AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/ ~~MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT~~	1. Contract Number N/A	Page of Pages 1 / 1

2. Amendment/~~Modification~~ Number	3. Effective Date	Solicitation Number	5. Solicitation Caption
DCTO-2008-R-0019/M0003	11-Jan-08	DCTO-2008-R-0019	Statewide Longitudinal Education Data

6. Issued By: Code	7. Administered By (If other than line 6)
Office of Contracting and Procurement Office of the Chief Technology Officer 441 4th Street NW STE 930S Washington, DC 20001 ATTN: ANNIE WATKINS 202-727-5274	Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP - OCTO) in support of OSSE STE 920 441 4TH STE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001

8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)	(X)	
N/A		9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. DCTO-2008-R-0019
	X	9B. Dated (See Item 11) 10-Dec-07
		10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.
Code 54-1960842 Facility		10B. Dated (See Item 13)

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

XX The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [ ] is extended. [XX] is not extended.
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 0 copies of the amendment: (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14

	A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.
	B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.
	C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:
	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [X] is not, [ ] is required to sign this document and return ______ copies to the issuing office.

14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

THIS AMENDMENT ADDS THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS TO THE SOLICITATION:
X1, PRINT VERSION OF J.02.4 "COST / PRICE DATA PACKAGE" ALSO AVAILABLE AT WWW.OCP.DC.GOV
X2, TABLE "USER PROFILES"
X3, "ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM POTENTIAL BIDDERS"

THIS AMENDMENT INCORPORATES THE FOLLOWING REPLACEMENTS WITHIN THE SOLICITATION:
Y1 REPLACES "TABLE OF CONTENTS, SECTION B"
Y2 REPLACES TABLE FROM B.3.1 "COMPONENTS OF THE SYSTEM"
Y3 REPLACES TABLE VIII "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EDUCATION DATA SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENT"
Y4 REPLACES TABLE M.4.1 "EVALUATION CRITERIA"

THIS AMENDMENT CHANGES THE FOLLOWING POST-AWARD DATES:
C.3.1.5 & F.3.3 "CONTRACTOR SHALL HAVE U.S.D.A. DIRECT CERTIFICATION IN PLACE BY" REPLACE "AUGUST 2008" WITH "30 SEPTEMBER 2008".
C.3.1.4.1.B & F.3.2 "CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE STATE-OF-THE-ART FULLY FUNCTIONAL 'UNIQUE STUDENT IDENTIFIER' SYSTEM TO MEET OR EXCEED STANDARDS IN SECTION C.3.1.4. REPLACE " BY JULY 2008" WITH "WITHIN 60 DAYS OF CONTRACT AWARD. "

THIS AMENDMENT DELETES C.3.5 "DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT" WHICH IS NO LONGER A REQUIREMENT.
ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect

15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)		16A. Name of Contracting Officer ANNIE R. WATKINS	
15B. Name of Contractor (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. Date Signed	16B. District of Columbia Annie R. Watkins (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. Date Signed 1/11/08

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B.3.1 COMPONENTS OF THE SYSTEM
Base Period (3 Years) Implementation CLINS.

CLIN NUMBERS	Supplies or Services	PRICE
0001	**Preliminary Project Plan:** Contractor shall submit a detailed project plan to meet the requirements identified in Section C.3.1.1	$
	<u>Implementation Components</u>	
0002	**USI:** Contractor shall provide state-of-the-art fully-functional Unique Student Identifier (USI) System as described in Sections C.3.1.4.1.	$
0003	**USDA Direct Certification:** The Contractor shall provide a state-of-the-art fully-functional system for Direct Certification of USDA Free and Reduced Cost Meal Program as described in Sections C.3.1.5	$
0004	**Student Tracking System**: The Contractor shall provide a state-of-the-art fully-functional Student Tracking System as described in Section C.3.1.6	$
0005	**Statewide Longitudinal Education Data (SLED) Warehouse**: The Contractor shall provide a state-of-the-art fully-functional SLED Warehouse, as described in Section C.3.1.7.	$
0006	**Teacher Tracking System:** The Contractor shall provide a state-of-the-art fully-functional Teacher Tracking System as described in Section C.3.1.11	$
	<u>Not Separately Prices CLINS</u>	
0007	**Reports:** The Contractor shall generate and provide reports, as described in Section C.3.1.13.	
0008	**Architecture Diagrams:** The Contractor shall provide any and all diagrams required to effect optimal and alternate technical solutions.	

CLIN NUMBERS	Supplies or Services	TOTAL PRICE
0009	**Integration of the SLED Systems from CLINs 0002 through 0006**: The Contractor shall provide clear evidence that systems are functioning. Contractor shall maintain Integration of the SLED Systems for the duration of this project.	$
0010	**Project Implementation**: The Contractor shall provide content and / or subject matter experts or other resources as required to ensure the SLED Systems are fully utilized, as described in Section C.3.1.10	$
0011	**Technical Support Services:** The Contractor shall provide all technical support services necessary to ensure systems are functioning properly. Contractor will provide 24 hour / 7 days a week consultation services to OSSE and OCTO, as described in Section C.3.15.	$
0012	**Storage / Backup Services:** The Contractor shall provide storage and backup services as described in Section C.3.6.3.	$
0013	**Systems and Data Security Services**: The Contractor shall, at all times, in all locations, ensure protection against unauthorized access, disclosure, transfer, modification or destruction of the SLED Systems and of all data and information in the SLED Systems, as described in Section C.3.4	$
0014	**OCTO System Administrator Capabilities:** The Contractor shall provide continuous capabilities for OCTO personnel to perform Administrator tasks and functions as described in Section C.3.6.3	$

0015	**Organizational Change Plan;** The Contractor shall provide a plan to provide a constantly updated array of "best practices" information to improve student achievement through the use of the SLED Systems, as described in Section C.3.8	$
0016	Optional CLINs: (Mark "Price" as N/A if option is not available or not included in proposal)	
0017	**Value Added Modules:** Contractor shall provide optional Modules as proposed: a.) b.) c.)	a$ b$ c$
0018	**Hosting Options:** a.) Offeror Hosting b.) OCTO Hosting c.) Combined Hosting	a$ b$ c$
0019	**Zone Integration Server Option:** The Contractor shall provide a Zone Integration Server to the specifications as described in Section C.3.10	$
0020	**Interoperability Agent Options**: The Contractor shall provide SIF standardized Agents for use by the Zone Integration Server to conform with most current School Interoperability Framework specifications as described in Section C.3.10. (Indicate if proposed Agents are open source). **Yes**______ **No** ______	$
0021	**Other Hardware Options:** The Contractor shall provide other hardware (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the SLED System, as described in the bidder's proposal.	$

0022	**Other Software Options**: The Contractor shall provide other software (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the SLED System as described in the bidder's proposal. This includes all necessary Licenses and Use Agreement costs.	$
0023	**Other Service Options**: The Contractor shall provide other services (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the SLED System as described the bidder's proposal.	$
0024	**Other Miscellaneous Options**: The Contractor shall provide other items (such as travel) necessary to ensure the success of the SLED System as described in the bidder's proposal.	$

	TOTAL FOR BASE PERIOD **(For comparison purposes: This figure shall include presumption that all optional CLINSs offered are desired. Where multiple options are offered, presume the most expensive option is desired.)**	$

****

B.3.2. **Option Period One (1).** All services and materials to be provided by the Contractor for Option Period One shall be included the Total for Option Period One. A more detailed breakdown shall be included in the proposal.

