must provide a description of the approach and methodology by which the bidder will accomplish all the associated subtasks and activities. The Technical Proposal must contain sufficient detail to convey the bidder’s knowledge of the subjects and skills necessary to successfully complete the project as stated in Task 3.

The U.S. Department of Education Assessment Peer Review process requires states to provide an independent alignment study for each test administered by the state as required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The successful bidder should plan to conduct two alignment studies, one for the CAST, and one for the CAA for Science.

The Technical Proposal must describe in detail the approach and methods to be used to conduct the alignment studies. The Technical Proposal must specify the rationale for the alignment methodology. The process for selecting panelists must be described along with the desired composition of the panel in terms of the number of panelists and their characteristics. The successful bidder will work collaboratively with the CDE Contract Monitor on recruiting and selecting panelists. The successful bidder will submit a list of proposed panelists to the CDE Contract Monitor for review and approval. The Technical Proposal must specify that the successful bidder will make all logistical arrangements for the alignment study to include providing required technology for panelists to use in viewing and completing test items. The successful bidder will work collaboratively with the CDE Contract Monitor to determine dates and locations for convening the panelists.

The successful bidder is responsible for all costs related to the alignment study, including, but not limited to, labor, travel, per diem, and either a $100 honorarium or the cost for a substitute teacher for participants (exclusive of outside observers, evaluators, or CDE staff). Substitute teacher costs are not determined by the CDE but are determined and may vary by the LEA.

The Technical Proposal must describe in detail the proposed alignment studies which must include the following components:

1. A review of contractor documentation for how alignment was considered in test development.
2. Use of a panel of educators (educators familiar with California content standards and Next Generation Science Standards [NGSS]) toreview test specifications, blueprints and test forms to assess sampling of the content specified in the standards (content connectors for the CAA Science assessment) for each domain.
3. Determine if the test items are at the appropriate depth of knowledge (DOK) for the content included in the test.
4. For complex assessment tasks, evaluate the alignment to the full cluster of standards that are associated with the task.
5. Assess the fit of the test to the population being tested in terms of the distribution of item difficulties within test forms and the distribution of student ability, using a Wright Map or similar data analysis technique.
6. Determine if evidence statements and interpretations of results as specified by the test developer are appropriate based on the content of the test.

## Page 21, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 3.1 CAST Alignment Study

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

3.1 CAST Alignment Study

The CAST will be administered operationally for the first time in January – July of 2019. It will be administered to students in grades five, eight, and high school. The assessments will be computer-based fixed-form (non-adaptive) assessments. The assessments include three sections: (1) A set of selected response and short constructed response items taken by all students, (2) A set of performance tasks taken by all students, and (3) A set of items matrixed across test forms. Results from the first two sections will be used to report individual student scores. The matrix portion of the test will not be used for individual score reporting, but will provide information at the school and LEA level on student achievement on a broader sample of content than would be possible otherwise.

Test forms for use in the alignment studies will likely not be ready for use until just prior to the start of the testing window. The alignment study will determine the degree of alignment of the CAST test items and test forms with the CA NGSS. The design of the alignment study must be appropriate for assessing the alignment of the assessment to the three primary components of the CA NGSS described below.

1. Disciplinary Core Ideas (DCIs) are the key ideas in science that have broad importance within or across multiple science or engineering disciplines. These core ideas build on each other as student’s progress through grade levels and are grouped into the following four domains: Physical Science, Life Science, Earth and Space Science, and Engineering.
2. Crosscutting Concepts help students explore connections across the four domains of science, including Physical Science, Life Science, Earth and Space Science, and Engineering. When these concepts, such as “cause and effect,” are made explicit for students, they can help students develop a coherent and scientifically-based view of the world around them.
3. Science and Engineering Practices describe what scientists do to investigate the natural world and what engineers do to design and build systems. The practices better explain and extend what is meant by “inquiry” in science and the range of cognitive, social, and physical practices that it requires. Students engage in practices to build, deepen, and apply their knowledge of core ideas and crosscutting concepts.

The alignment study methodology must provide an estimate of the reliability of panelists’ judgements. The methodology must also allow for multiple standards aligning to a single, complex, performance task.

The successful bidder will produce a CAST alignment study report that will be submitted as part of the U.S. Department of Education Assessment Peer Review. The bidder must acknowledge on the Bidder Certification Sheet (Attachment 1) that it will comply with Task 1.6 for the CDE Approval Schedule Requirements.

The Technical Proposal must describe in detail the proposed alignment study methodology which must address all of the following elements of alignment:

1. To what extent do the test design and test blueprints support the claims to be made about student performance on the assessment?
2. To what extent does the test blueprint represent an appropriate sampling of the content as set forth in the NGSS?
3. To what extent do the test forms and test items reflect the test design and test blueprints?
4. To what extent do tasks and items integrate more than one disciplinary core idea, crosscutting concept, and/or science and engineering practice?
5. To what extent do the test forms show balance across the disciplinary areas (physical science, life science, earth science, and engineering)?
6. Do the items range from low to high cognitive complexity and provide a sufficient number of items across the range of cognitive complexity?

