



**SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCHOOL  
DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS**

---

**RFP TITLE: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

**RFP #: 021-1617**

**DATE OF ISSUANCE:** November 9, 2016

**QUESTIONS DUE:** November 18, 2016

**FINAL QUESTIONS DUE:** November 21, 2016

**BID DUE DATE:** December 7, 2016 at 2:00 PM CST

**SUBMIT TO:** Purchasing Office of the St. Louis Public Schools  
Second Floor – Cashier’s Window  
801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Number of copies required: **(6) marked “Copies”, (1) marked “Original”, and (2) copies on Portable Thumb drive.** It is recommended that each original and copy have tabs corresponding to the required sections listed in this RFP, as appropriate. **Original and copies are to be submitted in 3-ring binders or binding of some fashion.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**  
**RFP #:021-1617**

	<u>Page Nos.</u>
Section 1. INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENT FOR SEALED PROPOSALS.....	2
Section 2. TENTATIVE RFP TIMELINE.....	2
Section 3. INSTRUCTIONS TO VENDORS/GENERAL INFORMATION .....	3
Section 4. QUESTIONS.....	6
Section 5. THE PROPOSAL.....	6
Section 6. EVALUATION CRITERIA, PROCESS AND CONTRACT AWARD.....	8
Section 7. MINORITY PARTICIPATION.....	9
Section 8. RESERVATIONS / STIPULATIONS.....	11
Section 9. FEDERAL WORK AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM (“E-VERIFY”).....	15
ATTACHMENT A SCOPE OF SERVICES.....	16
ATTACHMENT B COST / PRICING PROPOSAL.....	27
ATTACHMENT C E-VERIFY AGREEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT .....	28
ATTACHMENT D VENDOR AFFIRMATION FORM .....	30
ATTACHMENT E VENDOR CHECKLIST .....	31
ATTACHMENT F NON-SUBMITTAL RESPONSE FORM.....	32
ATTACHMENT G CONTRACT TEMPLATE	

## **Section 1. INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENT FOR SEALED PROPOSALS**

---

### **INTRODUCTION:**

The Special Administrative Board of the Transitional School District of the City of St. Louis (d/b/a St. Louis Public School System) (the “District”) wishes to contract with a firm to provide an Assessment System.

### **NOTICE TO VENDORS:**

Copies of this RFP #021-1617 for the **ASSESSMENT SYSTEM** (this “RFP”) may be obtained from the District’s website at [www.slps.org](http://www.slps.org) under “Site Shortcuts”, “Purchasing / RFPs”, or from the Purchasing Department, St. Louis Public Schools, 801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Louis, MO 63101.

The District reserves the right to accept or reject any or all Proposals (as hereinafter defined) and to waive any irregularities. The District also reserves the right to negotiate with selected firms regarding pricing and fee structures and all other aspects of the Proposals. All information included in a Proposal may be incorporated, at the District’s sole option, into the contract **ASSESSMENT SYSTEM** to be entered into between the District and the successful Vendor (as hereinafter defined). Any contract awarded as a result of this RFP will be awarded without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation or national origin.

## **Section 2. TENTATIVE RFP TIMELINE**

---

<b>Date of Issuance</b>	<b>November 9, 2016</b>
<b>Final Questions Due</b>	<b>November 21, 2016</b>
<b>Proposals Due in Purchasing Department</b>	<b>December 7, 2016 at or before 2:00 PM CST</b>

The District reserves the right to modify the above RFP Timeline as needed by posting the change as an addendum to this RFP on the District website.

### Section 3. INSTRUCTIONS TO VENDORS/GENERAL INFORMATION

---

- 3.1 Form of Submissions.** Each person or entity submitting a response to this RFP (each “Vendor”) should prepare and submit their proposal in response to this RFP (“Proposal”) in a sealed envelope or box. **The Proposal shall include (1) original, (6) copies and (1) electronic Proposal on Portable Thumb Drive.** The upper left hand corner of the package (envelope or box) shall be plainly marked as **RFP #021-1617, ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**, along with the firm name and the package shall be addressed to:

**Purchasing Office of the St. Louis Public Schools  
Second Floor – Cashier’s Window  
801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
St. Louis, MO 63101**

- 3.2 Manner of Submission** – The sealed Proposal must be received at the address listed in Section 3.1 on or before **December 7, 2016 at 2:00 PM CST**. Each Proposal will be date and time stamped upon receipt at the Cashier’s Window. Proposals received after that date and time will not be considered and will remain unopened. Proposals must be filled out as requested including all required signatures and pertinent information. Failure to do so is reason for rejection of the Proposal. If Vendor is a corporate entity, the entity’s name must be correctly stated, and the Proposal must include the state of incorporation of such entity, and, if a foreign entity, proof of registration to transact business in the state of Missouri. A person with the authority to act on behalf of the entity (i.e. an authorized agent of the entity) must sign his or her name on the Proposal.
- 3.3 Format of Proposal** - Each Proposal must include the information required in Section 5. Each required response listed in Section 5 shall be included as a required document with Attachment B.
- 3.4 Questions About this RFP** - All questions regarding this RFP shall be made electronically via e-mail in writing and directed to at **Terrance P. Bullock, PMP, [terrance.bullock@slps.org](mailto:terrance.bullock@slps.org)**. The subject of the e-mail shall be “QUESTION - RFP #021-1617”. Failure to provide the correct RFP number in the email will deem the question unanswerable and will not be considered as part of any addenda. Any questions submitted after the dates and times listed in Section 2 above shall not be considered or answered. Questions properly submitted **in writing** prior to the due date will be addressed. Answers to all properly submitted **written** questions will be posted on the District’s website at [www.SLPS.org](http://www.SLPS.org) as addenda no later than three (3) business days prior to the Proposal Due Date.
- 3.5 Addenda** - The District may revise this RFP by issuing written addenda. Addenda will be posted to the District’s website at [www.SLPS.org](http://www.SLPS.org) under “Site Shortcuts”, “Purchasing

/ RFPs”. Interested persons or entities are encouraged to check the District’s website frequently for addenda to this RFP. Vendors are responsible for viewing and understanding information in addenda to the same extent as the RFP. The District has no obligation or duty to communicate addenda to Vendors beyond the posting of addenda on its website.

- 3.6 Awards** – All Proposal selections must be approved by the Special Administrative Board prior to an award being final. Awards will be made to the responsible Vendor complying with the terms of these specifications, except that the right is reserved by the District to make such selection, as in its judgment, is best suited for the purpose intended. Notwithstanding anything contained herein to the contrary, a contract shall not exist between the District and the selected Vendor until: **A) such agreement has been duly authorized and approved by the Special Administrative Board; and B) the agreement has been documented in accordance with Missouri Revised Statutes Section 432.070.** After approval by the Special Administrative Board, all awards will be posted on the District website. A contract awarded pursuant to this RFP may not be assigned to any other entity without the express written authorization of an authorized agent of the District.
- 3.7 Rejection of Proposals** – The District reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal or any part of any Proposal.
- 3.8 Submitted Proposals Considered Final** – All Proposals shall be deemed final, conclusive and irrevocable, and no Proposal shall be subject to correction or amendment for any error or miscalculation.
- 3.9 Form of Contract** – Each successful Vendor shall be required to enter a contract in the form prescribed by the District. Templates of certain form contracts may be examined at the Department of Purchasing, 801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Louis, MO 63101 or may be found on the District’s website at [www.SLPS.org](http://www.SLPS.org) under “Site Shortcuts”, “Purchasing / RFPs”, “Contract Templates”. See Attachment G for the contract template to be used with the successful vendor. The District reserves the right to revise such templates or present a contract not contained within the template forms on the District’s website, in its sole and absolute discretion, to fit the unique situation presented by this RFP.
- 3.10 Preference for Missouri Products** – The District prefers to purchase those materials, products and supplies, which are produced, manufactured, compounded, made or grown, within the State of Missouri. When they are found in marketable quantities in the State of Missouri, and are of a quality suited to the purpose intended, and can be secured without additional cost over out-of-state products. Quality and fitness of articles will be considered in making purchases or letting contracts.

