## Request for Information No. II RFP No. 23/24-02 Assessment and Analytics Platforms October 3, 2023

## **Response to Proposers' Questions**

2.1 **Question**: What student volume levels would you suggest based on your membership?

Answer: Tier ranges can vary, depending on vendors' pricing structure. Some examples of tier ranges are:

0 - 10,000, 10,001 - 20,000, 20,001 - 30,000, 30,000+

500 – 1,500, 1,5001 - 10,000, 10,001 - 30,000, 30,001 - 50,000, 50,001 + (if including a minimum purchase volume)

Ed Tech JPA encourages vendors to propose tiered pricing sizes that work best for their organization.

2.2 **Question**: What is the client make-up and needs for out of state members? For example, are those primarily departments of education, small or large districts, or other consortium members?

**Answer**: Currently Ed Tech JPA has 3 out of state members: Campbell County Board of Education (TN), Onslow County Schools (NC), and Stafford County Public Schools (VA). These members range in size from approximately 5,000 - 30,000 members.

2.3 **Question**: Would it be acceptable to include a custom pricing table to address multiple products and potential product packaging? This would include all required components of the JPA pricing form extended to encompass multiple solutions.

**Answer**: Vendors may include a custom pricing table for easy reference *in addition to, not as a substitute for* completing the Ed Tech JPA Pricing Forms. Vendors may include the base products/pricing for each tier in the JPA pricing form and variations in a supplementary document (as long as the pricing for each tier and packaging are clearly stated). Ed Tech JPA encourages vendors to propose all variations on offerings in the pricing table so members have a clear idea of pricing when reviewing awarded solutions. If a vendor offers a la carte modules as well as a bundled product with multiple modules we recommend that vendors propose all available options. Please be clear which modules are included in bundled packages, so our RFP team and JPA members can clearly understand proposed options. Vendors may also propose hourly rates for training, implementation, and custom development.

2.4 **Question**: On pages 47 and 100 of the RFP you state, " Cross-references to the Proposal Form in additional materials will not be considered responsive". Could you clarify how JPA defines cross-referencing? Does this indicate that reference to a section (such as a complete report overview or a research document included in appendices) is unacceptable? This would improve the readability of the response if we could include important documentation as appendices. **Answer**: On pages 47 and 100 the RFP states: Write out all answers using the Proposal Form in Attachment 1. Additional material may be submitted with the proposal as appendices. No brochures, marketing materials, or internal company documentation will be considered when scoring Proposals. Cross-references to the Proposal Form in additional materials will not be considered responsive. *Any additional descriptive material that is used in support of any information in Vendor's proposal must be clearly identified*.

This requirement is intended to caution vendors against the inclusion of general marketing materials as a substitute for providing clear and comprehensive responses to the criteria defined in the RFP. Vendors are encouraged to provide supplementary materials to substantiate their responses. Vendors are welcome to cross reference different sections of the RFP and additional materials in their responses to the RFP criteria if they include specific sections and page numbers (Ex: On page 146, Section 6 of our Master Terms and Conditions, See screenshots of reports on pages 152-157...). These type of cross-references are welcome for both criteria that explicitly request documentation (e.g., project plan, sample reports, screenshots) and to demonstrate vendor's ability to meet technical specifications or claims that are made in response to a specific criteria.

Providing supplementary material does not exempt Vendors from responding directly to each criteria in the RFP. References to additional materials that are not clearly identified may be considered non responsive (ex: See our Master Terms and Conditions, See Appendix). General marketing material will not be considered in the scoring of proposals or the negotiation of any resulting agreements.

2.5 **Question**: I don't see where the questions/answers are posted on the website.

**Answer**: RFIs may be found on the webpage for the Assessment and Analytics RFP at <u>https://edtechipa.org/2324-02-assessment-and-analytics-platforms</u> all RFIs are posted under the Request for Proposal Documents tab.

2.6 **Question**: How should a vendor indicate that they are responding only partially to one section of the RFP?

**Answer**: Vendors may elect to respond to one or more sections of the Functionality & Usability section of the RFP. When electing not to respond to a section Vendors may leave it blank or write N/A. Vendors should also indicate if a section is included in their proposal in the "Included in Proposal (Y/N)" column of the grid at the beginning of the Functionality & Usability section (RFP pages 122 & 123)

Vendors should respond to all sections of the Vendor Support & Ability to Perform and Technology Requirements sections of the RFP.

2.7 **Question**: How should we respond to requirements in the section we will not be responding to?

Answer: When electing not to respond to a section Vendors may leave it blank or write N/A.

2.8 **Question**: Regarding the master bound and copy with easy to remove pages-do you require the ability to remove and replace pages or just remove? For example-if it is submitted and spirally bound-or do you prefer another alternative?

**Answer**: Our preference is that proposals are submitted in 3 ring binders. After award proposals are typically shredded in an effort to protect confidential and proprietary information and 3 ring binders allow for easier removal of paperwork than spiral binding.