## Page 26, Section 3, Scope of Project, Task 4.2 Data Collection

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

4.2 Data Collection

The Technical Proposal must describe in detail the data to be collected (including sampling plan, instruments to be used, and administration procedures), and the relationship of the data to the research question(s) to be investigated. The Technical Proposal must describe in detail the process to be used by the successful bidder to work with LEA collaborators to make use of available information and ensure the ability to address all of the targeted research questions within the constraints of available resources. This includes procedures to be used to conduct observations and/or collect other data on school sites.

Potential data in the evaluation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment results (may be obtained from the CDE). School and LEA information will be provided based on the need of the studies. No classroom level data will be available through the CDE. Classroom data can be obtained by working with LEAs cooperating in the evaluation study.
2. Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment results (may be obtained from the CDE)
3. California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) data including student demographic data, course taking data, and exit data (may be obtained from the CDE)
4. Surveys of school and LEA personnel
5. Individual and focus group interviews conducted with school and LEA personnel
6. Data collected from observational protocols or other observation techniques.

Specification of the data to be collected to address the Technical Proposal must describe research questions to include reviews of relevant literature, description of the populations from which the data will be collected, the type of data to be collected, data collection procedures to be employed, and a timeline for data collection.

Procedures to be used for primary data collection by the bidder must be described in detail in the Technical Proposal. The bidder must describe in detail provisions made to insure the confidentiality and security of any data collected. The Technical Proposal must describe and demonstrate in detail the bidder’s existing security protocols, policies and procedures that are designed to protect the security of assessment materials and protect the confidentiality of student data and data collected from individuals as part of the evaluation.

## Page 29, Section 4 General Proposal Information, 4.3 RFP Schedule of Events

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

4.3 RFP Schedule of Events

| Activity | Action Date |
| --- | --- |
| Request for Proposal Released | February 6, 2018 |
| Intent to Submit a Proposal | February 23, 2018, 5:00p PST |
| Receipt of Questions from Bidders Due | February 23, 2018, 5:00p PST |
| CDE Response to Questions Received | March 13, 2018 (Tentative) |
| Proposals Due | April 17, 2018, 2:00p PDT |
| Review of the Proposals | April 23 - 27, 2018 (Tentative) |
| Bid Opening | May 9, 2018, 11:00a PDT |
| Posting of Intent to Award (five business days) | May 21 - 25, 2018 (Tentative) |
| Anticipated Contract Start Date | July 1, 2018, or  upon DGS approval, whichever is later |

## Page 29, Section 4, General Proposal Information, 4.4 Contract Funding, and Time Period

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

4.4 Contract Funding, and Time Period

4.4.1 Funding

Contract funding is contingent upon appropriation in the annual Budget Act. It is anticipated that approximately $760,000.00 will be available for the RFP contract work in fiscal year 2018-19, with approximately $800,000.00 available in fiscal year 2019-20, and $400,000 available in fiscal year 2020-21. The total amount available for this project is $1,960,000.00.

If insufficient funds are appropriated for the work in this contract, CDE may cancel the contract with no liability of any kind accruing to or against CDE, its employees, agents, contractors or representatives and the bidder shall not be obligated to perform any work, or the Contract may be amended by CDE and the successful bidder to reflect a reduction of work and the reduced appropriation subject to appropriate government agency approval.

4.4.2 Time Period

It is anticipated that the contract start date will begin approximately on July 1, 2018 or upon the Department of General Services (DGS) approval (whichever is later) and will be completed approximately on December 31, 2020. The actual starting date of the contract is contingent upon approval of the agreement by the DGS. The contract period covers three fiscal years, for a total of 30 months (Refer to RFP, Section 4.8 for the definition of *fiscal year*):

* 2018–19 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019; 12 months)
* 2019–20 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020; 12 months)
* 2020–21 (July 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020; 6 months)

The proposed contract would cover evaluation activities for the following school year test administrations:

* 2017–18 school year test administrations
* 2018–19 school year test administrations
* 2019–20 school year test administrations

## Page 42, Section 5 Proposal Specifications, 5.3 Cost Proposal Requirements, B.

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

The following fiscal years must be addressed in the Cost Proposal:

The proposed term of the contract covers three fiscal years, for a total of 30 months (Refer to RFP, Section 4.8 for the definition of *fiscal year*).:

* 2018–19 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019; 12 months)
* 2019–20 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020; 12 months)
* 2020–21 (July 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020; 6 months)

## Page 44, Section 5 Proposal Specifications, 5.3 Cost Proposal Requirements, F.

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

The Cost Proposal must be submitted in a separately sealed envelope, marked as specified below. The outside of the sealed envelope containing the cost/price bid information must read:

COST PROPOSAL

Independent Evaluation of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress – CN170400

Attention: Jeff Eres

**Do not open until May 9, 2018, 11:00 am (PDT)**

## Page 49, Section 6 Evaluation Process A.5.a.

Delete in its entirety and replace with:

Cost Proposals will be opened for bidders who achieved the required minimum points in Phase II, Technical Proposal Evaluation, and Attachment 15. The final selection will be made on the basis of the lowest responsive Cost Proposal from a responsible bidder. The Public Opening of the Cost Proposal will be held at 1430 N Street, Room 4315, Sacramento, California, 95814 **at the time, day, and date specified in RFP Section 4.3 RFP Schedule of Events.**