State Responses to Vendor Questions for

NDERFP240325

Questions	Answers
How does NDE envision balancing the depth and breadth of sub-scores across ELA, math, and science assessments? Specifically, are you looking for aggregate cognitive domain scores, such as 'Analytical Thinking' and 'Data Interpretation', or more detailed competency scores like 'Inference Skills', 'Contextual Vocabulary', and 'Numerical Operations'? Could you clarify if there's a preference for integrating performance tasks that contribute to these sub-scores, particularly in contexts like scientific inquiry or mathematical problem-solving?	NDE is open to suggestions, but needs at least data as actionable as the subscore data we have now as detailed in the blueprints included in the NSCAS technical reports (see section 5 for tables): https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/2023-NSCAS-Growth-Technical-Report_Final.pdf and our interpretive guide: https://www.nwea.org/uploads/NSCASReportsIntGuideEnglish_NWEA_Guide.pdf . The goal is that the subscore data is actionable and useful for teachers - and in our current system, we have created the Achievement Level Explorer to help get at this.
How does NDE define the specific assessment literacy skills that professional development programs aim to enhance among Nebraska educators? For instance, are there expectations for educators to master particular areas such as interpreting student data, designing formative assessments, or applying adaptive testing techniques?	General requirements for all can be found on this page under the Formative Assessment Competencies header. https://www.education.ne.gov/assessment/formative-assessment/#1644263248795-5e8233bb-ccf4 Teacher specific competencies are found here: https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/NE_FASN_TeacherFoundationalStatements_Handout_FY22.pdf
Could NDE specify the intended frequency and key focus areas for updating the item bank to align with Nebraska's content standards? Are there particular intervals, such as biennial revisions, or critical academic domains, such as STEM fields or literacy, that require more frequent updates?	Curently a subset of items are replaced every year. The state is open to recommendations from vendors, but would expect that item pools would be refreshed every 3-5 years based on in-field best practices. Our standards revision timelines are found here and in the RFP: https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Updated-Standards-Revision-Timeline-1.pdf It is expected that as revisions are made, more updates will be needed to the subjects identified for targeted completion/ implementation to get ready for the state assessment.

What specific characteristics does NDE seek in the adaptive algorithms for ELA and math assessments in terms of adjusting question difficulty based on student responses? Could you clarify whether the adaptivity should focus more on breadth across standards or depth within specific skills, such as computational fluency in math or inferential reasoning in ELA?	The state needs to assure two things in their adaptive algorithms: 1) enough breadth is covered to generate a valid summative score; but 2) prefers to prioritize depth within specific areas to help provide more actionable data for educators related to what areas of supports students likely need to close achievement gaps and accelerate learning. (e.g. computational fluency, inferential reasoning, etc.) The ultimate goal is to return better data to educators to help them adjust instruction and differentiate for students.
What specific training modalities does NDE prefer for delivering professional development on new assessment systems to educators statewide? Are there particular formats, such as in-person workshops, online webinars, or hybrid models, that are considered most effective? Does NDE foresee utilizing digital platforms for ongoing support and training updates to ensure educators are continually equipped to utilize the assessment tools effectively?	Nebraska has been open to both face to face and virtual opportunities. Certified Facilitators will be the primary recipients of training from the vendors and will be responsible for working to roll out training across the state. A summary of how this has worked can be found here: https://cdn.nwea.org/docs/NE/NSCAS_Professional_Learning_Overview.pdf
How does NDE envision the integration of advanced assistive technologies in the assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities? For instance, are there particular expectations for the use of technologies such as touch-screen compatibility, voice-activated responses, or adaptive interfaces that adjust to individual user needs?	Nebraska would like to explore more options for this. Currently speech to text/ text to speech/ touch screen and refreshible braille have been explored with varying levels of success. Guidance for what we have been doing are found in this accommodations guide: https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Accommodations-Guidelines-2022-NE.pdf . Nebraska is open to exploring what is possible. As a smaller state, we do not always have enough students to explore these on our own.
What specific processes does NDE recommend for integrating Nebraska educators' insights into the development of state-specific assessment items? Are there preferred methodologies for gathering and utilizing local input, such as through digital collaboration tools, focused workshops, or pilot testing with feedback loops, to ensure that the items	In the past, teachers have participated in content advisory boards and item writing workshops. Because of the rural nature of the state, NE is open to utilizing digital collaboration tools in conjunction with face to face or virtual workshops to increase educator participation. We have also