B.3.2.1 **OPTION PERIOD ONE (1) (Year Four)**

0001A	**OPTION PERIOD ONE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT CLINS**	**TOTAL**
1001	**Technical Support Services:** The contractor shall provide all technical support services necessary to ensure systems are functioning properly. Contractor will provide 24 hour / 7 days a week consultation services to OSSE and OCTO, as described in Section C.3.1.5	$
1002	**Storage / Backup Services:** The contractor shall provide storage and backup services as described in Section C.3.6.3	$
1003	**Systems and Data Security Services**: The contractor shall, at all times, in all locations, ensure protection against unauthorized access, disclosure, transfer, modification or destruction of the systems and of all data and information in the systems, as described in Section C.3.4	$
1004	**OCTO System Administrator Capabilities:** The contractor shall provide continuous capabilities for OCTO personnel to perform Administrator tasks and functions as described in Section C.3.6.3	$
	Optional Clins: (Mark "Price" as N/A if option is not available or not included in proposal)	$
1005	**Value Added Modules:** Contractor shall provide optional Modules as proposed: a.) b.) c.)	a$ b$ c$

1006	**Hosting Options:** a.) Offeror Hosting b.) OCTO Hosting c.) Combined Hosting	a$ b$ c$
1007	**Zone Integration Server Option:** The contractor shall provide a Zone Integration Server to the specifications as described in Section C.3.11	$
1008	**Interoperability Agent Options**: The contractor shall provide SIF standardized Agents for use by the Zone Integration Server to conform with most current School Interoperability Framework specifications as described in Section C.3.10. (Indicate if proposed Agents are open source). **Yes______ No ______**	$
1009	**Other Hardware Options:** The contractor shall provide other hardware (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system, as described in the bidder's proposal.	$
1010	**Other Software Options**: The contractor shall provide other software (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system as described in the bidder's proposal. This includes all necessary Licenses and Use Agreement costs.	$
1011	**Other Service Options**: The contractor shall provide other services (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system as described the bidder's proposal.	$
1022	**Other Miscellaneous Options**: The contractor shall provide other items (such as travel) necessary to ensure the success of the system as described in the bidder's proposal.	$
	TOTAL FOR OPTION PERIOD ONE	$

B.3.2.2 Option Period Two (2) Year Five

2000	Item	PRICE
	OPTION PERIOD TWO MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT CLINS	**PRICE**
2001	**Technical Support Services:** The contractor shall provide all technical support services necessary to ensure systems are functioning properly. Contractor will provide 24 hour / 7 days a week consultation services to OSSE and OCTO, as described in Section C.3.7	$
2002	**Storage / Backup Services:** The contractor shall provide storage and backup services as described in Section C.3.6.3	$
2003	**Systems and Data Security Services**: The contractor shall, at all times, in all locations, ensure protection against unauthorized access, disclosure, transfer, modification or destruction of the systems and of all data and information in the systems, as described in Section C.3.4	$
2004	**OCTO System Administrator Capabilities:** The contractor shall provide continuous capabilities for OCTO personnel to perform Administrator tasks and functions as described in Section C.3.6.3	$
	Optional Clins: (Mark "Price" as N/A if option is not available or not included in proposal)	$
2005	**Value Added Modules:** Contractor shall provide optional Modules as proposed: a.) b.) c.)	a$ b$ c$

2006	**Hosting Options:** a.) Offeror Hosting b.) OCTO Hosting c.) Combined Hosting	a$ b$ c$
2007	**Zone Integration Server Option:** The contractor shall provide a Zone Integration Server to the specifications as described in Section C.3.11	$
2008	**Interoperability Agent Options**: The contractor shall provide SIF standardized Agents for use by the Zone Integration Server to conform with most current School Interoperability Framework specifications as described in Section C.3.10 (Indicate if proposed Agents are open source). **Yes**______ **No** ______	$
2009	**Other Hardware Options:** The contractor shall provide other hardware (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system, as described in the bidder's proposal.	$
2010	**Other Software Options**: The contractor shall provide other software (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system as described in the bidder's proposal. This includes all necessary Licenses and Use Agreement costs.	$
2011	**Other Service Options**: The contractor shall provide other services (not listed elsewhere in this Solicitation) necessary to ensure success of the system as described the bidder's proposal.	$
2012	**Other Miscellaneous Options**: The contractor shall provide other items (such as travel) necessary to ensure the success of the system as described in the bidder's proposal.	$
	TOTAL FOR OPTION PERIOD TWO	$

X1

COST / PRICE DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATION

RFP Number: ____________________ Closing Date: ________________________

Caption: ________________________ Total Proposed Amount: ________________

The undersigned ____
____
(please print name and title of offeror's authorized signatory) hereby certifies that, to the best of my knowledge, the cost and pricing data (i.e. at the time of price agreement this certification represents that all material facts of which prudent buyers and sellers would reasonably expect to affect price negotiations in any significant manner) submitted was accurate, complete, and current as of ______________________ (date of RFP closing or conclusion of negotiations as appropriate) . The undersigned further agrees that it is under a continuing duty to update cost or pricing data through the date that negotiations, if any, with the District are completed. The undersigned further agrees that the price, including profit or fee, will be adjusted to exclude any significant price increases occurring because the cost or pricing data was inaccurate, incomplete or not current. (See D.C. Procurement Regulations, 27 DCMR, Section 1624; and Section 25 of the Standard Contract Provisions for Use with District of Columbia Government Supply and Services Contracts, November, 2004, as amended).

Signed: ______________________________ Date: ____________________

Title: ______________________________

Company: ___________________________

Address: ___________________________

____

DUNS #:____________________________

Phone: _____________________________

Fax: _______________________________

COST/PRICE DATA REQUIREMENTS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION:

1.1 Offerors submitting cost/price proposals, in response to a District Request For Proposal (RFP), sole source procurement, change order, or contract modification exceeding $100,000 in total value, must include a complete cost and pricing data breakdown (i.e., data that is verifiable and factual) for all costs identified in the proposal, and relevant to the performance of the contract. The requirement for submission of cost or pricing data is met when all accurate cost or pricing data reasonably available to the Offeror has been submitted, either actually, or by specific identification, to the District. If not available at the time of submission, as later information comes into the Offeror's possession, it should be promptly submitted to the District in a manner that clearly demonstrates its relationship to, and effect on, the Offeror's cost/price proposal. This requirement continues up to the date of final agreement on price and/or other issues, as agreed upon between the parties.

(3)0. . . . . . . " There is a clear distinction between submitting cost or pricing data and merely making available books, records and other documents without identification or context. By submitting a cost/price proposal, the Offferor, if selected for negotiation, grants the Contracting Officer, or an authorized representative, the right to examine, at any time before award, those books, records, documents, and other types of factual information, regardless of form or whether such supporting information is specifically referenced or included in the proposal as a basis for pricing, that will permit an adequate evaluation of the proposed cost/price.

1.3 The cost/price proposal will represent the offeror's understanding of the RFP's requirements and the offeror's ability to organize and perform those requirements effectively and efficiently. The evaluation of the Offeror's cost/price proposal will be based on an analysis of the realism and completeness of the cost data, the conformity of the cost to the offeror's technical data and the proposed allocation of labor-hours and skill sets. Pertinent cost information, including but not limited to Defense Contract Auditing Agency (DCAA) and/or the Department of Labor (DOL) recommended rates for direct labor, overhead, general and administrative expense (G&A), etc., as necessary and appropriate, must be used to arrive at the most probable cost to be incurred by the Offeror. If the District considers the proposed costs to be unrealistic, the Offeror should adjust its proposed costs accordingly. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performance and cost or price should be explained in the cost/price proposal. The burden of proof for cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

1.4 The Offeror must submit its cost/price proposal in hard copy as well as on a diskette, which is in a format (i.e. MS Office, Lotus 1-2-3, etc.) specified and/or provided by the Agency Contracting Officer in the solicitation package. All cost/price proposals should provide a cost summary by all cost elements, cross-referenced to supporting documentation. See Table No. (1.4).