- 3.11 Bond (Not Applicable)** – A Bid Bond or Certified Check made payable to the school district, in the amount of 5% of the Base Bid shall accompany the following Bid Packages as a guarantee that the Vendor, if awarded the Contract, will furnish a 100% Performance and Payment Bond; execute the Contract; and proceed with the work. Upon failure to do so, he shall forfeit the deposit or amount of the Bid Bond as liquidated damages, and no mistakes or errors on the part of the Vendor shall excuse the Vendor or entitle him to a return of the deposit or Bid Bond. The bonds must be written by a Corporate Surety Company that is acceptable to the District and that meets the following minimum standards:
- a. Licensed pursuant to the Missouri Insurance Code
  - b. Listed on the United States Department of the Treasury’s Listing of Approved Sureties (Dept. Circular 570) in the amount of \$5,000,000.
  - c. The Bid Bond shall be valid for one hundred twenty (120) days following the deadline for submission of proposals.
  - d. The Bid Bond must be accompanied by an original signed and notarized Power-of-Attorney bearing the seal of the issuing surety company and reflecting that the signatory to the bond is a designated Attorney-in-Fact.
  - e. All bonds must be written by an insurance company that is rated in the A.M. Best key Rating Guide – Property & Casualty with a policy holder’s rating of “A-“ or better and a Financial size category of Class VII or larger.
- 3.12 Prevailing Wage (if applicable)** - Vendor and their subcontractors shall be required to submit weekly payroll sheets with their monthly invoices, compliance to the Prevailing Wage Standard, as well as an Affidavit of Compliance with Prevailing Wage Law at the conclusion of the project, prior to final payment
- 3.13 Taxes** – Vendors shall NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX, TRANSPORTATION TAX, and/or STATE RETAIL TAX in the Proposal, as these taxes does not apply to the District.
- 3.14 War Clause** – In the event that during the existence of a state of war, the United States Government takes over the plant of any manufacturer with whom the contractor has thereto fore contracted to furnish the articles required under his contract with the District, or any essential element thereof, and because of such action of the government, the contractor may furnish and deliver the articles required under the contract.
- 3.15 Purchasing Card (“P Card”)** – The St. Louis Public School District is now processing vendor payments through a Purchasing Card (“P Card”) Program with MasterCard. The “P Card” Program is a more simplified, efficient and cost effective method of remitting payments for approved expenditures. This payment program provides a faster payment to the vendor without the cost of check processing. For purchases of goods and materials, the “P Card” is the SLPS preferred method of payment and the District reserves the right to make usage of the “P Card” a requirement. Acceptance of the “P

Card” is one of the evaluation criteria that may be used in the review of vendor responses to this RFP (See Section 6.2).

- 3.16 Compensation** – Vendors are cautioned that items and/or services must be furnished at the price submitted. No increase in price will be permitted during the term of the contract.
- 3.17 Grievances** - Any complaints or grievances concerning or arising out of this RFP shall be submitted in writing to Purchasing Office of the St. Louis Public Schools, 801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Louis, MO, 63101, with a copy to Office of the General Counsel, c/o the Superintendent of Schools, 801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Louis, MO 63101.

## Section 4. QUESTIONS

---

- 4.1** Interested persons or entities may submit **questions in writing** pursuant to the process set forth in Section 3.4 above. Answers to the questions will be posted on the website as an addendum to the RFP pursuant to Section 3.4.
- 4.2** No communication shall be made with any District employee, other than Terrance Bullock, PMP, regarding this RFP. Violation of this provision may result in the rejection of Proposal.

## Section 5. THE PROPOSAL

---

- 5.1** The Scope of Services for this RFP is set forth in Attachment A.
- 5.2 Part I – Qualifications/Certifications/Resume and Operations Plan**

The following information must be provided in Part I of the Proposal. The documents should be clearly marked: “Part I – Qualifications”

  - 5.2.1 Vendors should provide detailed information addressing each of the following areas:
    - 5.2.1.1 Licensing and certification in the field of the requested services;
    - 5.2.1.2 Any citation or discipline action taken against the respondent by a licensing board or association related to the field of the requested services which is pending or has been resolved within the past 12 months;

5.2.1.3 Information regarding law suits relevant to the requested services that are pending or have been resolved within the past 12 months.

5.2.1.4 Failure to be forthright in disclosure shall be grounds for disqualification of a vendor. This section shall not be interpreted to require the disclosure of information shielded from disclosure by State or Federal Statutes and/or court order.

5.2.2 Please respond briefly, but completely, to the following:

5.2.2.1 Person/Entity Name

5.2.2.2 Address

5.2.2.3 Name and Title of Authorized Representative

5.2.2.4 Telephone Number

5.2.2.5 Fax Number

5.2.2.6 Email Address

5.2.2.7 Include the above information for each person/entity that is part of the project team for this Proposal

5.2.3 Bid Response Elements

5.2.3.1 Entity Qualifications

5.2.3.2 References (other school districts where possible)

5.2.3.3 Brief description of entity's experience with providing the requested services

5.2.3.4 Copies of Licenses and Certifications (including, but not limited to, license to conduct business in the City of St. Louis, Missouri)

5.2.3.5 Provide a brief summary of the primary role(s) and resumes describing the background and qualifications of each member of the project team for this Proposal.

### **5.3 Part II – Cost/Pricing Proposal**

The following information must be provided in Part II of the Proposal. The Proposal should be clearly marked: "Part II – Cost/Pricing Proposal"

5.3.1 Attachment B – Cost/Pricing Proposal must be used as the first page for this Part II.

5.3.2 Outline specifically the cost/pricing proposal for the fees and reimbursable expenses proposed. This proposal should include the method of pricing as well as the proposed fees/costs.

5.3.3 The Cost/Pricing proposal should be specific, and the detail of the cost/pricing should give the District a clear picture of overall costs as well as pricing criteria.