are both reflective of Nebraska's educational standards and responsive to local teaching contexts?	utilized UX research studies inclusive of focus groups to help gather information.
Considering the challenges of transitioning to new online assessment formats, could NDE identify specific technological or logistical hurdles it foresees, such as bandwidth limitations, device compatibility, or user interface intuitiveness? Are there particular training needs for administrators and teachers to manage these assessments effectively, such as real-time technical support or specialized training modules?	Online workshops are conducted annually to help attend to the technical details of assessment implementation, and technical guides are sent to the state test coordinators to support in the state. Bandwidth and device types that are being used are as seen in the project requirements, existing state IT systems (C.II) section pg 36 of the RFP. Because we are a rural state, it should be expected that bandwidth concerns may arise that users will need support on during assessment. To the extent possible, system interface should be intuitive and use native device capabilities. Per section I.II.j, (pg 85-86) help desk services are expected and Tier 1 and 2 support should be able to provide technical assistance directly to system users.
What is the ideal timeframe NDE envisions for delivering scores and detailed reports post-assessment? Furthermore, could you specify the level of detail expected in these reports, such as granular analytics on question types, cognitive domains covered, or individual learning objectives achieved?	Current reporting timelines for interim reports are seen in table F.1 of the RFP. Section I.III.g (pg 89-90) discusses expected timelines post-assessment for the summative assessment. We desire data to be returned as close to the testing event as possible. Current report design in seen in the interpretive guide: https://www.nwea.org/uploads/NSCASReportsInt GuideEnglish_NWEA_Guide.pdf . We understand that what is possible will depend on assessment design, and are open to innovations in reporting that make data more actionable for teachers and students.
Could NDE specify the types of research partnerships it deems critical for the ongoing evolution of the assessment system's validity and reliability? Are there particular collaborations with academic institutions, industry experts, or educational research organizations that NDE finds valuable, such as those	Partnerships with our TAC are essential. Partnerships with IHEs and professional evaluation organizations are encouraged. Outside of TAC, there are currently no formal research partnerships. We are open and hopeful to establish these moving forward.

focused on developing adaptive testing technologies or conducting longitudinal studies on assessment impacts?	
What specific training modalities does NDE prefer for delivering professional development on new assessment systems to educators statewide? Are there particular formats, such as in-person workshops, online webinars, or hybrid models, that are considered most effective? Does NDE foresee utilizing digital platforms for ongoing support and training updates to ensure educators are continually equipped to utilize the assessment tools effectively?	NE typically uses online webinars to deliver this both in the fall and the winter. This maximizes reach. Asynchronous follow ups or recordings are fine, but initial trainings should be synchronous and interactive.
How does NDE envision the integration of advanced assistive technologies in the assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities? For instance, are there particular expectations for the use of technologies such as touch-screen compatibility, voice-activated responses, or adaptive interfaces that adjust to individual user needs?	Nebraska would like to explore more options for this. Currently speech to text/ text to speech/ touch screen and refreshible braille have been explored with varying levels of success. Guidance for what we have been doing are found in this accommodations guide: https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Accommodations-Guidelines-2022-NE.pdf . Nebraska is open to exploring what is possible. As a smaller state, we do not always have enough students to explore these on our own.
What specific processes does NDE recommend for integrating Nebraska educators' insights into the development of state-specific assessment items? Are there preferred methodologies for gathering and utilizing local input, such as through digital collaboration tools, focused workshops, or pilot testing with feedback loops, to ensure that the items are both reflective of Nebraska's educational standards and responsive to local teaching contexts?	In the past, teachers have participated in content advisory boards and item writing workshops. Because of the rural nature of the state, NE is open to utilizing digital collaboration tools in conjunction with face to face or virtual workshops to increase educator participation. We have also utilized UX research studies inclusive of focus groups to help gather information.