1.5 The following information shall be included in this section, for the prime contractor and each proposed subcontractor:

(a) A properly completed "Cost/Price Disclosure Certification.'

(a) Identification of any estimates, along with the rationale and methodology used to develop them, including judgmental factors used in projecting future costs, based on known data, and the timing, nature and extent of any material contingencies.

I Disclosure of any other activities or likely events which could materially impact specific costs (i.e., existing large material and supply inventories, management/ownership changes, new technologies, collective bargaining agreements, etc.)

(d) Disclosure of any and all awarded and pending contracts with the District of Columbia, including contract number(s), amount, type (fixed price, cost reimbursement, etc.), agency, and a brief description of services.

(3) Source of approval and the latest date of approval of the offeror's Accounting system.

Table (1.4)
Example Cost Summary Format

Cost Item	Task 1			Task 2			Task 3			Task 4, etc.			Base Year Total
Direct Labor Categories • Employee A • Employee B • Employee C Total Labor Hours	R	H	D	R	H	D	R	H	D	R	H	D	
Total Labor Dollars													
Fringe Benefit													
Labor Overhead *													
Total Direct Labor													
Other Direct Costs • Equip. & Supplies • Materials • Travel • Other													
Subcontractors • Sub A • Sub B													
ODC Overhead *													
Total ODC & Subcontractors													
G&A													
Fee/Profit													
Total Price													

H = Hours R = Rate D = Dollars (Rate X Hours = Dollars)

Note: ***Provide cost information similar to the above format for each option/out-year***

* *Note: Small, field-based trade providers typically have a labor or combined overhead cost components. Larger, more diversified providers may have separate labor, and/or ODC or combined overhead component.*

2. SUPPORTING COST DATA:

2.1 The Offeror shall provide, for each cost element, a narrative description, in sufficient detail, to demonstrate price reasonableness, credibility and reliability. The Offeror shall provide its assumptions and methodologies used to estimate each cost element (significant item and quantity estimates, labor hour expenditure patterns and mix, etc.). The following information shall be included in this section:

2.1.1. The Offeror's total estimated costs plus its fee (if applicable) for providing all of the requirements of the RFP, as proposed in their technical proposal. Offerors should support their best estimates of all costs (direct, indirect, profit, etc.) to be incurred in the performance of the contract.

2.1.2. When proposing multiyear/option year pricing, the estimated proposed costs shall include a breakdown of all cost elements for the base year as well as each option/out-year. Labor, other direct costs, indirect costs and profit shall each be clearly identifiable. If different from the Defense Contract Auditing Agency (DCAA) or Department Of Labor (DOL) recommended rates, the Offeror shall provide a thorough explanation for the variation(s) of rates.

2.1.3. The Cost Summary Format (Table1.4) provides a format for the Offeror to submit to the District a pricing proposal of estimated cost by line item, along with supporting documentation that is adequately cross-referenced and suitable for cost realism analysis. A cost-element breakdown shall be attached for each proposed line item and must reflect any other specific requirements established by the Contracting Officer. When more than one contract line item is proposed, a summary of the total amount covering all line items must be furnished for each cost element.

2.1.4. If the Offeror has an agreement with a federal, state, or municipal government agency on the use of a Forward Pricing Rates Agreement (FPRA) or other rate agreement for labor, fringe benefits, overhead and/or general and administrative expense, the Offeror must identify the agreement, provide a copy and describe its nature, terms and duration.

3. SPECIFIC COST ELEMENTS:

A well-supported cost/price proposal reduces the effort needed for review and facilitates informed negotiations. The following are the minimum criteria that constitute an acceptable cost/price proposal:

3.1 **Direct labor:** A task-phased annual breakdown of labor rates and labor hours by category or skill level, including the basis for the rates and hours estimated (i.e., payroll registers, wage determinations, collective bargaining agreements, historical experience, engineering estimates, etc.).

3.1.1 The Offeror shall use the following Table No. (3.1.1) to exhibit its total labor hours by prime contractor and subcontractor(s). A separate table should be completed for each year (base and out-years).

Table (3.1.1)
Annual Labor Summary

Item	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Base Year Total
Labor Category, Prime • Employee A • Employee B • Employee C Labor Category, Sub. • Employee D • Employee E • Employee F Labor Category, Consultant • Employee G • Employee H					
Total Labor Hours by Task					

Note: Do not include wage rates in this table

3.1.2 A standard of 40 hours/week, 1,920 hours/year is recommended. If another standard is used, it should be precisely defined. Any deviation from the above labor-hour projection without substantiation may form the basis to reject the response to the RFP. The proposed labor-hours shall include prime contractor, subcontractor and consultant hours.

3.1.3 The Offeror shall also submit Table No. (3.1.4.b), depicting the labor mix percentages as proposed for the base year as well as the out-years and should match the personnel experience requirements specified in the RFP, Section **(to be referenced by the Contract Specialist),** under Personnel Experience. All of the RFP Key positions must be included within the Senior Staff categories. To provide a better understanding of this format, Table No. (3.1.4.a) is provided as an example.

3.1.4 The Offeror shall describe how the hourly direct labor rate was derived and indicate whether these rates are subject to any collective bargaining agreement(s), the Service Contract Act (SCA), Davis-Bacon, or any other special agreement which controls the labor rate indicated. When proposing price escalation for option/out-years, the Offerors must follow instructions provided under Economic Price Adjustments, Section H, of this RFP.

Table (3.1.4.a)

Summary of Proposed Annual labor Mix Category (with examples)

NAME (Note1)	LABOR MIX (Note 2)	OFFEROR'S LABOR CATEGORY (Note 3)	PERCENT OF TIME ON CONTRACT (Note 4)	PLANNED SOW ASSIGNMENT (Note 5)	STATUS (Note 6)
Able, Jackson	Sr. Staff Level 1	Program Director	PT/10%	N/A	PCE/E
Black, William E.	Sr. Staff Level 1	Psychiatrist	PT/20%	C.3	PCE/E
White, Pamela A.	Sr. Staff Level 2	Clinic Manager	PT/50%	C.4.1	PCE/P
Green, Robert T	Sr. Staff Level 3	Counseling Supvs.	PT/50%	C.4.2	PCE/P
Ross, Allen	Jr. Staff Level 1	Counselor	FT/100%	C.4.3	PCE/E

Note 1: Last name, first name, middle initial, grouped by task as specified in SOW. Attach resume for each name on list. The names on this list and the resumes are to be in the same order.

Note 2: Staff levels in each Labor Mix should be classified by the level of expertise and years of experience.

Note 3: Offerors internal labor category.

Note 4: State whether the individual is employed full time (FT) or part time (PT) and the planned percentage of the named person's production time that is to be applied as a direct charge to the contract.

Note 5: Identify by SOW paragraph(s) and task number, the major tasks to which the individual is expected to be assigned.

Note 6: Enter PCE if individual is to be a prime contractor employee; enter SCE if the individual is to be a subcontractor employee; enter CON if individual is to be a consultant. Enter E if employee as of the date of this proposal; enter P if the individual is a pending employee as of date of the proposal. Signed Commitment Agreements are required for all individuals with P status. A copy of each agreement is to be inserted behind the resume section in the technical proposal.

Table (3.1.4.b)

Summary of Proposed Annual labor Mix Category

NAME (Note1)	LABOR MIX (Note 2)	OFFEROR'S LABOR CATEGORY (Note 3)	PERCENT OF TIME ON CONTRACT (Note 4)	PLANNED SOW ASSIGNMENT (Note 5)	STATUS (Note 6)
Labor Category, Prime • Employee A • Employee B • Employee C • Employee D Labor Category, Sub. • Employee E • Employee F • Employee G Labor Category, Consultant • Employee H Employee I					

Last name, first name, middle initial, grouped by task as specified in SOW. Attach resume for each name on list. The names on this list and the resumes are to be in the same order.

