

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
External Evaluation of the Federal Per-Pupil Facilities Grant
Solicitation # (to be inserted by the Division of Purchasing)

PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

The purpose of this RFP is to enter into a contract with a qualified firm to provide an evaluation that will appraise the effect of Charter School Program (CSP) Start-up and Implementation Grant (FFY 2008-2011) had on participating Utah charter schools. Specifically, the objectives of this grant were to expand the overall number of high-quality charter schools in the state and the number of high-quality charter schools targeting underserved student populations as defined by Utah Administrative Rule R277- 470-19-A-1; increase new charter school board members' and directors' understanding of the laws and rules which frame charter school operations, as well as the policies, procedures, and practices of successful charter schools; provide additional training and information to all charter schools to promote best practices in instruction and school management; and evaluate the effects of Utah's charter schools on students, student achievement, staff, and parents.

There will be three sections for evaluating these options. The three sections are: 1) Defining high-quality charter schools in objective, measurable terms and determining the number of high-quality charter schools and the number of high-quality charter schools serving underserved student populations, 2) Assessment and improvement of the State Charter School Board's oversight and monitoring process specific to identifying high-quality and, subsequently, low-performing, charter schools, including the creation of a monitoring tool, and 3) Provide training and information to all charter schools to promote the evaluation of school performance specific to academics and operations using the tool designed in section 2.

BACKGROUND

Within the Federal Start-up & Implementation grant (FFY 2008-2011) awarded to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), a portion of the Administrative Personnel costs involve an evaluation of Utah's progress on objectives specified in the grant application. The hope is that using the CSP Start-up & Implementation grant monies set aside to support addressing these objectives would affect ongoing improvement of Utah's Charter School Program.

Another portion of the CSP Start-up & Implementation grant monies is dedicated to developing an oversight and monitoring tool that would help authorizers and charter schools evaluate their performance. Presently, the definition of high-quality is subjective and not written in state statute or board administrative rule. Thus, it is increasingly

important to develop academic and operational targets that are consistent, and evidence based, but does not increase charter school reporting requirements.

Currently, reports submitted to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) may or may not be used to determine charter school academic and operational performance. However, USOE staff knows that the information submitted in these reports could be useful in identifying both high- and low-performing charter schools. USOE charter school section staff has begun identifying desired indicators, measures, and metrics, as well as the corresponding report(s) currently submitted by charter schools which could inform the school's overall performance.

The information collected in the improved oversight and monitoring process will allow USOE to better fulfill the role of mentor and facilitate for charter school success. This would include appropriate intervention, remedial action, and enhanced planning

One of the primary duties of the State Charter School Board is to make recommendations on legislation and rules that affect charter schools to the Legislature and State Board of Education. If performance strengths and weaknesses were analyzed by a standardized reporting tool, the Charter School Board could identify important performance issues and provide effective recommendations for the charter schools based on these results. Additionally, the Charter School Board would have tremendous opportunities to remove obstacles for the creation of successful, solvent and efficient charter schools.

ISSUING OFFICE AND RFP REFERENCE NUMBER

The State of Utah Division of Purchasing is the issuing office for this document and all subsequent addenda relating to it, on behalf of the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). The reference number for the transaction is Solicitation #xxxxxx. This number must be referred to on all proposals, correspondence, and documentation relating to the RFP.

SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL

Proposals must be received by the posted due date and time. Proposals received after the deadline will be late and ineligible for consideration.

The preferred method of submitting your proposal is electronically through BIDSNYC (formerly RFP Depot.) However, if you choose to submit hard copies, one original and six identical copies of your proposal must be received at the State of Utah Division of Purchasing, 3150 State Office Building, Capitol Hill, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-1061. If sending via United States Postal Services (USPS), please mail to the State of Utah Division of Purchasing, P.O. Box 141061, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-1061.

LENGTH OF CONTRACT

It is anticipated that this RFP may result in a single award contract. The contract resulting from this RFP will be for a period of one year, with an option for up to four one-

year renewal periods.

PRICE GUARANTEE PERIOD

All pricing must be guaranteed for the full year. Following the guarantee period, any request for price adjustment must be for an equal guarantee period, and must be made at least 30 days prior to the effective date. Requests for price adjustment must include sufficient documentation supporting the request. Any adjustment or amendment to the contract will not be effective unless approved by the State Director of Purchasing. The State will be given the immediate benefit of any decrease in the market, or allowable discount.

STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Any contract resulting from this RFP will include, but not be limited to, the State's standard terms and conditions.

QUESTIONS

All questions must be submitted through BIDSYNC (formerly RFP Depot.) Answers will be given via the BIDSYNC site.