### **5.4 Part III –Required Documents**



The following information must be provided in Part III of the Proposal. The Proposal should be clearly marked: “Part III – Required Documents”

- 5.4.1 Attachment C - Federal Work Authorization Program Addendum and Affidavit
- 5.4.2 Attachment D - Vendor Affirmation Form
- 5.4.3 Attachment E - Vendor Checklist
- 5.4.4 Attachment G – Contract Template - Each Vendor is required to include, as part of the documents submitted with its Proposal, the actual contract the Vendor is proposing to enter into with SLPS that sets forth, in detail, the scope, terms, conditions, specifications, pricing and performance standards and guarantees contained in the Vendor’s Proposal. Attached to this RFP is the SLPS contract form (See Attachment G) that must be used by each Vendor. Each Vendor must mark-up the SLPS contract form to include the scope, terms, conditions, specifications, pricing and performance standards and guarantees contained in its proposal. The Vendor must submit in Microsoft Word documents, both clean and marked copies of its proposed revised SLPS contract form. The marked copy must show all changes the Vendor proposes to make to the SLPS contract form. All information included in a Proposal may be incorporated, at the SLPS’s sole option, into the contract to be entered into between SLPS and the successful Vendor.

**Section 6. EVALUATION CRITERIA, PROCESS AND CONTRACT AWARD**

---

**6.1 Evaluation Criteria** - The following criteria will be used with the weighted values below to evaluate each Proposal received. The District reserves the right to request clarification to the Proposal in order to evaluate all proposals.

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>
Total Price and Cost Effectiveness of Proposal	45
Proposal clearly outlines the vendors ability to perform tasks related to this project in terms of comparable design, complexity, reliability/validity and timeliness	35
Prior working relationship with the District	5
Ability to work with other vendors to provide a total Assessment System	5
Missouri School District Experience/ Demonstrated Expertise	5
M/WBE Participation	5
<b>Total Points Possible</b>	<b>100</b>

**6.2 Bid Opening** – All Proposals received on or before the Proposal Due Date and Time shall be assembled and opened publicly promptly at that time in the District Offices located at 801 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Louis, MO 63101 in a conference room to be designated. All interested parties are welcome to attend.

**6.3 Evaluation** – The District will assemble a review committee to assist in evaluating all Proposals (the “Evaluation Team”). From this evaluation, the District may select a Vendor solely on the basis of submittals, or may additionally identify a short list of Vendors for possible interviews. The District may contact any or all respondents to clarify submitted information.

The Evaluation Team will consist of the following individuals:

Title
Deputy Superintendent of Technology & Accountability
Deputy Superintendent of Academics
Chief of Staff/Associate Superintendent of ECE/SPED
Director of Assessment
Director of Curriculum & Development
Assessment & Evaluation Analyst

**6.4 Contracting** – Upon selection of a Vendor, the District will negotiate a scope of services and other terms and conditions of an agreement with the selected Vendor. If such negotiations are not successful, the District reserves the right to begin negotiations with other respondents.

## Section 7. MINORITY PARTICIPATION

---

**7.1** It is the policy of the District to pursue the goal of at least 25% Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) and 5% Women’s Business Enterprise (WBE) utilization in the provision of goods and services to the District while at the same time maintaining the quality of goods and services provided to the District through the competitive bidding process. It is the purpose of this policy to allow minority and women’s business enterprises to expand their opportunities and capacities by participating in all District operated programs. The District has developed a plan for participation in projects by minority business. This plan includes the following elements:

**7.1.1 Outreach** – A commitment to make every effort to inform contractors of pending contract opportunities through advertisements, workshops, brochures, and availability of plans.

- 7.1.2 **Good Faith Effort** – A commitment to verify contractor solicitations to ensure that sufficient time and information are available to make a responsible reply.
- 7.1.3 **Identification and Recruitment** – A commitment to coordinate efforts with the City of St. Louis, Contract Office, in the development of potential minority contractor interest.
- 7.1.4 **Monitoring and Reporting** – A commitment to measure and report anticipated and actual MBE/WBE participation.

**7.2 Discrimination In Employment By the Special Administrative Board**

- 7.2.1 During the performance of the contract, the SELECTED VENDOR agrees as follows:
  - 7.2.1.1 The SELECTED VENDOR will not discriminate against any employees or applicants because of race, age, handicap, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin or ethnicity. The SELECTED VENDOR will take affirmative action to ensure that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race age, handicap, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin or ethnicity.
  - 7.2.1.2 The SELECTED VENDOR will, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the SELECTED VENDOR; state that all qualified applications will receive consideration for employment without regard to race age, handicap, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin or ethnicity.
  - 7.2.1.3 The SELECTED VENDOR will send to each labor union or representative of workers with which he has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding, a notice advising that labor unions or workers representative of the Vendor’s commitment under contracts with the District.
  - 7.2.1.4 The SELECTED VENDOR will maintain and, upon request make available to the District all records and data necessary or useful to the review and monitoring of compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this contract. In the event the SELECTED VENDOR fails or refuses to make such records available, this contract may be cancelled, terminated, or suspended in whole or in part by the District, and the SELECTED VENDOR may be declared ineligible for further District contracts or subject to such other sanctions as the District deems appropriate.
  - 7.2.1.5 The SELECTED Vendor’s non-compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this contract, the contract may be cancelled, terminated, or suspended in whole

or in part by the District, and the SELECTED VENDOR may be declared ineligible for further District contracts or subject to such other sanctions as the District deems appropriate.

### **7.3 Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise Policies**

- 7.3.1 It is the policy of the District that minority and women-owned businesses shall have the maximum opportunity to participate in the performance of contracts utilizing District funds. MBE/WBE firms included in the respondent's submittal, either as prime consultants or subcontractors, must be certified by one or more of the following agencies on or before the date of the submission of qualifications:

**Missouri Division of Purchasing and Material Management**

Online: For MBE's: <http://www.oa.mo.gov/>

For WBE's: <http://www.oa.mo.gov/>

Phone: (573) 715-8130

**City of St. Louis: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program**

Online: <http://www.mwdbe.org/>

Phone: (314) 551-5000

**St. Louis Minority Business Council**

Online: <http://www.slmbc.org/>

Phone: (314) 241-1143

## **Section 8. RESERVATIONS / STIPULATIONS**

---

- 8.1** The District reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to A) reject any or all submittals when, in its opinion, it is determined to be in the public interest to do so; B) waive minor informalities of a submittal; C) cancel, revise, or extend this solicitation; D) request additional information deemed necessary; and E) extract, combine, and delete elements of individual proposals and to negotiate jointly or separately with individual respondents with respect to any or all elements of the proposal.
- 8.2** This RFP does not obligate the District to pay any costs incurred by any respondent in the submission of a proposal or in making necessary studies or design for the preparation thereof, or for procuring or contracting for the services to be furnished under this RFP prior to the issuance of a valid contract under Missouri law. Such exemption from liability applies whether such costs are incurred directly by the Vendor or indirectly through the Vendor's agent, employees, assigns or others, whether related or not to the Vendor.