Note 2: Staff levels in each Labor Mix should be classified by the level of expertise and years of experience.

Note 3: Offerors internal labor category.

Note 4: State whether the individual is employed full time (FT) or part time (PT) and the planned percentage of the named person's production time that is to be applied as a direct charge to the contract.

Note 5: Identify by SOW paragraph(s) and task number, the major tasks to which the individual is expected to be assigned.

Note 6: Enter PCE if individual is to be a prime contractor employee; enter SCE if the individual is to be a subcontractor employee; enter CON if individual is to be a consultant. Enter E if employee as of the date of this proposal; enter P if the individual is a pending employee as of date of the proposal. Signed Commitment Agreements are required for all individuals with P status. A copy of each agreement is to be inserted behind the resume section in the technical proposal.

3.2 **Indirect Costs:** The Offeror shall indicate it's proposed Fringe, Overhead and General & Administrative rates for each applicable fiscal or calendar year (as appropriate). The Offeror shall indicate if these rates are subject to a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement. If the proposed Indirect Rates differ from the Forward Pricing Rate Agreement, the Offeror shall provide an explanation. The Offeror shall provide its actual indirect rates for overhead, G&A and fringe benefits for at least the past three (3) years and shall explain the basis for any significant rate difference between the prior three year period and the rates proposed now.

3.3 **Other Direct Costs:** Other Direct Costs consists of materials, travel, reproduction, postage, telephone, supplies for the prime and all subcontracted effort. This includes all other direct costs associated with performance of the contract. Travel costs shall be in accordance with GSA Joint Travel Regulations for airfare, hotel, and per diem allowances. All other direct costs should be specifically identified and explained. If an allocated portion of a Direct cost is also included in an Offeror's indirect rate (such as General and Administrative), the Offeror should state so and list the types of expenses included in the indirect rate.

3.3.1 The Offeror should identify types, quantities, and costs of all materials and supplies proposed including a non-loaded priced listing of individual materials or supplies ordered, or a consolidated and priced bill of materials for the entire proposal. A thoroughly documented bill of materials includes part numbers, description, unit costs, quantity required, extended cost (including delivery charges) and basis for the proposed cost (price quotation, prior buy, signed purchase orders, etc.) plus any other non-recurring costs. Deliverable materials are items delivered as a part of the work product. Examples of this are copies and binders delivered to the Government as a report or software ordered for and installed on a computer in a District Government office.

3.3.2 The Offeror shall use the following Table (3.3.2) to exhibit its total other direct costs (ODC) by prime and subcontractor(s). A separate table should be completed for each year (base and out-years).

Table (3.3.2)

Other Direct Costs (ODC) Summary

Item	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Base Year Total
Supplies and Materials Office Equipment Travel • Airfare • Hotel • Meals & Incidentals • Ground Transportation Telecommunications Occupancy • Rent • Utilities • Building Maintenance Transportation Client Care Cost • Food • Medical • Clothing • Personal Hygiene Other					
Total ODC by Task					

Note: *State each individual cost element being proposed. Describe in the narrative section of the cost proposal, how each cost element is derived and why it is being proposed. (Not all cost elements in the table above will apply to each solicitation. The above table should be tailored to the requirements of the RFP.)*

3.4 **Subcontracting Costs:** Each subcontract must be addressed separately. For any subcontract exceeding $25,000 the cost/price proposal must show the names, quantities, prices, deliverables, basis for selection, and degree of competition used in the selection process. The subcontractor's cost or pricing data should be included along with the prime Offeror's proposal. If available, the Offeror should also include the results of its review and evaluation of the subcontract proposals. The Offeror shall provide copies of any cost or price analyses of the subcontractor costs proposed.

3.5 **Start-up Costs:** As appropriate, the Offeror shall identify all start up costs associated with this effort.

3.6 **Other Historical Data:** All offerors with current or past experience (within three to five years) for similar requirements, as described herein, must submit, as a part of their cost data, the following:

(a) Contract Number.

(b) Government agency (federal, state, District, municipal) the contract was awarded by.

(c) Name and phone number of the Contracting Officer.

(d) Name and phone number of the Contract Administrator.

(e) Name and phone number of the Contracting Officer's Representative (if applicable) and the Contract Administrator.

(f) Period of Performance of the Contract.

(g) Total amount of contract(s)

In addition to the above data, the following table (No. 3.6) will be completed and submitted with the cost data:

Table (3.6)

Format for Historical Data

	Proposed Contract			Delivered Contract *		
	Number Of Hours**	Contract Value	Average Hr Rate	Number Of Hours**	Contract Value	Average Hr Rate
Direct Labor						
Loaded Labor***						

* Should include any increased scope officially added to contract.
** If provided different number of hours, the difference should be explained.
*** Loaded labor should include all loading and profit. If significant material (i.e., greater than 5%) is included in the contract, data shall be presented both with and without material cost.

In addition, any other data the offeror believes is necessary should be provided in this section.

Note: *For data submitted in the above table for "delivered Contract", the Offeror shall indicate the date as of which, the submitted data is current.*

Attachment 2- User Profile

User Type	User Profile	Estimated # of Users
General Public	Basic Users	Infinite
Student	Basic Student User	75,000
Parents	Basic Student User	150,000
Teachers/Counselors (preK-12 + post-secondary)	Power User LEA Direct Meal Certification User	8,000
School Administrators (preK-12 + post-secondary)	Power User LEA Direct Meal Certification User	1,200
LEA Central Office	Power User LEA Direct Meal Certification User	500
LEA Power Administrator	Power Administrator LEA Direct Meal Certification User	Each school should have 1 (Approximately 230 Schools)
Public Charter School Board (PCSB)	Power User	10
SEA (OSSE) Central Office	Power User	50
Community-based Org (CBO)/Non-Governmental Org (NGO)	Power User	100
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education,	Power User	20
DC Council	Power User	20
Executive Office of the Mayor	Power User	20
University of the District of Columbia	Power User	30
USDA Free and Reduced Meal Direct Certification User	Basic Users	5
System Administrator	Administrative User	3

Basic Users: Run prompted reports

Basic Student User: This user type would be defined to see student level data (ie. Student name, demographics, classes, grades, attendance, etc.) of only the student(s) assigned to the user.

Power Users: Run prompted reports and conduct ad hoc analysis

LEA Power Administrator (LEAPA): This role should be created by the system administrator and serves as the administrator at an LEA for which it is assigned. It should not be an administrator for any other LEA. The role should have the ability to create LEA specific user accounts, disable accounts, reset passwords and change user profile information (ie. first name, last name, contact information, etc.).

Administrative User: Users with advanced skills to develop reports and deploy them for basic and power users, create user accounts, access levels, create fields in databases, add fields to the decision support module, etc.

LEA Direct Meal Certification User: Specific to the LEA that is assigned to the individual with this role. These types of users can only view data as defined in DC-2, DC-3, DC-7 and DC-8 (LEA specific data).

Estimate a 10% concurrent usage.

Questions from the Solicitation and Answers from OCP/OCTO/OSSE

Question: Are there problems with data quality in the SISs? Is the data clean?
Answer: The data is probably not very clean.

Question: Would it be possible to republish the table on page 25 and list the underlying data structure of the sources i.e. whether it is Oracle, SQL Server, flat file?
Answer: No. This information had not yet been collected. Vendors should build the collection of these technical requirements into their proposal.