Considering the challenges of transitioning to new online assessment formats, could NDE identify specific technological or logistical hurdles it foresees, such as bandwidth limitations, device compatibility, or user interface intuitiveness? Are there particular training needs for administrators and teachers to manage these assessments effectively, such as real-time technical support or specialized training modules?	Online workshops are conducted annually to help attend to the technical details of assessment implementation, and technical guides are sent to the state test coordinators to support in the state. Bandwidth and device types that are being used are as seen in the project requirements, existing state IT systems (C.II) section pg 36 of the RFP. Because we are a rural state, it should be expected that bandwidth concerns may arise that users will need support on during assessment. To the extent possible, system interface should be intuitive and use native device capabilities. Per section I.II.j, (pg 85-86) help desk services are expected and Tier 1 and 2 support should be able to provide technical assistance directly to system users.
What is the ideal timeframe NDE envisions for delivering scores and detailed reports post-assessment? Furthermore, could you specify the level of detail expected in these reports, such as granular analytics on question types, cognitive domains covered, or individual learning objectives achieved?	Current reporting timelines for interim reports are seen in table F.1 of the RFP. Section I.III.g (pg 89-90) discusses expected timelines post-assessment for the summative assessment. We desire data to be returned as close to the testing event as possible. Current report design in seen in the interpretive guide: https://www.nwea.org/uploads/NSCASReportsIntGuideEnglish_NWEA_Guide.pdf. We understand that what is possible will depend on assessment design, and are open to innovations in reporting that make data more actionable for teachers and students.
Could NDE specify the types of research partnerships it deems critical for the ongoing evolution of the assessment system's validity and reliability? Are there particular collaborations with academic institutions, industry experts, or educational research organizations that NDE finds valuable, such as those focused on developing adaptive testing technologies or conducting longitudinal studies on assessment impacts?	Partnerships with our TAC are essential. Partnerships with IHEs and professional evaluation organizations are encouraged. Outside of TAC, there are currently no formal research partnerships. We are open and hopeful to establish these moving forward.

Could NDE outline the communication strategies previously employed that were found most effective in ensuring stakeholder engagement and transparency? For example, are digital newsletters, interactive webinars, or stakeholder workshops preferred? How does NDE evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies in terms of reaching diverse groups such as educators, parents, and local education agencies?	Interactive webinars and regular email updates to DACs have proven effective. Feedback has been collected in the past via ad hoc surveys and through partnerships with the AAAC and NACIA.
How does NDE systematically prioritize areas for continuous improvement within the assessment system? Are there specific metrics or feedback mechanisms, such as contractor performance reviews or user satisfaction surveys, that play a significant role in this process?	NE regularly engages the AAAC and NACIA to gather feedback, and asks the TAC to help evaluate progress. Additionally, Nebraska recently launched a stakeholder feedback and engagement research project to help inform this RFP. This was the first such effort in recent years and included surveys of teachers, leaders, and parents as well as structured focus groups and conversations with educators, state staff, the AAAC and the NACIA. This analysis was shared with the TAC and used by NDE to inform the RFP - and the common themes are seen in section C.I pg 44-45 of the RFP.
Could NDE detail specific instances where previous program evaluations have effectively utilized assessment data to influence decision-making and policy adjustments? For instance, are there particular cases where data insights led to notable changes in assessment formats, instructional strategies, or curriculum updates?	NDE used stakeholder input to make the shift to through-year and online testing. We have not historically used program evaluation to drive large-scale shifts. Annual meetings were used to identify enhancements to program deliverables and innovations, such as the Achievement Level Explorer tool and changes to reports.
Could NDE please confirm that submissions should include three business reference for the bidder? The text in the noted sections seems to contradict. Is there a specific format or specific information you would like to receive for business references?	Business references, per pg 92, should include the customer name, including the contact person, a current telephone number, a facsimile number, and email address.
Could NDE please confirm the start date of the awarded contract would be July 1, 2025? And that operational testing would begin in spring 2026? Information in other sections seems to conflict with these dates.	The start date is July 1, 2025. If the vendor is offering a through-year solution, the first test administration would be September 2025.

