

**STATE OF WASHINGTON  
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP No. 2018-27: Alignment Study – Grade 10 Smarter Balanced Mathematics and Grade 10  
WA-AIM English Language Arts Assessments  
Addendum 02 – Q&A**

*Note to potential respondents:*

*This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2018-27, originally issued April 24, 2018. Please also refer to Addendum 01, issued May 21, 2018, and Amendment 01, issued July 3, 2018.*

*All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.*

1. **QUESTION:** [Does OSPI] have any Math or ELA/Special Education experts [OSPI] particularly likes to work with?

**ANSWER:** We do not recommend individuals with whom vendors could work as vendors develop their RFP responses.

2. **QUESTION:** Does OSPI require a[n] item-by-item analysis, in addition to a more holistic analysis for each assessment?

**ANSWER:** For the WA-AIM alignment effort, OSPI would be open to proposed methodologies that would include analyses considering item-level consideration. The most recent study, being conducted in summer 2018 with the science assessment, will be using teacher-submitted evidence, which includes item-level information, to look at alignment to the selected access point. Refer to Exhibit H (New Exhibit released with this Q&A Addendum) for an example of teacher-submitted evidence.

For the SBA, due to the volume of items and previous alignment work done by Smarter Balanced at the item level, OSPI would suggest not including item-level analysis in proposed methodologies.

3. **QUESTION:** Could OSPI please confirm the total number of items that will need to be analyzed for each assessment?

**ANSWER:** For the WA-AIM, teachers are required to develop five unique items per standard. For the SBA, as mentioned in the response to Question #2, item-by-item analysis is not a requirement of proposed methodologies.

4. **QUESTION:** Does the current alignment to standards allow multiple standards to be associated with a given item?

**ANSWER:** For the WA-AIM, no. For SBA, yes.

5. **QUESTION:** If not, would assigning additional standards tags to items be desirable?

**ANSWER:** For WA-AIM, no

6. **QUESTION: Page 6 – Section 3. Background 1. Smarter Balanced Assessment – Mathematics Information states, “Each item on the assessment aligns to one of the Smarter Balanced Claims. These claims represent the organization of the standards for both math.”**

What is the RFP intending to communicate here? (The last part of the second sentence is missing.)

**ANSWER:** A reference to ELA (English language arts) was omitted. The overarching intention of this clause was to denote how the math (and ELA) assessment items are designed with respect to the associated standards (claims).

7. **QUESTION: Page 6 - Section 3. Background 2. Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM) – ELA Information states, “The WA-AIM alternate assessment was developed under the same guiding principle of the regular assessment, focusing on individual standards and writing sets of five (5) items to fully measure the standard.**

Can OSPI describe the intended “guiding principle”?

**ANSWER:** There is an intentional correspondence of specific assessment items to a particular content standard.

8. **QUESTION: Page 8 - Section 5. BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS Desirable Qualifications:**

- **Participation in the primary activities of and conduct of studies of a recognized expert in Next Generation Science Standards.**
- **Experience in developing assessment items and tasks aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards.**

Are these the desirable qualifications or is this an error?

**ANSWER:** The first release of the RFP contained errors related to the content and associated standards. The actual work reflected in Amendment 01 asks for past experience working with the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and English language arts.

9. **QUESTION: Page 18 - Section 2A. Alignment Plan – Considerations. There are several references to WCAS and NGSS.**

What are the appropriate assessments and intended standards? Could the offerer clarify the grade levels and content areas for each study?

**ANSWER:** As noted in the previous response to Question #8, the actual work reflected in Amendment 01 asks for an alignment study specific to Washington’s current high school assessments in mathematics (regular assessment) and English language arts (alternate assessment).

10. **QUESTION: Page 20 Section 2C. Panelist Recruitment. Details will be coordination of travel and reimbursement of associated expenses (travel, stipends, substitute costs, etc.)**

Is the successful bidder responsible for reimbursing panelists expenses? Are these expenses part of the amount OSPI has allotted for the budget of this project?

**ANSWER:** Yes, the winning bidder will be responsible for reimbursing the expenses of the participating panelists and attending agency staff. Yes, these expenses are to be included within the allotted budget amount.

11. **QUESTION:** Page 20 Section 2C. Panelist Recruitment. At a minimum, recruitment of panelists must focus on means of candidates demonstrating:
- Existing understanding of, or plan to acquire working knowledge of, the NGSS and the expectations behind effective instruction with and assessing of the standards.**
  - Existing understanding of, or plan to acquire working knowledge of, the Science Assessment Item Calibration (SAIC) Assessment Framework and/or OSPI's specific test design for NGSS.**

Are these the correct qualifications for panelists?

**ANSWER:** As stated in previous responses, the actual work reflected in Amendment 01 asks for an alignment study specific to Washington's current high school assessments in mathematics (regular assessment) and English language arts (alternate assessment).

12. **QUESTION:** What number of participants does OSPI anticipate for each study?

**ANSWER:** The aim is to have 10 participants per grade-content study.

13. **QUESTION:** Who will assume responsibility and cost of providing materials for the studies?

**ANSWER:** The winning bidder will be responsible for the costs of materials used at the alignment study activities. OSPI will assist, as needed, in preparing the base documents agreed upon for use in the alignment study activities.

14. **QUESTION:** Will OSPI provide the sample of CAT items for HS WCAP Mathematics alignment study?

**ANSWER:** OSPI, the winning bidder, and American Institute for Research (AIR), Washington's assessment vendor, will coordinate to provide items for review, should an item-level analysis be part of the winning proposal.