Question: Data from the source systems is critical. Is the expectation that there be an ongoing data cleansing process where the system would be completely in **place** by August 2008 or should it just have a capability to have a data cleansing process?
Answer: It is ideal to have something in place by August 2008 but in the RFP response mention your timeline.

Question: Pg 23 says free and reduced meals should be by August 2008 but this piece uses the Data warehouse central piece
Answer: Put everything in the RFP response. We would like for this piece to be done by August 2008.

Question: Would the data warehouse reside in OCTO or OSSE?
Answer: OSSE – It is a business solution

Question: Is the presentation going to be sent to the list?
Answer: No

Question: Is there an LSDBE requirement? How does prime vendor select the subs?
Answer:
- 35%
- Prime vendor should find the subs

Question: What was the reason behind the decision to use SIF?
Answer: Interoperability

Question: What HR systems are being used?
Answer: Peoplesoft is the system

Question: What kind of decision support is available for pre built reports – What kind of users would be using the system?
Answer: Power users and day to day users. The pre-built reports would be used primarily by people without the need or desire to do ad hoc querying. These would be your basic low tech users.

Question: Does small business and LSDBE need to be identified?
Answer: Needs to be identified and is part of evaluation process.

Question: Parents are an important stakeholder.
Answer: We agree, they are listed as a user group in the rfp.

Question: Is grant going to be used?
Answer: Yes, the state has received an LDS grant from the Department of Education. This grant is one source of revenue for the project.

Question: Should Role based security be provided?
Answer: Role based and rule based security should be provided.

Question: It should be Due date is Jan 7 can it be moved to incorporate answers in the response.
Answer: Yes, please see the recently published amendment to the RFP on OCP's website.

Question: Are all questions going to be published?
Answer: Yes, all questions will be published. No secret questions.

Question: If vendors feel there is not enough info in RFP to do fixed price, would time and materials contract be entertained?
Answer: No

Question: Who should questions be sent to? OCP cc Bradley
Answer: Annie.Watkins@dc.gov and Bradley.Hill@dc.gov

Question: Is grant funds only funds?
Answer: No we also have local funds

Question: What is preslugging?
Answer: Pre-slugging is where the basic information on a test sheet (such as the id, student's name, teaher name, etc) is pre-printed on the test sheet.

Question: Who is administering the test DC CAS?
Answer: A third party vendor.

Question: Should vendors provide hardware solutions?
Answer: Yes

Question: Do you have preferred hardware vendor?
Answer: No. Vendors should choose the hardware vendor that best fits their needs.

Question: Will the district consider issuing this solicitation as a masters services agreement?
Answer: No

Question: Will the district remove the provisions of H.5 "51% DISTRICT RESIDENTS NEW HIRES REQUIREMENTS AND FIRST SOURCE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT"?
Answer: No, we do not intend to remove this provision. However, all offerors should read this section carefully, especially section H.5.5 and H.5.6 to ensure that they understand the full context if this requirement.

Question: Are there any companies that are precluded from (1) priming or (2) being a subcontractor to a prime for this initiative due to their past or current involvement with OSSE, OCTO, DCPS, DCPCS, and/or OCP?
Answer: No

Question: The District is requesting options and value added modules; however per the below language on Page 6 of the RFP, vendors run the risk of being penalized to include options/value-add modules as it only increases their cost proposal. The District could find vendors not including these optional products/services as their proposals would be more costly than the competition.
Answer: Vendors will not be penalized. Value added components will be evaluated separately from the base requirements. The OSSE and OCTO wish to consider other components available from Offerors as cost options to be considered at a later time, however, the prioritized modules must be architected such that the value-added components may be added without a re-design of the core system. This section of the proposal submission is purely optional. The purpose of the value added modules is for vendors to provide additional creativity for the data warehouse that has not been identified as a requirement. Vendors can use this section to identify cutting edge technology that we may not be aware of that is out of scope of the RFP requirements, but could be a feature that we may find extremely beneficial and to be implemented at a later date. This section should be used by the Offerors to provide a module they deem to be beneficial to OSSE and OCTO. The value added module costs will be looked at separately from the cost of the system that meets the requirements. It should list the actual module, definition and cost for each proposed "Value-Added Module". If Offerors provide "Value-Added Modules", Offerors should provide explanations and pricing structures for system capabilities that exceed the stipulated requirements.

Question: Can the District remove the evaluation of the value added modules and options as they should not be included in the FFP price evaluation?
Answer: This section will remain in the RFP.

Question: Does a vendor need to propose a solution for each of the hosting options (e.g.: must a vendor price a "Combined Hosting" option)?
Answer: The vendor should propose hosting solutions on this spectrum of options for the solutions they are prepared to provide. Vendors don't need to propose all options, but if the district finds that it wishes to pursue a certain hosting option to which a vendor has not responded, the district will not be able to evaluate that solution. Therefore, it is in the best interest of all vendors to propose solutions for a local hosting, vendor-hosted, and combined hosting option, but vendors are not required to do so.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO/OCP provide insight on how it will be evaluating the costs of the different options? (e.g.: will the District average the three options, take the lowest cost option, etc?)
Answer: All the options will be evaluated in the same manner as the basic requirement unless otherwise indicated.

Question: The requirements mandated by the National School Lunch Program is a large undertaking in itself which a vast majority of SEAs have chosen to have this system/application built separately from its student longitudinal data system. As the District must have this system operational in August 2008, will the SEA investigate having this requirement of the RFP removed and issue this need under its own RFP?
Answer: The District will not be separating this provision of the solicitation from the SLED program. However, offerors should understand that the direct certification component does not have to be built into the warehouse itself. The data and functionality from the direct certification business function should be able to be imported into the data warehouse once it is operational, but it is acceptable for an offeror to propose a solution to this component that exists initially outside of the data warehouse. It is important that all offerors understand the difference between the SLED program and the component of the SLED which is called the State longitudinal education data warehouse. The longitudinal data warehouse is the flagship component of the program to which all data in the program should be integrated. The SLED program is OSSE's umbrella term for all of the different components of this system that will form the central nerve center of OSSE's ability to make data driven decisions. The SLED Program consists of the 5 components described in the RFP: the USI, the direct certification component, the student tracking system, the data warehouse, and the teacher tracking system.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO please provide the following information for IMA: • Detailed description of the type of data that is collected in the system. • Information on how the data are inputted and who inputs the data. • The number of current and future system users. • The number of data elements in the system. • The data format/model of the system. • The database size of the data set.
Answer: - IMA personnel manually provide a flat file (approximately 7MB) to an FTP server that contains the following data elements: Name (First and Last Name), Address, Quadrant, City, State, Zip, Sex, Race, Date of Birth. DCPS provides a file (approximately 10MB), via email, that is an extract of DCSTARS (SIS) and it contains the following data elements: Last Name, First Name, DOB, Gender, Ethnicity, SSN, Student ID, Street Number, Street Name, Apartment, Province, Zip, School Name. We access the FTP site to get the IMA file and then we manually run a script that compares the two files. The matches are students that are eligible to receive free meals. A file that contains the matches is sent to DCPS so they are aware of the students that are eligible to receive free meals. The DCPS file is approximately 10MB. The IMA file is approximately 7 MB.

Offerers are encouraged to provide an innovative solution. The original concept is to have a SLED FTP site that would contain a DCPS and IMA folder. (It may be beneficial to accommodate a manual process and an automated process in the event the IMA application is not integrated into the SLED and depending upon how long it will take an offeror to get the DCPS SIS linked into the SLED.) Every month this process occurs. A monthly automated process would check the SLED FTP site to get the files and then run an automated matching process and email the report to defined users and possibly even make it available via the decision support tool for the same predefined users. It is important to note that displaying student SSNs should not occur, but student ID's are acceptable.