- 8.3** The District will give preference to firms based in the bi-state St. Louis metropolitan area when other considerations are equal.
- 8.4** Careful consideration should be given before confidential information is submitted to the District as part of this RFP Proposal. Review should include whether it is critical for evaluating a bid, and whether general, non-confidential information, may be adequate for review purposes. Any and all documents submitted by the respondent may become public if and when they are submitted to any advisory or legislative public body, or pursuant to the Missouri Sunshine Law. The Missouri Sunshine Law provides for public access to information the District possesses. Information submitted to the District that Vendors wish to have treated as proprietary and confidential trade secret information should be identified and labeled “Confidential” or “Proprietary” on each page at the time of disclosure. This information should include a written request to except it from disclosure, including a written statement of the reasons why the information should not be disclosed.
- 8.5** Vendors acknowledge and agree, by submitting a Proposal, that:
- 8.5.1 Once a Vendor is selected for the engagement, all electronic, written and printed materials developed by such Vendor as a result of this engagement shall become the property of the District, and the District shall be entitled to use any and all such materials in any way desired by the District, in its sole and unfettered discretion.
- 8.5.2 The qualifications of each member of the respondent team are important criteria in the selection process. The selected Vendor will not be allowed to substitute any member of the team listed in the Proposal without prior written approval by the District. The District, in its sole and absolute discretion, reserves the right to accept or reject proposed changes to the team and personnel associated with the team and/or to negotiate the composition of the team.
- 8.5.3 Adherence to the schedule for the work is of critical importance to the District as time is of the essence, and agrees to dedicate the personnel listed in the Proposal to completing the work in accordance with the schedule outlined in this RFP. Vendors further acknowledge that the contract for the engagement may include significant liquidated damages for failure to perform in accordance with such schedule.
- 8.5.4 To having read this RFP in its entirety and agreeing to all terms and conditions set out in this RFP. Vendors also accept the responsibility to review and understand all applicable policies of the District, which may be found on the District’s website [www.slps.org](http://www.slps.org) under “Shortcuts”, “Board Policies”.
- 8.5.5 The District, and any consultants retained by the District, has the right to make any additional inquiry or investigation they deem appropriate to substantiate or supplement information contained in respondent’s submission, and authorize the

release to the District and/or the District consultants of any and all information sought in such inquiry or investigation.

- 8.5.6 Under penalty of perjury, that to the best of his/her belief: A) the prices in the Proposal were arrived at independently and without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement for the purpose of restricting competition as to any matter or agreement for the purpose of restriction competition as to any matter relating to such prices with any other Vendor, or any other competitor; B) unless otherwise required by law, the prices in this Proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by the Vendor, and will not be knowingly disclosed by the Vendor, prior to opening, directly or indirectly, to any other Vendor or competitor; and C) no attempt has been made or will be made by the Vendor to induce any other person, partnership, corporation, or entity to submit or not to submit a proposal in response to this RFP for the purpose of restriction competition.
- 8.5.7 It is not delinquent in any real estate, personal property, or earning taxes assessed against it or which it is obligated to pay to St. Louis, Missouri.
- 8.5.8 No fictitious name of any entity or person has been used in this Proposal, and no unidentified third-party will have an interest in any resulting contract or in the performance of any work under this Proposal.
- 8.5.9 It does not do business as or operate under any fictitious name.
- 8.5.10 It has only presented one Proposal in response to this RFP.
- 8.5.11 The Proposal is made in good faith.
- 8.5.12 It, its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, employees, and all team members listed in the Proposal have not been convicted of a felony within the last five (5) years, which felony is related in any way to providing the services and/or items referenced in this RFP, or to the competency of the service provider to perform under any resulting contract.
- 8.5.13 It, its affiliates and subsidiaries, all their respective officers, directors, employees, and all team members listed in the Proposal are not currently under investigation by any governmental agency and have not in the past four (4) years been convicted or found liable for any act prohibited by state or federal law in any jurisdiction, including conspiracy or collusion with respect to responding to any public contract.
- 8.5.14 It, its affiliates and subsidiaries, all their respective officers, directors, employees, and all team members listed in the Proposal have not been excluded from any procurement or non-procurement programs with the government as identified by the U.S. General Service Administration Office of Acquisition Policy.

- 8.6** Any misrepresentations or false statements contained in a response to this RFP or to any request for additional information related to this RFP, whether intentional or unintentional, shall be sufficient grounds for the District to remove respondents from competition for selection at any time.
- 8.7** Vendors shall ensure that no improper, unethical, or illegal relationships or conflicts of interest exist between the Vendor, any employee, officer, director, or principal of the Vendor or District and any other party. The District reserves the right to determine the materiality of such relationships, when discovered or disclosed, whether intended or not. The District also reserves the right to decide in its sole and absolute discretion whether disqualification of the Vendor and/or cancellation of the award shall result. Such disqualification or cancellation shall be without fault or liability to the District. In the event that the District disqualifies a Vendor based on such an improper communication or relationship, and that Vendor's Proposal would have otherwise been considered the lowest responsible bid complying with the terms of these specifications, the District reserves the right to select as the winning Proposal the next most qualified responsible Vendor complying with the terms of these specifications.
- 8.8** Vendors agree that they will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, ordinances, and other requirements that apply to the scope of work in this RFP, including, but not limited to, all reporting and registration requirements. Vendors further agree that this RFP and any contract awarded pursuant to it will be governed under the laws of the State of Missouri.

## **Section 9. FEDERAL WORK AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM (“E-VERIFY”)**

---

Pursuant to Missouri Revised Statute 285.530, all Vendors awarded any contract in excess of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) with a Missouri public school district must, as a condition to the award of any such contract, be enrolled and participate in a federal work authorization program with respect to the employees working in connection with the contracted services being provided, or to be provided, to the District (to the extent allowed by E-Verify). In addition, the Vendor must affirm the same through sworn affidavit and provisions of documentation, and sign an affidavit that it does not knowingly employ any person who is an unauthorized alien in connection with the services being provided, or to be provided, to the District. Such agreement and affidavit is included as Attachment C to this RFP.



**ATTACHMENT A**  
**RFP # 021-1617 Assessment System**  
**Scope of Services**

**Section 1: Background and Purpose of the Request for Proposals**

**1.1 Program Summary**

The District is envisioning the best possible Assessment System (AS) to meet their growing and changing needs. The District understands that this vision may not be fulfilled through one solitary vendor or product. Therefore, the District is seeking proposals from vendors to provide as much of the needed components of the proposed Assessment System. The District currently has a contract with one vendor to supply the benchmark assessments aligned to the State assessments in the various content areas and grade levels. This RFP is looking for the missing system pieces to complete the needs of the St. Louis Public Schools. Contracts would be awarded to the vendor that provides the needed services effectively, efficiently and economically. In summary, SLPS is looking for:

- 1) PK-12 Reading and Mathematics performance assessments with normative score data, with the potential for predictive alignment to State Standards and assessments. Scores required for Missouri Senate Bill 319 would be reading level, grade equivalent, and other national norms. (see: <https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/curriculum/english-language-arts/senate-bill-319>)
- 2) The system should allow progress monitoring for RTII/MTSS and Reading Intervention. Similar Individualized Academic Plan processes would be a plus. In addition, a plus, would be the ability to re-group students based on performance levels.
- 3) The Assessment System will provide educators with ongoing and timely diagnostic/formative assessment information needed to differentiate instructional support for students, better target classroom instruction, plan curriculum, plan and implement professional development, and monitor student learning and progress over time.
- 4) Instructional resources to help teachers in instructional planning based on student performance should also be available through the Assessment System. Lists of leveled readers and other reading resources related to reading performance and subsequent instruction would be a plus.
- 5) A Reading assessment/intervention program designed for Missouri students grades PK-12 that will help them master the content outlined in the Missouri State standards; a user-friendly interface that allows students to move through the program step-by-step, is preferred not required.
- 6) A Mathematics assessment/intervention program designed for Missouri students grades PK-12 that will help them master the content outlined in the Missouri State standards; a user-friendly interface that allows students to move through the program step-by-step, is preferred not required.
- 7) A plus, would be a system with a Science assessment/intervention program designed for Missouri students grades PK-12 that will help them master the content outlined in the Missouri State standards; a user-friendly interface that allows students to move through the program step-by-step.
- 8) The Assessment System will be web-based and online. The District is looking for fixed-form and

adaptive assessments, i.e., as a student answers questions correctly the system adapts the types of questions presented to the ability level of the student.