Could NDE please share the expected term of the contract?	The contract is one year, July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026, with the option to extend for 4 additional years.
NDE indicates that they own and plan to continue to build a robust item bank. Is NDE open to a consortium approach with shared ownership of development and item content?	It is not preferred to use a consortium approach with shared ownership and item content; however, NDE is open to considering it depending on other deliverables.
Could NDE please confirm whether other resources, in addition to family reports, would need to be translated to the 6 languages indicated on page 29? Specifics about resource length would be appreciated for budgeting purposes.	It would be ideal if an interpretative guide for score reports for parents/care givers are in the 6 languages indicated on pg 29. The interpretative guide length is dependent on how detailed the vendor's reports are.
There appears to be text missing under G.c., could NDE please confirm whether there is missing text?	The text "b. Purposes, Use, and Claims, c." will be deleted.
Could NDE please clarify whether they are asking for three references foreach key personnel identified in a submission, or if the information stated (name, address, and telephone number) is requested for business references?	The references noted on pg 75 are for the individuals of key personnel who will work on the project. The vendor should provide name, address, and telephone number. For corporate experience, noted on pg 92, vendor submits the name of the contact person, current telephone number, facisimile number, and email address.
Could NDE please confirm the contract term with start and end dates? It appears that dates under **Invoices** are from a previous procurement.	There was a typo, the contract duration is July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026.
Does NDE have any specific requirements related to page limits, formatting style requirements (e.g., page size, spacing, margin, font, and point size), required sections to be included in response?	There are no specific requirements.
Is there an annual fixed cost associated with the contract or does NDE have flexibility to support new test design and redevelopment?	NDE has flexibility to support a new test design and redevelopment.
Is there a file size limitation for proposal submissions via email?	The limit is what your system can send via email. If needed, you can submit a zip file.
The RFP states "Bidders should complete Sections II thru VI as part of their proposal." There are several sections in the RFP with roman numerals ii through vi; could the State clarify the section titles and	II. Terms and Conditions pp 8-17; III. Contractor Duties pp 18-25; IV. Payment pp 26-27; V. Project Description and Scope of Work pp. 28-90; VI. Proposal Instructions pp 91-93

beginning/ending page numbers of sections ii through vi for which vendors must respond?	
The RFP states that "The bidder should provide the following information in response to this Request for Proposal," and the first section of this requirement is "A. Project Overview." Is the bidder expected to provide a response for the sections from page 28 until page 48 (A. Project Overview, B. Project Environment, C. Project Environments), or is this informational text?	This is informational text. See E.III
Could the State clarify the contract award date, contract start date, and first administration year?	The contract award date is 9/25/24, or whenever the NDE and vendor has finalized terms of the contract. The contract start date is July 1, 2025. The first administration year is 2025-2026.
Could the State clarify where in the proposal organization "Section E. Scope of Work" should be addressed?	Vendors may provide this in a separate section called Scope of Work or within the Work Plan.
Is it intended for the organization of the proposal to start at "D. Business Requirements?"	Yes, that is correct.
Is there an expected number of items to release each year by grade and subject?	NDE does not have an expectation and is open to understanding what is possible.
The Technical Approach consists of subsections a – e. Please clarify where in the RFP these requirements are further described so vendors can respond to those specific requirements.	a. Understanding of the project requirements pg 44-45; b. Proposed development approach pg 48-51; c. Technical considerations pg 52-53, 56-75; d. Detailed project work plan pg 75-80; e. Deliverables and due dates pg 53-54, 80-90.
Should bidders submit a Cost Table for each year of the contract (one base year with four option years)?	Please submit a Cost Table for each year of the contract, one base year with four option years or add columns to represent one year with four option years.
Is it acceptable to have some cells with either a zero charge or a "not separately priced" disclaimer?	Yes. We are anticipating vendors will be able to provide separate costs for general and alternate assessments, but some costs may not be able to be differentiated between the two for things like technology platform and program staff.