Question: The number of years of data that are available. • The security platform that is used. • The vendor who originally built the system. • The quality of the data in the system.
Answer: There is no current system in place for Direct Meal Certification. Refer to above answer.

Question: How many languages need to be provided (and what are they), or do vendors only need to provide the open architecture and capability for additional languages?
Answer: The Language Access Act mandates that DC agencies translate vital documents when the constituency represents at least 3% or 500 individuals, whichever is less. Thus, only English and Spanish are mandated by law.

Question: OSSE/OCTO has obtained Business Intelligence (BI) licenses from both Cognos and Business Objects. To ensure that vendors utilize existing licenses and thus reducing the total cost of ownership (TCO) to the District of Columbia; can OSSE/OCTO please provide (by BI vendor) which (1) products are available for SLED and (2) for each of those products the number of licenses available for SLED?
Answer: There is currently no fixed standard for business intelligence tools, nor are there any licenses set aside for the SLED. However, the DC Government (the District) does currently have a contract with Business Objects and Informatica and offerors could seek to negotiate additional licenses for use for the SLED if they believe it would produce a more competitive proposal in terms of quality and cost. In addition, to more effectively manage its licensing costs and ongoing maintenance and support cost, the District must always consider how a proposed solution affects the number of tools it must support. Nonetheless, the first and foremost criteria in our evaluation is the value of the capability proposed and the vendor is in no way restricted to any specific toolset, and thus has the flexibility to propose any BI or ETL solution that they feel best meets the needs of this RFP, delivers the greatest value to the city, and addresses both our immediate and long term operational cost. Acceptable responses could include the proposed tool as a component of the total cost or propose the District assume the licensing and maintenance cost directly. In either case, the initial cost to the District, as well as ongoing maintenance and support cost, will be factored into the value equation.

Question: Detailed description of the type of data that is collected in the system. • Information on how the data are inputted and who inputs the data. • The number of current and future system users. • The number of data elements in the system. • The data format of the system. • The database size of the data set.

Answer: We do not have this information. The answers to these questions should be part of the technical requirements gathering effort by the offeror.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO confirm that the source systems are available to build the reports listed in Table IX? As listed in Table IX, the text indicates these narrative reports are to be generated by the vendor. Can OSSE/OCTO confirm that vendors are not expected to generate the narrative, since that narrative is actually policy. Vendors are required to only to generate the non-narrative portions of said reports?
Answer: The sources will be made available. The vendors are not required to generate the narrative portions of the reports. The vendors however, are expected to generate the non narrative parts of these reports and also to make sure that the data elements required by the narrative reports are incorporated in the SLED.

Question: Does OSSE/OCTO require vendors to propose all three hosting options?
Answer: The vendor should propose hosting solutions on this spectrum of options for the solutions they are prepared to provide. Vendors don't to propose all options, but if the district finds that it wishes to pursue a certain hosting option to which a vendor has not responded, the district will not be able to evaluate that solution. Therefore, it is in the best interest of all vendors to propose solutions for a local hosting, vendor-hosted, and combined hosting option, but vendors are not required to do so.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO please provide additional information on OCTO's in-house capabilities? o Number of racks available? HVAC and Power Specifications? Which server vendors (Dell, HP, etc.) do you support in your data center today?
Answer: Environmentals are already in place to accommodate this project. Dell is the recommended server vender.

Question: If the vendor proposes an OCTO Hosted Solution, what will the vendor's level of access to the OCTO Data Center be (i.e. does the vendor have immediate access to the servers)?
Answer: - Access to the data center is granted by request; escort will be provided when the vender arrives. The appropriate level of remote access to the servers will be provided.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO provide the breakdown of number of users by their usage profile? Examples of typical BI usage profiles are outlined below: • Basic Users: Run prompted reports • Power Users: Run prompted reports and conduct ad hoc analysis • Advanced Developer: Users with advanced skills to develop reports and deploy them for basic and power users.
Answer: - Refer to Attachment 2- User Profile

Question: OSSE/OCTO is requesting integration with a document management system (DMS). However, the RFP is silent on what information needs to be integrated. Can OSSE/OCTO please provide additional information how they would like to integrate SLED with DMS?
Answer: This requirement has been removed and is no longer required.

Question: Should the vendor propose new Backup Infrastructure to be used exclusively by SLED? If not, what is the existing backup infrastructure that the system needs to be compatible with?
Answer: - Backup solution is provided by OCTO Server Operations under managed services. The data center currently uses "Storage Tech" netbackup. We backup across OCTO data centers. As a result, backups are automatically off site.

Question: Is there an existing OCTO backup/offsite storage contract that the SLED project can utilize? If so, can the Disaster Recovery plan be made available so that vendors can incorporation this plan?
Answer: - The District Government currently has 2 data centers that are used to do back ups across data centers. As a result, disaster recovery and offsite backup processes and procedures are already in place.

Question: Should the vendor propose a new SAN Infrastructure to be used for data storage exclusively by the Data Warehouse Solution? If not, what is the existing SAN infrastructure that the system needs to be compatible with?
Answer: - Offeror should provide their storage requirements to OCTO WEB Applications or Server Operations departments if they intent to come into the data center. No standalone SAN are permitted in the data center. The system will be integrated into the enterprise SAN, but application owner will be responsible for the cost of storage.

Question: Can OSSE/OCTO please provide additional information regarding capacity/scalability for the following: • OC-2: Define "excessive demand" and "short notice"?
Answer: The solution should have the ability to handle a 1,000 concurrent users.

Question: Define "adequate network connectivity" ?
Answer: - Adequate network connectivity means users have the ability to connect to the Internet and are able to click on normal HTML pages and the response time is less than 1 sec.

Question: Does OCTO manage Technical Support under the model of multiple "tiers"?
Answer: Yes, there is an IT Help Desk organization presently in place. The processes, resources, procedures and training of District Government Help Desk staff would need to be established. Vendors should provide their best guidance on staff quantity per Help Desk tier type that would be needed for this effort.

Question: Can OCTO specify the number of FTEs (distinct from the number of support contacts) who provide Tier 1 coverage during the following periods: 7AM – 7 PM Weekdays , 7PM – 7 AM Weekdays Weekends and Holidays
Answer: - Vendors should provide their best guidance on staff quantity per Help Desk tier type that would be needed for this effort.

Question: CLINs 0002 (USI) and 0003 (USDA Direct Certification) have near-term due dates for these components. To ensure that vendors create realistic program plans (including staffing), can OSSE/OCTO please provide the expected award date of this contract so that all vendors can use the projected start dates as a basis?
Answer: See section 12 of page 1 of the Solicitation. "...if the offer is accepted within 150 calendar days from the date for receipt...". Also see the amendment which changes the due dates for these two items.

Question: The first sentence of this section refers to a picture of the Coalition Concept of Operation. The graphic is missing in the RFP, can OSSE/OCTO please provide this graphic?
Answer: The graphic is located on page 100, Table XIII, L.16.4

Question: If the vendor who is priming the SLED project is certified by SLBOC or SDLBD as a SBE, ROB, LRB, LBE, DZE, or DBE; does that vendor need to meet these Subcontract Set-Aside goals as it is a company that falls under the provisions of the Small, Local, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act of 2005?
Answer: Yes.

Question: Will the Government please entertain extending the due date of the proposal 2 weeks to allow vendors to fully incorporate the responses to questions submitted?
Answer: No

Question: The table in this section of the RFP appears to have 4 columns but the 4th column is outside the margin. Can OSSE/OCTO confirm that there are only 3 columns in this table or reissue Section M.4.1?
Answer: There are only 3 columns in this table.