- 9) Student results from selected response assessments need to be viewable in the system quickly (preferably immediately) and available at all levels for data analysis (student, class, school, district). If integral to accurate data analysis, test validity information needs to be included for accurate use of valid data.
- 10) The Assessment System must include a data analysis tool allowing District staff to query the formative, summative and customized assessment results. Lastly, demographic student/staff and assessment data needs to be exportable from the system in multiple formats (i.e., PDF, MS Excel, CSV, TXT, etc.).
- 11) The Assessment System should include a data management and reporting tool complete with user developed dashboard, user developed multiple measures and other reports (where multiple district, state and benchmark assessment data may be imported into the system and viewable in reports), growth, portfolio, longitudinal, content summary, grade level summary, item analysis, etc. reports at the student through district level. Reports that look at teacher/class performance would be beneficial.
- 12) Static and updated live student reports should be available to give school and district staffs multiple ways to view student, class/teacher, district reports to inform instruction, professional development, and curriculum.
- 13) Automated nightly data loads from the District's Student Information System (SIS K-12) to the Assessment System must be possible. During Summer School, there needs to be a flexible process to accommodate spring student's graduating to the next grade. Spring is the pre-test and Summer School is the post-test, students need to be coded for the same grade level throughout.

The accepted proposal will be awarded a contract for one school year with the potential of up to two more full school years of renewable options, depending on changing financial needs and demands by the State. The selected vendor will be contacted to finalize the specific details of the contract, schools involved, projected enrollments, training schedules, and costs.

## **1.2 Background and Purpose of the Request for Proposals**

The District is composed of 46 elementary, 9 middle, 14 high schools, and 9 Alternative programs. All total, there are approximately 23,000 students in grades PK-12. Student learning will be assessed relative to Missouri State Standards.

## **Section 2: Minimum Qualifications**

All proposals received on or before the proposal due date and time and at the location specified in the RFP, will be evaluated to determine whether a prospective contractor meets the following minimum qualifications:

- 1) Proposer must have a minimum of five (5) years, preferably ten or more years of successful experience providing products/services similar in scope to the components described in this RFP, for which they are submitting a proposal. Proposals should include a description of the size and scope of these products/services.
- 2) Proposer must provide a list of at least three client references and their contact information. The District will contact these references at its discretion. St. Louis City Public Schools, if currently a client, cannot be listed as a reference.

**If your proposal does not clearly meet these qualifications it will not be considered.**

### **Section 3: Scope of Services – Executive Summary**

#### **Components of the Assessment System**

All assessment components described in this section must be deliverable online. The Assessment System will include the following components:

#### **General Requirements**

- 1) Single sign-on for multiple modules if applicable.
- 2) Demonstration site or separate practice site/sand box to load and validate data files, test assessment deployment, scan and score file uploads, etc. prior to full implementation
- 3) Comprehensive plan for system implementation, training District level system staff, and professional development for end-users.
- 4) Dedicated account managers from the vendor, i.e., a specific set of managers designated to address the specific account-based needs and questions of SLPS assessment department. This is above and beyond the basic “help” desk assistance. These managers understand the nuances of the SLPS account, goals and purposes that are different from other clients.

#### **Diagnostic/Formative/Predictive Benchmarks**

The proposal should include diagnostic/formative assessments that can be given at least three times a year. It is preferred that these assessments be aligned to Missouri State Standards and present predictive scores of potential performance on the State MAP assessment (both grade level and end of course), where appropriate. The District understands that the latter will not be possible until Missouri takes the first round of State Standards aligned assessments. These Assessments should be provided in Reading (grades PK-12), and preferably Mathematics (grades PK-12). The Reading and possibly Mathematics Assessment must be linked to RTI and progress monitoring procedures.

### **Section 4: Scope of Services - Detailed**

#### **4.1 Assessment Development**

The success of the Assessment System depends on the quality of the items and the rigor of their alignment to Missouri State Standards; the strength of the research underlying the assessments; timeliness of accurate data return and access, outstanding implementation services; and outstanding technical support services. The proposer is responsible for ensuring that the assessments and related research and services are of the highest quality.

#### **4.1A Content Development Applying to Diagnostic/Formative/Predictive Benchmarks**

- 1) If an existing product without modification is proposed, proposals should describe, in general, the process that was used to develop the existing assessments.
- 2) If assessments are to be developed (through development of new assessments or adjustments to existing assessments), proposals should provide a general schedule and description of the process for development of the assessments and should indicate the extent of and schedule for any necessary item development in order to provide such assessments to meet the District’s implementation timelines. Due to the depth and breadth of the assessments requested in this proposal, the District understands that the assessments may be developed during the course of the first year of implementation, but in time for each

of the scheduled assessment administrations according to a schedule finalized by the District. The District also understands that assessment scores predictive of performance on the State Standard assessments cannot be provided until the first operational administration of the State Standard assessment.

- 3) All items should be aligned to Missouri State Standards. Proposals will describe the process for the alignment of items to the content/skills being assessed. The District is interested in assessments that are designed to minimize the standard error of measurement, the Formative assessment items should also be aligned to the appropriate developmental skill level of the participants when the assessment is administered. Adaptive assessments are preferred.
- 4) Proposals should describe the process for refreshing the item pool and updating the assessments, including the identification and replacement of poor-performing items subsequent to the first year of implementation. The proposer should describe the business model or process for adjusting assessments in the event of future changes to Missouri State Standards as well as, specifically and clearly describing the cost implications this has for the District.
- 5) Instructional resources for the content area assessments, such as lessons, remedial/acceleration activities should be identifiable and useable by the teacher or assignable to students when appropriate based on formative assessment performance.
- 6) Reading assessments should provide analyses based on standards/skills and level of mastery with suggestions to teachers for next steps in lesson planning. A list of leveled readers should include one or more of the following measures: Fountas & Pinnell, age, Grade Level Equivalency, Lexiles, ZPD Ranges, ATOS, DRA, Reading Recovery, etc.
- 7) When students demonstrate multiple remedial areas, it is preferable that the system highlights or prioritizes for the teacher the areas to focus on first to have the best impact and improvement in student learning.
- 8) A technical manual describing the Diagnostic/Formative assessments, including research covering the frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, standard errors of measurement, reliability and validity analysis, and the relevant item statistics, should be provided.