DISCUSSIONS WITH OFFERORS (ORAL PRESENTATION)

An oral presentation by an offeror to clarify a proposal may be required at the sole discretion of the State. However, the State may award a contract based on the initial proposals received without discussion with the Offeror. If oral presentations are required, they will be scheduled after the submission of proposals. Oral presentations will be made at the offeror's expense.

PROTECTED INFORMATION

The Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA), Utah Code Ann., Subsection 63-2-304, provides in part that:

the following records are protected if properly classified by a government entity:

(1) trade secrets as defined in Section 13-24-2 if the person submitting the trade secret has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in Section 63-2-308 (Business Confidentiality Claims);

(2) commercial information or non-individual financial information obtained from a person if:

(a) disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to result in unfair competitive injury to the person submitting the information or would impair the ability of the governmental entity to obtain necessary information in the future;

(b) the person submitting the information has a greater interest in prohibiting access than the public in obtaining access; and

(c) the person submitting the information has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in Section 63-2-308;

* * * * *

(6) records the disclosure of which would impair governmental procurement proceedings or give an unfair advantage to any person proposing to enter into a contract or agreement with a governmental entity, except that this Subsection (6) does not restrict the right of a person to see bids submitted to or by a governmental entity after bidding has closed;

GRAMA provides that trade secrets, commercial information or non-individual financial information may be protected by submitting a Claim of Business Confidentiality.

To protect information under a Claim of Business Confidentiality, the offeror must:

1. provide a written Claim of Business Confidentiality *at the time the information (proposal) is provided to the state*, and
2. include a concise statement of reasons supporting the claim of business confidentiality (Subsection 63-2-308(1)).
3. submit an electronic “redacted” (excluding protected information) copy of your proposal response. Copy must clearly be marked “Redacted Version.”

A Claim of Business Confidentiality may be appropriate for information such as client lists and non-public financial statements. Pricing and service elements may not be protected. An entire proposal may not be protected under a Claim of Business Confidentiality. The claim of business confidentiality must be submitted with your proposal on the form which may be accessed at:

<http://www.purchasing.utah.gov/contract/documents/confidentialityclaimform.doc>

To ensure the information is protected, the Division of Purchasing asks the offeror to clearly identify in the Executive Summary and in the body of the proposal any specific information for which an offeror claims business confidentiality protection as "PROTECTED".

All materials submitted become the property of the state of Utah. Materials may be evaluated by anyone designated by the State as part of the proposal evaluation committee. Materials submitted may be returned only at the State's option.

DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

The extent of the contract is limited to the one year evaluation of the CSP Start-up & Implementation Grant (FFY 2008-2011) in all Utah public charter schools. The offeror must detail how the evaluation meets the following technical requirements:

- Sound methodology that includes the quality assurances set in place for valid and secure procedures of benchmarking Utah charter schools, including

developing profiles for Utah charter schools, examining base-level analysis of school performance, and benchmarking targets based on model results.

- Sound methodology that includes the quality assurances set in place for valid and secure procedures of creating performance metrics, and analyzing distributional properties of metrics.
- The evaluation and suggested improvements of our State Charter School Board's oversight and monitoring process based on a reporting system design that facilitates appropriate, credible, and defensible reporting, and interpretation.
- Use state data in the development of the improved oversight and monitoring tool.
- Meet good statistical methodology (e.g., valid and reliable) in identifying the high-performing charter schools and high-performing charter schools serving underserved student populations.
- Use of state data for the demographic groups identified.

Section 1:

1) Defining high-quality charter schools in objective, measurable terms and determining the number of high-quality charter schools and the number of high-quality charter schools serving underserved student populations.

Vendor must provide a detailed plan and cost sheet describing the vendor's method of defining, evaluating, and reporting the number of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter schools serving underserved student populations. Please include the quality assurances and security plans that will be in place for the data collection and management.

Vendor must provide the methodology in finding the comparison schools. Each charter school will be paired with other state and national public schools based on these subgroups: ethnicity (white/non-white), location (urban/rural), special education, economically disadvantaged, language English proficient (LEP), and other subgroups or specific conditions as determined by the vendor and charter school section staff.

The vendor must provide a procedural manual of the methodology used in finding these comparison schools.

Section 2:

2) Assessment and improvement of the State Charter School Board's oversight and monitoring process specific to identifying high-quality and, subsequently, low-performing, charter schools, including the creation of a monitoring tool.

Vendor must provide a detailed plan and cost sheet describing the vendor's method of assessing the oversight and monitoring process of the State Charter School Board and

the creation of an objective and sustainable monitoring tool. Please include the quality assurances and security plans that will be in place for the data collection and management.