Could the State clarify what is meant by the Lump Sum/All or None item vs. the item-by-item basis? For example, if the state awarded the Alternate Assessment to one Bidder and the General Assessment to a separate bidder – would the shared costs be negotiated upon award?	In the context of this RFP, item by item or lump sum refers to the assessment systems. For example, the state could award the Alternate Assessment to one Bidder and the General Assessment to a separate bidder. To the extent posssible bidders should submit their most accurate cost estimate which should include any costs they believe will be required for integration. To the extent bidders feel that scope changes may be needed, they should clearly articulate this in proposed scope changes articulated on pg 78 H.III of RFP.
What is the file size limitation for emails?	The limit is what your system can send via email. If needed, you can submit a zip file.
The RFP states that bidders should "submit one (1) original copy of the entire proposal…" Should vendors submit cost proposals in a separate file?	Yes, please submit the cost proposals in a separate file.
These paragraphs indicate that the ELA, Math, and Science assessments will be administered operationally beginning in spring 2025. Should the year reference in these two locations be 2026, since the contract will not start until July 1, 2025, as indicated on page 2?	September 1, 2025 references through-year or interim assessment test administrations.
Please confirm that the references to September 1, 2025, in these sections refer to the availability of the interim assessment?	September 1, 2025 references through-year or interim assessment test administrations.
How does NDE anticipate sharing state-level data with the successful bidder?	Through our state system known as ADVISER, which uses Ed-Fi standards.
Please confirm that bidders should include costs for item bank realignment for ELA in year 4 (2028-2029) to reflect the new standards, which will be approved in fall 2028.	Yes, this is correct.
Will science items in NDE's existing item bank be realigned to the new science standards upon delivery to the new contactor at the start of the contract? (Board is approving new standards fall 2024.)	Yes, this is correct.
Should bidders include costs for item bank realignment for math in year 5 (2029-2030)? (Board is approving new standards fall 2029.)	Yes, this is correct.

Please confirm that bidders should plan on ALD processes and standard setting in the following years for both the general assessments and the alternate assessments: Science – Year 2 (2026-2027) ELA – Year 5 (2029-2030)	Yes, this is correct.
Should an independent alignment study be planned in year 3 (2027-2028) for science? (Note that an alignment study for ELA would likely be done in 2030-2031, which is outside the scope of this procurement.)	Yes, this is correct.
The RFP indicates on page 41 that "there is one paper/pencil form created per grade for all three subjects…" We have a couple questions about paper materials: • Are these materials printed and shipped to the districts? If so, are the paper materials collected from districts/schools and scanned by the bidder? • Or, are these materials provided as print-on-demand forms to be printed at the districts/schools and securely destroyed at the schools? If this is the case, do school personnel enter student responses directly into the testing platform? • Please confirm that Braille materials should be printed by the vendor and distributed to districts. If this is true, are the Braille booklets securely destroyed by district/school staff after testing? Are responses for students responding using a Braille booklet entered into the test engine by school personnel or are scannable forms produced and shipped with the Braille booklets?	All paper assessments and materials are print on demand and school personnel enter responses. The districts securely destroy the forms following testing. Braille materials are printed by the vendor and distributed to districts. The District Assessment Contact enters student responses into the test platform. The district securely destroys the booklets after testing.
What portions of the ELA assessment are translated into Spanish? Is the entire test translated, or just the test directions?	For ELA, a description of the test and the directions are translated into Spanish. The ELA test items are in English.
Please confirm that the transfer of the Nebraska items and meta data will be done via QTI processes. When can the awarded contractor expect to receive the item pool with meta data?	Yes, this is correct. The transfer of the item pool with meta data will be part of the negotiations.

Should costs be provided only for year 1 (2025-26) or for all five potential contract years?	Please submit a Cost Table for each year of the contract, one base year with four option years or add columns to represent one year with four option years.
Please confirm that administration manuals are printed and distributed to districts. If this is confirmed, at what rate are they distributed (e.g., one manual per 15 students). Are the administration manuals grade and/or subject specific?	Administration manuals are print on demand and are subject specific.
In the section called "Invoicing" please confirm that the proposed initial contract will run from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026.	This is correct.
Regarding the users of the Online Dynamic Reporting System listed on page 87, would NDE be amenable for the successful bidder to provide data that can be uploaded elsewhere for some of the user roles? For instance, for parents, data could be posted to a Family/Parent Portal, and for policy makers, data could be posted on NDE's website.	Yes
To ensure consistency across RFP responses, please confirm that the training for the CF staff will be in-person and that it will occur once per year.	The training for the CF staff may be in-person or virtual. This training occurs monthly or depending on the needs.
Due to email file size restrictions, will NDE accept proposal submissions via a OneDrive link, from where NDE can view and download the proposal submissions?	Please submit your proposal as described in the RFP, via email. If this is not possible, contact Procurement and they will work with you.
Is there a preferred regional dialect for any of the listed languages i.e. Spanish (Mexican, Castilian, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.)?	Currently we use Mexican Spanish for our assessments and resources; however, we have no state requirements at this time for specific dialects.
Will NDE please provide a clarified outline of how they would like the proposal submission structured? There are conflicting outlines on RFP p. 52 (III. Proposal Organization) and RFP p. 91 (VI. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS).	Follow the Proposal Submission 1-3 pp 91-93