## **4.2 Reporting and Data management**

With the goal of guiding classroom instruction, curriculum development, and instructional supports, the Assessment System described in this RFP must provide educators with general and skills-specific student performance results, including standard/skill analysis reports, in a timely fashion that enables educators to adjust instruction as needed. This information must be user-friendly, flexible, modifiable, and readily and easily accessible. Immediate results for the selected response items preferred.

Data management should be as user friendly or automated as possible.

### **4.2A Types of Reports**

- 1) Proposals should include a list of the reports currently available within the proposer's application, i.e., screenshots of the various reports.
- 2) Reports will display overall assessment performance as well as strengths and weaknesses relative to the specific State standards. Please describe costs and specialized processes, if a special data load must be included to allow assessment results reported based on State Standards.

- 3) Skill/standard or item analysis reports should be available at the student, class, building, and district levels.
- 4) A screening report, or some report showing the State based performance level of students should be available.
- 5) Reports need to be available on individual assessments and across assessments (longitudinal/growth) throughout the school year relative to skills and performance. For example, if three Benchmarks are proposed, summary reports should display student performance across the three benchmarks at the student, class, building, and district levels.
- 6) Student longitudinal reporting should be available. Student reports indicating overall performance and performance relative to skills will be maintained across grades and for each school a student attends. For example, with longitudinal reporting, a teacher planning for his/her class before school begins in September can examine the performance on the previous years' Benchmarks of students in his/ her incoming classes. Growth reports should be based on student growth percentiles, if possible.
- 7) The system must be able to archive reports each year so that educators may review historical reports based upon class and school configurations in previous years.
- 8) The District requires that individual student reports be located in a student portfolio so that educators may view all reports that the student has taken over the course of the school year from a single point of access.
- 9) The District would like to develop individualized academic plans (IAPs) for students. This would allow staff to monitor goals, targets, progress, and interventions implemented. If the system allows for this, that would be a plus.
- 10) Reports to help with system management and clean up, i.e., user demographics, etc.

#### **4.2B Level of Reporting**

- 1) Reporting should be available at the level of the individual student, groups of students, classroom, grade level, school, and district.
- 2) Report functionality should allow users to perform a drill-down/roll-up on reports at all levels of hierarchy (overall assessment performance to skill level performance to specific item-level).
- 3) The reports should permit educators to disaggregate data at the district, school, classroom and individual student levels according to District or State defined reporting categories. The District prefers a ready-made report template that provides this information, and the capacity to build ad hoc reports is required.
- 4) All reports should include the scores, number of students represented in the summary, number of missing scores, and summaries of the scores, i.e., ranges, mean, median, mode, standard deviation, etc. If there is a validity indicator, such as time on test, that information should be included. All reports should include the ability to sort based on the key data elements in the report, i.e., students' last name (alphabetically) or according to the students' scores (e.g. high to low performance on total test).
- 5) Usage reports and reports on user demographics will help staff monitor usage, clean up system access and better manage user accounts.

#### **4.2C Accessibility and Timeliness of Reports**

- 1) Reports for all assessments should be accessible online and available for printing or saving in an electronic format outside of the platform (i.e., PDF, MS Excel, CSV, TXT, etc.).
- 2) Timely reports are critical to the success of the Assessment System in providing instructionally relevant information. Reports from school-wide online assessment administrations should be available as soon after the test is completed as possible. Reports should reflect live rosters, as well as historical to inform instruction, professional development and curriculum.
- 3) All reports should also be printable, individually and in batches, in an easy-to-read format. The reports should not have awkward page breaks, orphaned paragraphs or orphaned answer choices. Proposals should indicate in what format reports are printed (i.e., PDF, MS Excel, CSV, TXT, etc.). All reports must be available in a timely manner.
- 4) The system should allow various levels of users to have access to reports— including but not limited to principals, teachers, assessment coordinators, central office staff at the District, and students. The system must allow the District to determine who has access to which reports and when they have access. Preferably, access can be controlled by report or by function.
- 5) The District administrators should have the ability to enable educators to drill down into the online reports and view unsecure test items. This should be a test-specific feature so that it can be enabled for some administrations and disabled for others based upon the District’s desired level of security. In addition, the District should be able to turn this feature on and off for each individual assessment, providing, when desired, specific windows of time for teachers to view items to gain a better understanding of student performance.

#### **4.2D Report Information**

- 1) Assessments reports should contain, where appropriate:
  - Total test percentage correct.
  - Percentages correct relative to each standard and then relative to each skill assessed within the standards.
  - The reports should indicate students individually and as a group that are in need of help on a particular skill or based on overall performance on a specific assessment.
  - Where appropriate, graphic elements should be used to create a more user-friendly format for analyzing the data and to highlight areas in need of focus.
  - Scale score, raw score
  - NCE, National Percentile, standard deviation, when appropriate
  - Grade Equivalent for reading performance (other normed scores a plus)
  - Validity indicators, i.e., if time on test is suspect, reports should allow reporting with all scores and/or only valid scores. The District should be able to set the validity level.
- 2) Assessment summary reports should show:
  - School performance by grade level relative to District summary grade level data
  - An overall district report, then broken out by grade, content, etc.
  - An overall school report, then broken out by grade, content, etc.
  - Classroom performance relative to summary grade data in the same grade in the school, compared to district-wide grade performance

- Data disaggregated by District and/or State defined subgroups
  - Ability to sort roster reports of schools, classrooms, or students by scores
  - Average, median, mode (where appropriate)
- 3) All assessment reports should include:
- Scale scores for overall assessment performance
  - Average, median, mode (where appropriate)
  - Indication of the probability a student with a given overall score on the assessment will perform at a specific Performance Level on the relevant State tests, the District should be able to modify as needed
  - The standard error of measurement associated with the predictive scale score
  - Numbers tested, numbers missing, overall student head count
  - Where appropriate, a validity indicator so that reports include all tests, only valid tests, etc.

#### **4.2E Data and System Management**

- 1) The reporting system must be menu driven and simple to use. The ability to create or modify reports at the district level would be a plus.
- 2) Usage reports and data extracts on demand are required.
- 3) Proposals should describe how the application supports data export and the formats supported, so the District may import the data into other applications (e.g. the District's data management program). The preferred format is MS Excel for assessment data. The preferred format for extracts or exporting of test items and assessments is MS Word.
- 4) The Assessment System should have a procedure in place for data cleanup. This entails clearly defined and step by step data validation as the data are manually loaded by the District (if an automated data load process is not available) into the system to prevent long delays and major fixes to faulty data loaded into the system.
- 5) The Assessment System should have a user-friendly process to clean out/remove old erroneous assessment data in the system, including cleanup/remove or hide old data for non-active users (both staff and students).
- 6) The Assessment System should have a procedure in place to export all the user and assessment score data accumulated in the system for District records.
- 7) The Assessment System should have a procedure to assign system functions, by individual function to staff or groups of staff members.
- 8) The Assessment System should have a procedure that allows teachers to make multiple groups of students for RTII, MTSS, and other remediation/acceleration work.