15. **QUESTION:** Are the Speaking and Listening (SL) standards to be included in the analysis of the high school WA-AIM ELA assessment to the high school access points for ELA?

**ANSWER:** Yes. There is one Speaking and Listening standard measured on the HS WA-AIM.

16. **QUESTION:** For the WA-AIM ELA assessment it appears the OSPI provides teachers with examples of performance tasks to be used. It also appears that teachers are instructed to develop their own performance tasks that they can use in assessing their students. Does this accurately describe the WA-AIM ELA assessment for high school students? If not, what is an accurate description of the assessment or where is it described in more detail?

**ANSWER:** The design of the WA-AIM assessment is for teachers to engage students with items associated with the identified performance task. Teachers can use the example items where possible (in some cases there are not five items per task) or devise new items as long as the new items adhere to the restrictions and requirements of the higher order performance task.

17. **QUESTION:** If teachers have developed their own performance tasks to be used in the WA-AIM ELA, will all or some proportion of these teacher-made performance tasks, student work, and scores awarded be available to be analyzed in the alignment study?  
**ANSWER:** Teachers do not develop the performance tasks, only the items used with students to determine understanding of the associated standard. The alignment study for WA-AIM does not require focus on the 5 items per task, but the alignment between learning standard, access points, and performance task. If the proposed alignment method includes alignment judgements of the items administered to student, this will be found in teacher-submitted evidence, which can be provided. Refer to Exhibit H (New Exhibit released with this Q&A Addendum) for an example of teacher-submitted evidence.
18. **QUESTION:** If teachers do not develop their own performance tasks, then will the examples that have been developed for the WA-AIM ELA for high school be available for analysis in the alignment study along with actual student responses and scoring?  
**ANSWER:** The items that students engage with at the time of assessment are not the primary focus of the alignment study, but the example items will be available for supporting information. OSPI can provide a sampling of student responses available as well, though at present submission of student work is a voluntary activity with respect to the collected data for the WA-AIM assessment.
19. **QUESTION:** What reporting categories are used to report the results of the WA-AIM ELA for high school? Are students given one score for ELA or are they given scores for Reading: Literature; Reading: Informational Text; Writing: Text, Types, and Purposes; Writing: Research to Build and Present Knowledge; and Speaking and Listening: Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas or something different?  
**ANSWER:** Score are reported at the standard level then aggregated into a final content score which determines the reporting level.
20. **QUESTION:** Will student performances on items taken on the assessment from the 2017-2018 WA-AIM ELA testing be available to be used in the alignment study?  
**ANSWER:** Samples of student work can be available to access, but submission of actual student work is voluntary.
21. **QUESTION:** What are the reporting categories for the WCAP Grade 10 mathematics assessment?  
**ANSWER:** Scores are reported at three (3) Claim levels then aggregated into a final content score which determines the reporting level.
22. **QUESTION:** How is the CAT part of the assessment aggregated with the performance [task] to form the scale score? What is the comparison in the score value (possible points awarded) between the performance assessment and one item from the CAT part?  
**ANSWER:** Student performance across both the CAT and the performance task are combined to generate an overall scale score as described on the Smarter Balanced Reporting Scores webpage (<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/scores/>) and documents and the Technical Reports on the Development and Design webpage (<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/>) in the Technical Documentation section. Items in both the CAT and the performance task can be worth 1, 2, 3, or 4 points.

23. **QUESTION:** The use of a Computer Adaptive Test (CAT) for the WCAP Grade 10 mathematics assessment suggests that there will be a large set of test events completed by students. What will be available by September 1, 2018, for analysis of the WCAP Grade 10 mathematics alignment study such as testing algorithm for the adaptive selection of item for a student, a range (low to high scores) of test events from the spring 2018 testing of the grade 10 assessment, how items from the item pool for the CAT are selected, test event records for a range of students, or other relevant materials?

**ANSWER:** Available information will be coordinated among OSPI, the winning bidder, and American Institute for Research (AIR), Washington's assessment vendor, depending on the winning proposal's plan.

24. **QUESTION:** What value is placed on using teachers and others from Washington as content experts compared to content experts from other states? Is the OSPI desire to have Washington teachers receive the benefit of professional development that comes from participation in an alignment study?

**ANSWER:** Yes, a higher order consideration and outcome has always been on professional learning of Washington teachers. Washington has not previously used educators from other states in alignment studies, or any state assessment development work. For the scope of this activity Washington will not wish to entertain using educators from outside of Washington.

25. **QUESTION:** How many content experts per grade have been used in the past for conducting alignment studies for the state?

**ANSWER:** In previous alignment studies, the aim has been inclusion of at least 10 participants, but across individual events, OSPI has experienced a need to accept fewer, but that is not a function of process design, but availability of experts to participate during the scheduled event.

26. **QUESTION:** Has OSPI made any adjustments to the SBAC claims given that the WCA[P] is delivered in 10<sup>th</sup> grade instead of 11<sup>th</sup> grade?

**ANSWER:** No. The 10th grade SBA claims are the same as the 11th grade SBA claims and are reported in the same way.

Per Questions #2 and #17, **SECTION E. RFP EXHIBITS** shall be amended to read as follows:

- Exhibit A Certifications and Assurances
- Exhibit B Sample Contract
- Exhibit C General Terms and Conditions
- Exhibit D SBA Math and WA-AIM Assessment Materials
- Exhibit E Proposal Evaluation Criteria
- Exhibit F Contractor Intake Form
- Exhibit G Proposal Checklist
- Exhibit H Example Teacher-Submitted Evidence