"The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment is seeking a Contractor to provide a balanced system of English language arts (ELA), math, and science assessments for general education and alternate education students to be administered operationally beginning in *Spring 2025*." Please confirm that the date provided in the first sentence of the Project Overview (Spring 2025) in the RFP is incorrect and should read "Spring 2026" as the text goes on to say that the test designs should be "ready for administration no later than September 1, 2025."	The summative assessment will be operational in Spring 2026. If the vendor offers a through-year solution, the system should be operational in the fall of 2025.
Does the State agree that the Contractor will retain exclusive rights over any designs, programs, documents, data, reports, materials, supplies, equipment, accomplishments, processes, improvements, methodology, and assessment items owned by the contractor prior to award and not specifically created for the State and that all of these items shall remain Contractor's exclusive property? Can the State confirm this is true for item samples submitted with the proposal if they are proprietary and belong to the Contractor?	Yes, what the Contractor owns prior to the award remains property of the Contractor. This includes any item samples shared with the state.
Page i of the RFP states, "The term of the contract will be one (1) year commencing upon execution of the contract by the State and the Contractor (Parties)/notice to proceed. The Contract includes the option to renew for four (4) additional one (1) Year periods upon mutual agreement of the Parties. The State reserves the right to extend the period of this contract beyond the termination date when mutually agreeable to the Parties." 1. The Cost Table on p. 54-55 of the RFP has a section for Scoring and another for Test Scoring. Please clarify what scoring estimates need to be provided for each section. 2. Does the vendor need to submit a cost	1. Please see pg 69-71 for scoring which includes handscoring and other item scoring considerations and pg 74 for Test Scoring which includes information about aggregating scores for proficiency and growth determinations, and other analyses that might be needed. Vendors needing to submit these as one cost may do so, but should clearly articulate where the costs are covered. 2. Please submit a Cost Table for each year of the contract, one base year with four option years or add columns to represent one year with four option years. 3. Cost Proposal- only proposals that meet RFP requirements will have cost evaluated. Cost will be evaluated based on the total value the proposal brings to the state as opposed to a fixed based cost rating. We will

proposal for just the one (1) year of the contract? Or the total of 5 years, 1 base year and 4 optional renewals? So, do 5 cost proposals need to be submitted or can the vendor add columns for each of the 5 years? 3. Is the one (1) year Base price evaluated for award? OR are the total of Base and Options evaluated?	evaluate the base price and consider options as add on value.
Does State have a preference for in-person item writer workshops or can they be scheduled virtually?	The preference is in-person item writer workshops; however, it is an option. Other work can be done virtually (e.g., content and bias review, alignment study).
Does State have a preference for in-person review meetings, including content, bias/sensitivity, accessibility/ fairness, rangefinding (for constructed response) and data review or can they be scheduled virtually?	Review meetings can be done virtually.
Please confirm that the State requests bidders to plan for (and cost) standard setting (or standards validation) meetings for science in 2027 and for ELA in 2030, the years in which the newly aligned SSAs will be launched, according to Figure B.3: Nebraska's Content Standards Adoption Timeline.	This is correct.