Question: Requirement C.3.10.1 - To meet the SIF Compliance Requirement, is the contractor required to state that they can integrate and conform to the most current version of (SIF2.*) or that they and their solution are certified by SIFA (as stated in Section L.20)?
Answer: If a solution is SIFA certified please note this. If a product is not SIF certified and the offeror plans to integrate and conform to the most current version of SIF then this should also be stated. It is important to note that we do not expect the datawarehouse to be 100% SIF certified at the onset. However, our requirement is to have a SIF compliant datawarehouse that uses SIF agents to connect applications to the datawarehouse at final implementation.

Question: Is OSSE looking for a COTS product or custom build/framework or solution?
Answer: - No preference. Either is acceptable.

Question: In the RFP, there was not a stated cap on liability for this project. Many companies interpret the lack of that language to mean the liability for this project is

unlimited, thereby there management would not allow them to pursue this opportunity. Would the District of Columbia considering capping the liability on this deal as 1 times the value of this contract?
Answer: No.

Question: What is the base period for the contract? Page 2 states "base period (3 years) implementation CLINS, however on page 61, the RFP states "the term of the contract shall be for a base period of 12 months, from date of award..."
Answer: See Amendment.

Question: Page 70 there seems to be a picture missing from the description for the Data Quality Coalition; section G.10.6 "The Coalition Concept of Operations is depicted in the picture", however there is no picture provided.
Answer: The graphic is located on page 100, Table XIII, L.16.4

Question: Can you clarify the statements in Section C.3.6.3 – what does it mean to provide 'continuous capabilities for OCTO personnel to perform Administrator tasks and functions'
Answer: This means users with advanced skills to develop reports and deploy them for basic and power users, create user accounts, access levels, create fields in databases, add fields to the decision support module, etc. All functions associated with administrative rights.

Question: Is there a vendor list that I can register to receive such notices with regard to the above RFP? Or will everything be posted to a certain page on your website?
Answer: All materials relating to this solicitation will be on the OCP website.

Question: Request you to please let us know if we can respond to the RFP which is out on Dec 10, even though we have not responded to the attached RFI.

Answer: Offerors are welcome to respond to the RFP if they did not respond to the RFI.

Question: Can I visit with you on the phone?
Answer: All communications relating to this solicitation must be conducting through the contracting officer in the DC Office of Contracts and Procurement, Bradley Hill (e-mail: bradley.hill@dc.gov).

Question: The "Distribution of SIS's across charter schools by Campus" lists 69 campuses. Only 59 out of these have a SIS identified. What about the other campuses (e.g. Young America Works)?
Answer: For campuses that do not have an SIS identified, OSSE/OCTO was not able to verify that campus' system.

Question: Section C.3.1.11 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EDUCATION DATA SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENT in the main RFP does not have the details of all the SIS's

listed in Attachment 4 “Distribution of SIS’s across charter schools by Campus”. Could you provide the details for all these systems? (e.g. Headmaster, PCR Educator, Rediker, School Master, School Minder etc.)
Answer: For campuses that do not have an SIS identified, OSSE/OCTO was not able to verify that campus’ system.

Question: Is the expectation to bring in data for students beyond Grade 12 i.e. from college and other post-secondary education?
Answer: Yes, This is stated in sections C.1, C.3.1, C.3.1.7, and C.3.1.11 among other sections.

Question: Where will this data be sourced from and in what format?
Answer: Please see Table VIII for a list of known data sources from which data will be pulled. Specifically, the OneApp, the Educator License Information System, the Candidate Performance Assessment System, the UDC SIS, and the National Student Clearinghouse are some of the known systems which house this data. There are likely other systems that contain relevant data for post secondary students.

Question: Is this data limited to certain Universities such as UDC? Is this data in scope for this project? Please also clarify requirement DW-30 (Match student records between P - 12 and postsecondary education systems)
Answer: UDC is the only post secondary institution that we see in scope currently, however we anticipate creating partnerships with surrounding public universities in surrounding States as well as private institutions.
Requirement DW-30 seeks for offerors to provide the functionality within the data warehouse for the system to be capable of accommodating data from post-secondary students. The system should also provide tools to match K-12 records to their respective post-secondary record.

Question: Is the expectation to bring in employment data for students beyond Grade 12? Where will employment data be sourced from and in what format? Is this data in scope for this project?
Answer: Yes. The Unemployment Insurance Waging Hours Reporting System from the US Department of Labor system contains employment information. SSN could be one of the fields used to match students with this data. But, since the collection of SSN cannot be mandated, the offeror may need to devise another method to match data.

Question: Do you have a system to determine Unique Student Identifiers in place today? Is this a homegrown system?
Answer: - Currently STARS is the official generator of unique student IDs. A process has been created and is being implemented on a interim basis to manage and report on this process, to minimize errors with the unique ID.

Question: We propose using SIF technology to implement the USI solution. The expectation is that ONLY the 14 Student Information Systems mentioned in Attachment

4 (namely Blackbaud, DC STARS, Headmaster, PCR Educator, PowerSchool, Rediker, SASI, School Master, School Minder, STI, Creative Curriculum, MS Access, MS Excel and MS Word) will exchange data with the USI repository. Is this assumption correct? Also, please confirm that there will be no using SIF technology to exchange information between the Data Warehouse, the SISs and the other systems such as Destiny listed in Table VIII in Section C.3.1.11. Please refer to Requirement # USI-19 and Section C.3.10 while providing this clarification.
Answer: - The SIS's mentioned in attachment 4 are the SIS' that we've identified to date. They are not finalized and could be others. Our objective is to have a SIF compliant datawarehouse that uses SIF agents to connect applications to the datawarehouse.

Question: The expectation is that the Zone Integration Server (ZIS) will be housed at the state level. Is this assumption correct? If yes, will this be housed by OCTO?
Answer: Yes to both questions

Question: Do you or the LEAs already own SIF agents for any of the SIS systems?
Question: Do you already own SIF agents for any of the other systems (e.g. Destiny etc.)?
Answer: - We do not own SIF Agents and there has not been any investigation to identify which LEAs own SIF agents.

Question: Will the cost of the SIF agents required for the SIS be acquired by OSSE / OCTO separately from this project? Or does the cost of this proposal need to include the cost of procurement of these SIF agents?
Answer: Your proposal needs to include the cost of procurement for SIF agents.

Question: Section C.3.10 – Which LEAs operate SISs that does not have a SIF agent?
Answer: If the vendor has integrated their SIF agent into the application and you only have to choose to turn it on or off there is usually no charge for this agent. Power School is one such application and the only SIS that we are aware of that does this. We are not sure if there are additional fees that Pearson charges to support the SIF agent or if this support is covered by the normal yearly tech support maintenance agreement. Most of the SIS vendors have SIF agents that are not integrated into the application and are usually stand alone or considered an add on module to the application.

Question: Is the expectation that the LEAs will procure (and pay) for the SIF Agent?
Answer: The expectation is that OSSE will procure and pay for the SIF agent.

Question: What kind of data is expected to be used from Trillium in the process of determining Unique Student Identifiers?
Answer: - General demographic data for the student, including (Last Name, First Name, DOB, Gender, Address, City of Birth, Parent/Guardian Names, etc…)

Question: Requirement # USI-8 cites the ability to assign and follow unique student identifiers for children beginning from birth. In what specific scenario will an USI be assigned to a child at birth? Do the current SIS contain data for kids before the Pre-K grade?
Answer: The USI should allow for open integration with any system that requires assignment of a USI. As long as the data system can provide the required information (Name, DOB, Gender, etc…) the USI should be able to assign the correct or a new USI and integrate with the data warehouse. This should support both a real-time and batch interface. The source of the data should not matter.