The offeror may propose to use a survey design including computer-based surveys, paper-based surveys, or both. If this method is chosen for data attainment, then a copy of this survey must be submitted. The survey must be no more than two pages and demand a minimal amount of time to fill out. If a computer-based survey is chosen, then the survey must be administered on the Utah Item Pool System (UTIPS) survey system. The USOE will provide UTIPS training to the vendor. For information about UTIPS, go to: http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/info_utips.aspx .

The vendor will work with the USOE charter school section staff in the evaluation and design of the new monitoring tool. It is the vendor's responsibility to design a procedural manual for the new monitoring tool, as well as train the USOE charter school section staff on this system.

Section 3:

3) Provide training and information to all charter schools to promote the evaluation of school performance specific to academics and operations.

Vendor must provide a detailed plan and cost sheet describing the vendor's method of training charter schools on the monitoring tool designed to assist the State Charter School Board with improved oversight and monitoring of school's academic and operations.

The vendor will work with the USOE charter school section staff in the design and implementation of the training, as it is important to the USOE to build local capacity in this area.

DELIVERABLES

Evaluation report including:

1. The ranking of all charter schools using the measurement tool designed for use by the State Charter School Board.
2. The number of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter schools serving underserved populations.
3. A comparison group of schools for each charter based on subgroups defined in the Scope of Work.
4. A procedural manual for the methodology used in the identifying the comparison schools.

5. Evaluation of the assessment and improvement of the State Charter School Board oversight and monitoring process.
6. A procedural manual for the new monitoring tool.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Development of a Project Plan

The offerors must develop a detailed plan for completing this contract. The plan must include each of the components specified in the attached Scope of Work section and how it relates to project deliverables. This plan will also include a timeline of key activities that are outlined in the Scope of Work.

Demonstration of Expertise in Developing Evaluations of Pre-define groups

The offeror must have a record of accomplishment in the development and refinement of high quality evaluation methodology as well as a mastery of research statistics.

Offerors must provide a minimum of two letters of reference and specific examples of providing and supporting an evaluation for a section of a state department of education.

The offeror must demonstrate a history of meeting deadlines and satisfy the requirements of the contract.

The offeror must demonstrate expertise in survey development (if applicable).

In addition, offerors must provide detailed information about specific evaluations they have developed, including the topic of evaluation, as well as a detailed description of the demographics in that sample/population.

The offeror must include in its proposal any evaluation tools like survey samples (if applicable) the vendor will use. These samples must include the psychometric as well as practical evidence of its validity. Samples will be used for evaluating the quality of the vendor's evaluative abilities.

Offerors must include in their proposal resumes or vitas of key staff that will work on any of the components specified in the "Scope of Work" and/or "Deliverables" sections of this RFP.

Offerors must provide details about their security, quality assurance/control, and reporting procedures in their facilities and how these procedures relate to components specified in the Deliverables and the Scope of Work contained herein. Any sub-contractors who will work on components in the "Scope of Work" must be listed in the offeror's proposal with information about their key staff as well as their corporate capabilities.

Cost Proposal

In preparing the proposed budget for the project, the offeror must provide a statement of

total costs and annual budgets as well as detailed cost estimates for the following contract products and services:

- Evaluation of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter schools serving underserved populations.
- Evaluation of the assessment and improvement of the State Charter School Board's oversight and monitoring process.
- Procedural manual for the new monitoring tool.
- A comparison group of schools by individual charter.
- Procedural manual for the comparison methodology.
- Survey materials, including each test form option.
- Travel costs
- Training costs for State authorized charter schools

PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT

All proposals must include:

1. **RFP Form.** The State's Request for Proposal form completed and signed.
2. **Executive Summary.** The one or two page Executive Summary is to briefly describe the offeror's proposal. This summary should highlight the major features of the proposal. It must indicate any requirements that cannot be met by the offeror. The reader should be able to determine the essence of the proposal by reading the executive summary. Protected information requests should be identified in this section.
3. **Detailed Response.** This section should constitute the major portion of the proposal and must contain at least the following information:
 - A. A complete narrative of the offeror's assessment of the work to be performed, the offeror's ability and approach, and the resources necessary to fulfill the requirements. This information should demonstrate the offeror's understanding of the desired overall performance expectations. The narrative must also clearly indicate any options or alternatives proposed.
 - B. A specific point-by-point response, in the order listed, to each requirement in the RFP.
4. **Cost Proposal.** Cost will be evaluated independently from the technical proposal. Please enumerate all costs on the attached Cost Proposal Form.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

A committee will evaluate proposals against the following weighted criteria. Each area of the evaluation criteria must be addressed in detail in the proposal.