The RFP states, "All proposals that are responsive to the Request for Proposal will be evaluated. Each evaluation category will have a maximum point potential." Will NDE please provide the points per category, including cost?	Each of the 13 bullets under Section E I. Proposal Evaluation on pg 51-52 are criteria against how each larger section of the proposal response will be evaluated. "Proposal that is clear and easy to understand" listed under bullet 12 should be a stand alone bullet. The following sections, listed on page 52-53, will be assigned points. (1) Meeting Project Requirements- 10 points (includes addressing keep/change list, IT integration, and meeting assessment best practices). (2) Business Requirements & Workplan -5 points. (3) Technical considerations - 30 points: (5 each- design, test development, item develoment, scoring, test scoring, psychometrics). (4) Project Planning & Management- 15 points. (5) Deliverables and due dates- 40 points: documentation- 5, test administration- 15, professional learning- 10, reporting- 10. (6) Cost Proposal- only proposals that meet RFP requirements will have cost evaluated. Cost will be evaluated based on the total value the proposal brings to the state as opposed to a fixed based cost rating.
Please confirm that the first operational administration(s) for this contract are fall 2025 (through-year or interim) and spring 2026 (through-year or summative).Or, was it the State's intention that the general education and alternate assessment be administered operationally beginning in Spring 2025?	The first operational administration for this contract is fall 2025 if the vendor submits a through-year design or interims. Otherwise, the first operational administration for a summative only is spring 2026.

Two questions: 1. Must these references be for all named staff members or just for the Program Director, Project Manager(s), and Professional Learning Lead outlined on page 75? 2. Must these references be professional/former clients, or can they be personal/supervisors?	The references noted on pg 75 are for the individuals/key personnel who will work on the project. The three listed are acceptable. The vendor should provide name, address, and telephone number of professional client/former clients. Only the Professional Learning Lead may use a supervisor as reference.
Will you please confirm how many years we should include in our cost table? Do you seek pricing for only Year 1 of the contract or, do you prefer Year 1, plus four additional optional years?	Please submit a Cost Table for each year of the contract, one base year with four option years or add columns to represent one year with four option years.
Is each vendor allowed to recreate the table from page 54 in an Excel spreadsheet, and submit that with the proposal, or must we submit our price using the table in its PDF form?	Please use the table as provided on pg 54.
Does the State wish to have the price proposed under separate cover from the technical proposal, or within the same document?	Separate cover from the technical proposal.
Will you please clarify how you would like the proposal submitted? Is it the State's intention for each vendor to work the sections on pages 52-54 into the format from pages 91-93?	Follow the Proposal Submission 1-3 pp 91-93. Submit via email.
Will the State please confirm the dates listed in this requirement?	The dates should be July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026.
Will the State please confirm if the Item Writing Workshop should be held in person or virtually.	The preference is in-person item writer workshops; however, it is an option. Other work can be done virtually (e.g., content and bias review, alignment study).
Will the State please confirm the dollar amount of stipends.	Presently the stipend for full-day work by educators is $175
Will the State please confirm the dollar amount of substitute teacher fees.	Each district determines these. The NDE does not track this data.

Please confirm whether the rangefinding event for constructed responses is in-person or virtual.	NDE does not have an expectation and is open to understanding what is possible.
Please confirm if the TAC meetings are in-person or virtual.	Presently the TAC meetings are in-person; however, depending on the topic and urgency, we hold virtual meetings. In the future, NDE anticipates two 1.5 day TAC meetings.
Please confirm if the alignment study event and the standard setting event are in-person or virtual.	It is preferred standard setting is done in-person, but the alignment study can be virtual.
Will the state please provide details regarding the native format (i.e., PDF, QTI) of the alternate assessment items coming from the current vendor?	The print-on-demand pdfs are the print forms generated from a QTI-compliant item bank and test authoring applications, but the pdfs themselves aren't directly related to QTI. Both the online and print forms are created using these applications. The current vendor imports QTI files (items) from other entities into Insight Item Bank (also known as IDEAS). They are also able to export items from IDEAS in QTI format to send them to other entities, item banks, etc
Does NDE want to continue with a Spanish version of an electronic ISR and Interpretive Guide, as a base program cost?	Yes
Can the NDE confirm that reports must be in paper form, and we should cost accordingly, or are you open to alternate options as a cost savings?	We are open to alternate options, but please include costs for reports in paper form.
Will the NDE please clarify if vendors should interpret the use of "policymakers and the general public" to mean that individual policymakers and members of the general public would have access to the secure online reporting system? Or, can we assume that there will be a public page (such as the NDE's webpage) that already includes public information for these groups?	You are correct; this refers to the public reporting of data through the Nebraska Education Profile.