#### **4.3 Managing Users and Assigning Assessments**

- 1) An automatic interface between the District's Student Information System (SIS K-12) and the Assessment System to import and update student, staff and class roster information is required. Proposals should include a description of the process to update student information and class rosters.
- 2) Describe how the system imports student demographic information, class rosters and educator information from the systems used by the District, SIS K-12. The description should respond to the following questions: Can an automatic data load be set up taking the data directly from the student data management system, or must the file be manipulated prior to data loading. If file manipulation is

required, what are the criteria? What are the concerns that allow for longitudinal data tracking? What are the data clean-up procedures? How often? How long does the process take for a similar sized district? Will the SLPS end-user be able to export needed files on demand to complete the data clean-up process? Is there a way to change grade levels of Summer Schoolers to match Spring tested grade levels for pre- to post-test analyses?

- 3) A quick and easy method with explanation as to adding and archiving teachers, students, classes individually or en masse
- 4) A quick and easy method to export a report and use other methods to monitor test completers, those that have not responded to any test questions but logged in and started to take the test, those in process, and those completed.
- 5) Proposals should include a description of how user names and passwords are assigned and distributed. Proposals should include a description of the process for password recovery and answer: Can passwords be set up as a default and then required to be changed periodically? What security measures are in place?
- 6) Proposals should include a description of the capability to assign and administer assessments at the district, school, classroom, group, and individual levels. A quick and easy method for mass test assignments should be possible. Proposals should include screens shots displaying the steps for scheduling assessment windows and assigning assessments.

#### **4.4 Assessment Delivery**

Proposals should describe the process for administering each type of assessment on which the proposer is bidding, including the necessary or recommended equipment and facilities.

- 1) Assessments must be offered online via the computer and other electronic media, such as applications. Technical support must be available to trouble shoot and define technical problems related to hardware, software, network availability, etc.
- 2) Assessments should be able to be administered under timed or untimed conditions. For timed administrations, educators should be able to make exceptions for individual students who have accommodation plans allowing extended time or untimed administrations.
- 3) Assessments should be able to be administered to students with individualized accommodations, i.e., increasing font size, assisted delivery, etc.
- 4) The Mathematics tests should allow text to speech.

#### **4.5 Scoring**

However, not the preferred method, in cases of emergencies or other issues, the proposal should describe the processes for paper and pencil test delivery, entry of student responses into the system and scoring of those responses. What data must be collected in answer sheets? Can the answer sheets be pre-coded? Are there specific answer sheets that are needed? What are the additional costs?

##### **4.5A Scoring Solution**

- 1) For the above-listed Assessments, responses to the multiple-choice items will be scored electronically by the system. Multiple choice responses will be input into the system via one or more of the following methods:
  - a. By students entering their responses directly into the system using electronic media for specialized IEP students
  - b. By educators entering student responses into the system through electronic media



- c. In emergencies, through scanned answer sheets and an uploaded scan file for paper-delivered Assessments.

#### **4.6 Implementation and Ongoing Support**

Proposals should describe the overall approach to implementation and ongoing support provided for the proposed Component(s). The proposal should include a plan of implementation timeline and key activities for full rollout by August 2017.

##### **4.6A Project Management**

- 1) Each proposer should describe the process for providing project management.
- 2) Implementation should include a plan for regular communication with the District to describe:
  - Recent revisions or developments in the offering/ system.
  - Issues with the development of the assessments or the delivery of the assessments.
- 3) Usage of various parts of the components.
- 4) Routine summaries of customer service and technical support issues.
- 5) Other issues that may have occurred, including those that may impact implementation and training.

##### **4.6B Customer Support/Technical Support**

- 1) Support Materials and Documentation will include:
  - An educator user's manual that is available online and printable.
  - An administrator's user manual that is available online and printable.
  - Online help within the application.
- 2) Proposals should describe the telephone support to be provided. At a minimum, customer support for users should be available via the phone from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. In emergency situations on weekends, support should be available at an extra cost.
- 3) Proposals should describe the availability of and levels of technical support that would be provided.
- 4) Dedicated technical support

#### **4.7 Systems Training and Professional Development**

The proposal needs to have a comprehensive plan regarding training the District system users with a top down perspective. The District system users must understand first their roles in system set-up, maintenance, and deployment. Secondly, they need to know the options and the long-term limitations of those options. A professional development implementation plan will have to be developed that is efficient, informative, and user friendly. The District's philosophy behind professional development is train at the point of need and as much as possible until the next point of need. If the vendor already has an established relationship with the District, and the proposed system is already set up with minimal modification, the comprehensive plan should address the needed changes.

Proposals should include a plan for professional development with itemized costs.

Professional development needs to be flexibly designed to assist needy schools, Academic Instructional coaches assigned to specific schools, as well as district administration. Differentiated professional development will need to be offered in multiple sessions at least quarterly. Ideally, though probably financially improbable, an

onsite person in the district 1-2 days a week to oversee implementation of the system, provide professional development and assist schools with implementation in the classroom would be the best-case scenario.

#### **4.7A Logistics of Training and Professional Development**

- 1) Proposals should describe a recommended method that is both cost-effective and instructionally-effective for providing systems training and professional development to instructional leaders and teachers in the District for full roll-out by August 2017 and during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- 2) Proposals should describe any time needed to work with District technology staff to set-up the system, and District Assessment Office training or professional development.

#### **4.7B Professional Development**

- 1) The proposers providing the assessments should also include professional development for educators on how to use the data from the reports to improve classroom instruction and student learning.
- 2) The core assumption of the professional development design must be that people learn by doing. During the professional development, participants in the training should be working hands on with data generated by the different types of assessments. For the assessments to accelerate learning, the leadership and all teachers must be deeply engaged in analyzing the assessment data to:
  - Identify student learning needs through looking at data.
  - Responding to student learning needs.
- 3) Examples of specific topics to cover include:
  - How to look at data, identify instructionally relevant information, and develop appropriate action plans.
  - How to use the rubrics embedded in the system to score the constructed response/performance event/performance task questions.

#### **4.7C Systems Training**

- 1) The proposers will provide training on the technology used and the logistics of administering the assessments, helping the teachers and administrators learn how to use the processes and systems for each component.
- 2) Proposers should outline what they consider the most effective model and schedule for training on the Components of the system. Note, the District has found that training given at the time of need works best. Staffs need to apply the training on relevant and real time data.
- 3) At a minimum, proposers will provide onsite training to central office and designated school staff. For example, training will be provided in how to upload student/staff/class information into the system, schedule assessments and make assessment assignments, how to access reports, to correct and update student/staff/class information, etc. If a “train the trainer” model is proposed, training must include how to deliver the training sessions to other teachers and administrators, and support materials for doing so.

#### **4.8 Technology**

Where possible, the Assessment System should be a standalone product that needs little to no maintenance from District Technology staff. Where possible, students should be able to access the Assessments and instructional materials for various platforms: netbooks, iPADS, laptops, desktops, etc.

#### **4.8A Proposals Should Provide an Overview of the Technology Application**

Proposals should describe the technology used in delivering the application on computer or other hardware. This description at the least should include:

- A listing of the browsers (including versions) that are supported.
- A description of the network bandwidth requirements.
- A listing of the versions of Windows and other operating systems with which the application works.
- A description of the hardware and software configuration for operation of the application and storing of the data. This should also include a description of the hosting environment.
- A description of the third party software needed by the District and the schools to use the application; a description of any downloads to the client that are necessary, and a description of any hardware necessary for operation at the District or school level needed to optimize utilization of the application in the schools.
- Descriptions of any demonstration sites or practice/sand box sites to pre-test data loads and other functions prior to full implementation.
- What are the server requirements if applicable? Will the vendor host or will the District need to provide a specific server?

