

**Connecticut State Department of Education**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD AND AGENCY HEAD ACCEPTANCE**

**Date:** August 15, 2014

**Scoring Committee Members:** Gail Pagano, Abe Krisst, Jeff Greig, Janet Stuck, Ajit Gopalakrishnan, Mohamed Dirir

**RFP Title:** RFP #14SDE0018 – New England Assessment Consortium (NEAC): Implementation of the Smarter Balanced English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments: Academic Office

**NEAC Overview:** Connecticut, New Hampshire and Vermont, hereafter referred to as the New England Assessment Consortium (NEAC) formed a multi-state collaborative for an array of activities and services needed for the implementation of the Smarter Balanced English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments. Each state has separate procurement requirements and individually issued an RFP with common elements along with state specific requirements. Each state conducted separate evaluations of the five proposals.

**Criteria:** The following is the evaluation criteria used by all three states for the scoring identified in the attached signed evaluation committee ratings.

<b>NEAC RFP Evaluation Criteria and Rating System</b>					
<b>Each Proposal Evaluation Criterion will be rated for evidence of quality, clarity, completeness, innovation and overall probability of success using the following ratings:</b>					
<b>S = SUPERIOR</b>	<i>Meets and exceeds expectations for this criterion; demonstrates a high level of capacity, innovation and creativity; High probability of success.</i>				
<b>A = ADEQUATE</b>	<i>Meets expectations for this criterion; consistent with industry standards and practices; good probability of success.</i>				
<b>M = MINIMAL</b>	<i>Meets some but not all expectations, and/or meets expectations at the lowest acceptable levels; moderate to low probability of success</i>				
<b>I = INADEQUATE</b>	<i>Fails to meet some or all expectations; does not demonstrate sufficient capacity to reach project objectives; low to very low probability of success</i>				
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>(circle rating point value)</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Quality of Response to Project Priorities (24 points):</b>					
1. Responds clearly, concisely and completely to all RFP priorities and requirements		6	4	2	0
2. Demonstrates understanding of the states' vision and the challenges that need to be met in order to achieve it		6	4	2	0
3. Proposes methods, procedures and strategies that are sound, innovative, and represent current research and best practice in assessment design and delivery.		6	4	2	0
4. Achieves an acceptable level of balance between technical quality, efficiency, and cost effectiveness		6	4	2	0
<b>Corporate Capacity and Staffing (24 points):</b>					
1. Provides a staffing plan that is sufficient in terms of numbers, roles, and areas of expertise.		6	4	2	0
2. Includes evidence that key project staff are adequately trained and have sufficient experience with respect to each staff member's role in the project		6	4	2	0

3. Demonstrates the capacity to meet project deadlines, work within budgets, handle and solve problems, and achieve a high level of client satisfaction, citing satisfactory completion of similar projects and providing references where appropriate.	6	4	2	0
4. Proposes project management procedures and strategies that address the unique challenges of serving a multi-state collaboration, citing experience that prepares the bidder for this role.	6	4	2	0
<b>Expertise and Experience in Priority Areas (30 points):</b>				
1. Demonstrates the capacity to develop, administer and process student assessments across four states within a three month testing window	6	4	2	0
2. Demonstrates the capacity to score student assessments with a high degree of accuracy, integrity and efficiency	6	4	2	0
3. Demonstrates the capacity to host a web-based assessment delivery system, provide technical assistance to system users, and implement sound quality assurance protocols	6	4	2	0
4. Demonstrates the capacity to analyze and report student results to meet a variety of purposes and satisfy the needs of key constituent groups, including educators, policy makers and parents.	6	4	2	0
5. Provides evidence that all project activities and deliverables will adhere to the highest standards of integrity particularly as it relates to the confidentiality of student information	6	4	2	0
<b>Fiscal Management and Cost (12 points)</b>				
1. Proposes a budget that is cost effective and consistent with the states' histories with projects of similar size and scope	6	4	2	0
2. Demonstrates the ability to employ sound fiscal management practices that meet and exceed standards of practice for the industry and in accordance with billing and reporting practices required by the states.	6	4	2	0
<b>Overall Quality of the Proposal:</b> Provides a comprehensive, coherent and integrative response to the scope of work and other project priorities that demonstrates the capacity to implement the project on time, within budget and at a high level of quality (10 points)	10	7	4	0
<b>Sub-Totals</b>				
<b>Total</b>	/100			

**Scoring:** The following identifies Connecticut's three top scoring vendors for the RFP, and their related scores, based on the adopted evaluation criteria and rating system.