<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>
---------------	----------------------------

40%	Technical quality of the Scope of Work (evaluation, tool improvements, and comparison).
10%	Adequacy of corporate quality assurance & data security procedures
10%	Demonstrated ability to complete the Scope of Work
10%	Quality of technical support
30%	Cost

Include the following attachments with your RFP:

- (1) Cost sheets provided*
- (2) RFP Evaluation Score Sheet*
- (3) Other attachments as needed*

Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet

ACQUISITION OF A FACILITIES GRANT EVALUATION

Solicitation # _____

Firm Name: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Score to be assigned as follows:

0 = Failure

1 = Poor: inadequate, fails to meet requirement

2 = Fair: only partially responsive

3 = Average: meets minimum requirement

4 = Above average: exceeds minimum

5 = Superior

		Score (0-5)	Weight	Points
Technical quality of test material <i>(35 points possible)</i>		----	----	----
Quality of defining and identifying high-quality charter schools	5 points possible		X2	
Record of accomplishment in the development and refinement of high quality evaluation methodology	5 points possible		X2	
Quality of evaluation tools, including psychometric and practical evidence of validity	5 points possible		X2	
Timelines: - 4 points for proof of meeting timelines / deadlines - 1 point for quality of proposed timeline	5 points possible		x1	
Corporate capacity <i>(15 points possible)</i>		----	----	----
Quality assurance	5 points possible		x1	
Data security	5 points possible		x1	
Reporting procedures	5 points possible		x1	

Demonstrated ability to complete scope of work <i>(10 points possible)</i>		----	----	----
Evidence of successfully completing similar projects for SEA	5 points possible		X1	
Evaluation by previous clients (i.e., SEA or department within SEA)	5 points possible		X1	
Quality of technical support <i>(10 points possible)</i>		----	----	----
Technical expertise in evaluation	5 points possible		X1	
Specialization of staff	5 points possible		x1	
Cost <i>(30 points possible)</i>	30 points possible			*Inserted by Purchasing Dept.
Total Evaluation Points	100 points possible		Total	

*Purchasing will use the following cost formula: The points assigned to each offeror's cost proposal will be based on the lowest Proposal Price. The offeror with the lowest Proposal Price will receive 100% of the price points. All other offerors will receive a portion of the total cost points based on what percentage higher their Proposal Price is than the Lowest Proposal Price. An offeror whose Proposal Price is more than double (200%) the Lowest Proposal Price will receive no points. The formula to compute the points is: $\text{Cost Points} \times (2 - \text{Proposal Price} / \text{Lowest Proposal Price})$.

Cost Proposal Form

ACQUISITION OF A FACILITIES GRANT EVALUATION

Salaries & Benefits \$ _____

List key project staff and salary and benefits for each individual.

Travel \$ _____

Provide a description and the amount for proposed travel (e.g., Training for state chartered schools, 3 staff members x 3 days, \$400 airfare per person, \$79 hotel per night, \$50 food per diem per day, \$250 rental car = \$2,611). Expenditures for transportation, meals, hotel, and other expenses associated with staff. Payments for per diem in lieu of reimbursements for subsistence (room and board) also are charged here.

Supplies & Materials \$ _____

Provide a description and the amount for proposed supplies and materials (e.g., 3-ring binders for monitoring tool procedural manual x 3 = \$10.00). *Supplies*: items of an expendable nature that are consumed, worn out, or deteriorated in use; or items that lose their identity through fabrication or incorporation into different or more complex units or substances. *Materials*: non-equipment items which with reasonable care and use may be expected to last for more than one year.

Equipment \$ _____

Provide a description and the amount for proposed equipment (e.g., external hard drive for data storage = \$150). NOTE: Depreciation for owned equipment used during this project will be considered. Expenditures for the acquisition of fixed assets, such as audiovisual equipment and computer equipment (hardware) are included here.

Software \$ _____

Provide a description and the amount for proposed software.

Website development / customization \$ _____

It is expected that the information from this project will be available on the USOE website or on company website through a link on the USOE website. Provide a description and the amount for proposed web development / customization.

Postage \$ _____

Other purchased services \$ _____

Provide a description and the amount for proposed purchased services. Amounts paid for services rendered by organizations or personnel not on payroll. This would also include expenses for meeting facilities, conference hotels (which may include direct-billed items for group meals and lodging provided to participants, equipment, space charges, and miscellaneous). Also include any travel and per-diem expenses for participants.

Indirect Cost / University Overhead

\$ _____