#### **4.8B Security**

- 1) The Proposer must elaborate how their solution supports a strong security policy and provides:
  - Appropriate privacy measures (e.g., password protection, etc.)
  - Secure layers
  - A process whereby information, especially personally identifiable, is transferred securely while in transport to and from educational entities over the internet or the network infrastructure
- 2) Proposers may present equivalent or more robust alternate security architectures and standards that provide protection against unauthorized disclosures, data transfers, modifications, or destruction whether accidental or intentional.

#### **4.8C Backup for the Application and Database**

A description of the process and configuration for providing backup to the application and databases must be provided that includes:

- the virus protection used
- how student response data is stored at all times such that it is not lost if there is a power outage or other disruption
- the redundancy built into the system, including an alternative hosting facility, redundant data connections and access to additional ISPs
- the frequency of data backups and the storage location of application and data backups and the timing for retrieving the backup of the data and the application

## 4.9 Supplemental Programs

A description of the other supplemental program aspects as related to instructional support, data collection, monitoring, and student demographics for special populations and specialized programs.

- Does the system support data entry for monitoring and updating Individualized Education Plans, Individualized Academic Plans, RTI models, Reading Intervention monitoring, etc.?
- Does the system allow ability grouping and tracking of performance based on these groupings?
- Does the system support English Language Arts resources such as: tests for comprehension, vocabulary, literary techniques?
- Does the system have books students may read independently or individually linked to their assessment results, suggested booklists based on assessment results, and teacher access to books that can be reviewed for content/level/ratings for assignment to students?
- Does the system have practice and modeling exercises for various skills?
- Does the system have the capability of connecting the building library to determine book levels and assist in assignment to students?
- Does the system have a Reading, Mathematics, and (preferably) Science program designed for Missouri students grades PK-12 that will help them master the content outlined in the Missouri state standards; a user-friendly interface that allows students to move through the program step-by-step? Every unit should consist of, at least, a pre/post unit assessment and topics that cover each of the standards. Topics could include but not limited to questions, answers, explanations, lesson extension challenge, writing prompts, skill differentiation ideas, problem solving activities and lessons that address the specific skills required in mastering the Missouri state standards.



**ATTACHMENT C**

**AGREEMENT**

[Name of Vendor]:

a) Agrees to have an authorized person execute the “Federal Work Authorization Program Affidavit” attached hereto and deliver the same to The Special Administrative Board of the Transitional School District of the City of St. Louis (d/b/a St. Louis Public School System) (“District”) prior to or contemporaneously with the execution of a contract with the District;

b) Affirms it is enrolled in the “E-Verify” (formerly known as “Basic Pilot”) work authorization program of the United States, and are participating in E-Verify with respect to your employees working in connection with the services being provided (to the extent allowed by E-Verify), or to be provided, by your company to the District;

c) Affirms that it is not knowingly employing any person who is an unauthorized alien in connection with the services being provided, or to be provided, by your company to the District;

d) Affirms you will notify the District if you cease participation in E-Verify, or if there is any action, claim or complaint made against you alleging any violation of Missouri Revised Statute 285.530, or any regulations issued thereto;

e) Agrees to provide documentation of your participation in E-Verify to the District prior to or contemporaneously with the execution of its contract with the District (or at any time thereafter upon request by the District), by providing to the District an E-Verify screen print-out (or equivalent documentation) confirming your participation in E-Verify;

f) Agrees to comply with any state or federal regulations or rules that may be issued subsequent to this addendum that relate to Missouri Revised Statute 285.530; and

g) Agrees that any failure by your company to abide by the requirements a) through f) above will be considered a material breach of your contract with the District.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

For and on behalf of: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Company Name)

**FEDERAL WORK AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM AFFIDAVIT**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, being of legal age and having been duly sworn upon my oath, state the following facts are true:

1. I am more than twenty-one years of age; and have first-hand knowledge of the matters set forth herein.
2. I am employed by \_\_\_\_\_ (hereinafter "Company") and have authority to issue this affidavit on its behalf.
3. Company is enrolled in and participating in the United States E-Verify (formerly known as "Basic Pilot") federal work authorization program with respect to Company's employees working in connection with the services Company is providing to, or will provide to, the District, to the extent allowed by E-Verify.
4. Company does not knowingly employ any person who is an unauthorized alien in connection with the services Company is providing to, or will provide to, the District.

**FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_ (individual signature)

For \_\_\_\_\_ (company name)

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF MISSOURI)

) ss.

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_ )

On this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_, before me, \_\_\_\_\_, a Notary Public in and for such County and State, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, known to me to be the person who executed the affidavit on behalf of said \_\_\_\_\_ and acknowledged to me that he or she executed the same for the purposes therein stated. Subscribed and affirmed before me this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public  
My commission expires on: \_\_\_\_\_





**ATTACHMENT E  
VENDOR CHECKLIST**

---

**RFP TITLE: Assessment System**

**RFP #: 021-1617**

- ( ) Submitted all information as requested.
- ( ) Received \_\_\_\_\_ number of addendum(s).
- ( ) Submitted one (1) original, (6) copies and one (2) electronic Proposal on Portable Thumb Drive.
- ( ) Signed Federal Work Authorization Program Agreement.
- ( ) Signed and notarized Federal Work Authorization Program agreement and affidavit
- ( ) Signed Vendor Affirmation Form (by an authorized official of the company where appropriate).
- ( ) Signed and dated Cost / Pricing Proposal.
- ( ) Clean and Marked Copies of the SLPS Contract Form
- ( ) No conditions or restrictions have been placed by the company on this Proposal that would declare it non-responsive.
- ( ) Current Certificate of Insurance.
- ( ) Submitted a copy all certificates and license including, but not limited to, the license (to conduct business in the City of St. Louis, Missouri).
- ( ) Submitted state tax identification number. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Signature of Authorized Official**

---

**Date**

---

**Company Name**

**ATTACHMENT F**  
**NON-SUBMITTAL RESPONSE FORM**

---

**RFP TITLE: Assessment System**

**RFP #: 021-1617**

**NOTE TO VENDOR:**

If your company's response is a "non-submittal", the District is very interested in the reason for such response since the District desires to ensure that the procurement process is fair, non-restrictive and attracts maximum participation from interested companies. We, therefore, appreciate your response to this non-submittal response form.

---

Please indicate your reason for responding with a "non-submittal":

- Unable to meet the requirements for this project.
- Unable to meet the time frame established for start and/or completion of the project.
- Received too late to reply. Received on \_\_\_\_\_ .
- Please remove our company's name from receiving similar type solicitations.
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

Your response will be given careful consideration, and included in the contract file. Your input will assist the District in determining changes necessary to increase participation and competition.

---

**Authorized Signature** **Title** **Date**

---

**Name of Company / Consultant**

---

**Company Address**

( ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( ) \_\_\_\_\_  
**Business Telephone Number** **Facsimile**

---

**E-Mail Address**