**Connecticut Top Three Scoring Vendors:**

1. American Institutes for Research (AIR)
2. Data Recognition Corporation (DRC)
3. Measured Progress (MP)

### Connecticut Evaluation Committee Mutually Agreed Upon Ratings

Quality of Response (24)	Questar	AIR	CTB	MP	DRC
1	2	4	4	4	4
2	2	4	4	4	4
3	2	6	4	4	6
4	2	4	2	4	4
<b>Corporate Capacity (24)</b>					
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	2	4	4
3	2	6	4	4	6
4	2	6	4	6	6
<b>Expertise and Experience (30)</b>					
1	2	6	6	4	6
2	2	6	4	6	6
3	4	6	6	4	6
4	2	6	4	6	4
5	4	6	4	4	4
<b>Fiscal Management (12)</b>					
1	2	4	0	6	6
2	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Overall Quality (10)</b>					
1	4	10	7	7	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>84</b>

**Connecticut's Committee Recommendation:**

*Based on the results of our review of all proposals, the recommendation of the committee is to issue an award to the American Institutes for Research (AIR).*

**Justification for Recommendation-** Parameters could include, Score, Agency Needs, Capacity, Price, and any rationale used to provide a greater knowledge as to the recommendation:

*AIR was rated #1 out of the five proposals. AIR submitted a comprehensive proposal that responded clearly, concisely and completely to all RFP priorities and requirements. AIR is deemed the most likely of all vendors to successfully implement assessments with a high degree of accuracy, integrity and efficiency. Therefore, the committee recommends this vendor for award, pending agreement on a final contract for the services.*

**Submitter Certification:**

*By signing below and being a member of the scoring committee for this RFP solicitation, I am confirming that the actions of the committee, to arrive at this recommendation, have abided by the process, rules, and laws*

identified in the "Procurement Standards for Personal Service Agreements and Purchase of Service Contracts" issued by the Office of Policy and Management.

Signature of Submitter: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name/Title: Gail Pagano, Education Consultant Date: 8/15/14

**Agency Head Acceptance:**

By signing below I agree with the Scoring Committee's recommendation above and authorize notification to the selected proposer(s), and to begin negotiations leading to the issuance of the necessary contract awards to the vendors stated. To the best of my knowledge, I confirm that the process used has conformed to the process, rules, and laws identified in the "Procurement Standards for Personal Service Agreements and Purchase of Service Contracts" issued by the Office of Policy and Management.

Signature of Agency Head: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name / Title: Stefan Pryor, Commissioner of Education Date: 8/15/14

**Proposals Received with Date**

DATE REC'D	VENDOR
6/5/2014	CTB/MCGraw Hill
6/5/2014	Questar
6/5/2014	AIR
6/6/2014	DRC
6/6/2014	Measured Progress

**RFP# 14SDE0018 NEAC: Implementation of the Smarter Balanced English Language Arts  
and Mathematics Assessments**

**RFP Proposal Evaluation Committee Mutually Agreed Upon Ratings  
June 30, 2014**

<b>Quality of Response (24)</b>	<b>Questar</b>	<b>AIR</b>	<b>CTB</b>	<b>MP</b>	<b>DRC</b>
1	2	4	4	4	4
2	2	4	4	4	4
3	2	6	4	4	6
4	2	4	2	4	4
<b>Corporate Capacity (24)</b>					
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	2	4	4
3	2	6	4	4	6
4	2	6	4	6	6
<b>Expertise and Experience (30)</b>					
1	2	6	6	4	6
2	2	6	4	6	6
3	4	6	6	4	6
4	2	6	4	6	4
5	4	6	4	4	4
<b>Fiscal Management (12)</b>					
1	2	4	0	6	6
2	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Overall Quality (10)</b>					
1	4	10	7	7	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>84</b>

Gail Pagano \_\_\_\_\_

Abe Krisst \_\_\_\_\_

Jeff Greig \_\_\_\_\_

Janet Stuck \_\_\_\_\_

Mohamed Dirin \_\_\_\_\_

Ajit Gopalakrishnan \_\_\_\_\_