Question: How will data be obtained from the District of Columbia Department of Human Services Income Maintenance Administration (IMA)? Will this source allow a direct data pull (using a database link from the SLED) or will this be extracted by the source system steward and provided to us?
Answer: - IMA personnel manually provide a flat file to an FTP server that contains the following data elements: Name (First and Last Name), Address, Quadrant, City, State, Zip, Sex, Race, Date of Birth. DCPS provides a file, via email, that is an extract of DCSTARS (SIS) and it contains the following data elements: Last Name, First Name, DOB, Gender, Ethnicity, SSN, Student ID, Street Number, Street Name, Apartment, Province, Zip, School Name. We then manually run a script that compares the two files. The offeror should provide a solution that automates this process. As long as the DCPS SIS is integrating with the SLED then data pull is possible. At the present time there are no plans for the IMA system to link to the SLED and direct data pull will need to be discussed more with the IMA personnel.

Question: Please clarify Requirement # DC-4. What is meant by providing schools with the ability to have their own role?
Answer: - Schools should be capable of doing the requirements specified in DC-3, DC-7.

Question: Could you differentiate (to help us provide cost breakdowns accurately) between what will be contained in the STS piece of the implementation and the SLED? SLED seems to be the overarching (ETL and Reporting) technology for building the various subject areas. STS seems to be a subset of the subject areas contained in the SLED that will contain student level detailed data.
Similarly TTS will be a subset of the SLED that will have detailed data related to teachers.
Answer: This is generally a correct characterization. The STS is generally the business requirements for enrollment and student level data that will be found mostly in student information systems. The TTS is generally the business requirements for educator level data. The SLED is the integration point for all of the components in the SLED program. In addition, the SLED portion of the RFP contains more detailed descriptions of the more advanced integration capabilities that OSSE seeks in this system (such as test scores, value added analysis, etc.)

Question: How much historical data (starting which school year) will be loaded?
Answer: 5 years

Question: When are you planning on reporting Graduation Rates as per the National Governors' Association (NGA) guidelines? The NGA Graduation rate report will require longitudinal data for minimum 4 years. Do you have the required data stored in some place already?
Answer: Generally, DCPS and most other LEAs currently possess 4 years of the data necessary to make the NGA calculation now. However, there are likely some LEAs that will not have this data for 4 full years.

Question: Do we expect to integrate data only from AccuPlacer at UDC for Requirement # STS-11?
Answer: Yes.

Question: The expectation is that the LEAs (working with SIS vendors and or OCTO staff) will provide extracts from the disparate SIS systems in a pre-determined format (prescribed by the implementer). As such, the implementer will not have to spend time figuring out the intricacies of the different SIS systems (this would significantly change implementation estimates) to extract the data. Please confirm that this is the valid approach. References to this can be found in Section C 3.1.8 (data submissions from LEAs).
Answer: We are currently developing a data dictionary that will identify the data elements, business definitions, data format and the associated source systems that provide the data elements at each LEA. The data dictionary will be communicated to the LEA community to make them aware of the data elements that OSSE is requiring. We will then work with the implementer to determine the exact data format and time frame data is needed and communicate this to the LEA community as well. It will be the responsibility of the LEA to provide the data elements needed, in the format desired and in the time frame requested, via the appropriate SIF agents. An ETL tool will extract the data from the LEA applications SIF agent and import the data into the SLED. As a result, there will not be a need for analysis of each SIS system.

Question: In addition to the 14 SISs listed in Attachment 4, how many other source systems will data be sourced from? Will all the systems listed in Table VIII in Section C.3.1.11. be in scope?
Answer: We have updated the Table VIII, in Attachment Y3 to the Amendment.

Question: Where will we get the data to meet Requirement # DW-10? How will we know what is the highest education level attained, employment status, employer and NAICS industry code? Are we buying data from a 3rd Party provider? What fields will be used to match students with this 3rd Party data? SSN?
Answer: Highest education level attained will come from the National Student Clearinghouse. The Unemployment Insurance Waging Hours Reporting System from the US Department of Labor system contains employment information. SSN could be one of the fields used to match students with this data. But, since the collection of SSN cannot be mandated, the offeror may need to devise another method to match data.

Question: Is the expectation to bring in only Summative Assessment scores into the SLED?
Answer: At this juncture, only summative assessment score are in scope to the SLED. However, OSSE would like a system that has the capability of bringing in formative assessments if the data quality coalition agrees that this data would be useful.

Question: If the expectation is to bring in Formative Assessment data also, then is there a single vendor / format for the formative assessment results?
Answer: The main formative assessment in the District of Columbia is the DC-BAS which is administered by OSSE. There are other contracted and "home grown" formative assessments in the District also used at Charter LEAs.

Question: Does Requirement DW-11 refer to "Grade" as in Grades K through 12 OR as in Assessment Grade (below proficient, above proficient etc.)?
Answer: Neither, "Grades" refers to the students marks in the classes in their schedule (e.g. A, B, C, D, F, Satisfactory, Incomplete, etc).

Question: Can you please provide additional information on Requirement #TTS-13 – "Tracks assessment scores in the Praxis series of standardized tests"
Answer: Offerors are to propose a solution for the TTS that collects and tracks data on the Praxis scores of educators in DC LEAs, including, at least, their score, test taken, date test taken, and whether the educator passed the test.

Question: What kind of data is expected to be used from Trillium in the process of determining Unique Teacher Identifiers?
Answer: - Last Name, First Name, DOB, Address, Gender and SSN are the typical required fields.

Question: There is a reference to state report cards in Section 3.1.8. Typically, report card implementations require very specific data collection workflows. Is the expectation to include estimates for this as part of this RFP response?
Answer: The best reference is the state's current report card located on the OSSE's website at http://webb.k12.dc.us/nclb/. Automating the creation of the state report card should be included in the offerors response to the RFP.

Question: What is the multi language reporting capability required? How many languages are the reports required in?
Answer: - The Language Access Act mandates that DC agencies translate vital documents when the constituency represents at least 3% of 500 individuals, whichever is less. Thus, only English and Spanish are mandated by law. Current DCPS Policy has been to translate into English, Spanish, and, additionally, Amharic, Traditional Chinese, Korean, Spanish and Vietnamese.

Question: Is it possible to get a word format / excel format of the tables in the RFP? The PDF version does not allow for a clean copy and paste operation.
Answer: Available upon e-mail request to Bradley.hill@dc.gov .

Question: What does CLIN NUMBERS mean?
Answer: CLINs = Contract Line Item Numbers.

Question: What does the Unit Price and Quantity columns in the price schedule in Section B.3 signify
Answer: See Amendment.

Question: The Request for Information (RFI) release earlier included the creation of a special education system. Why does the RFP not contain this?
Answer: The OSSE determined that it was in its best interest to pursue the procurement for the state special education system in a solicitation separate from the items in this RFP.

Question: How many environments will be part of this implementation? Is it OK to assume a Development, Test and Production environment?
Answer: - Yes

Question: Could you please provide the number of users that will access the system by user community listed in Section C.3.1.8 USER GROUPS? Is it OK to assume a 10% concurrent usage?
Answer: - Refer to "Attachment X2"- User Profile"

Question: Does the RFP response have to strictly adhere to the structure of Section B.3 PRICE SCHEDULE? As an example, CLIN Number 10 Project Implementation is *"The Contractor shall provide content and / or subject matter experts or other resources as required to ensure the SLED Systems are fully utilized"* . Our implementation methodology provides for this natively and as such does not require separate pricing.
Answer: See the attachment to the Amendment.

Question: Page 2 of the RFP lists these sections.

B.3 Price Schedule
B.3.1 Price Schedule for the Base Year
B.3.2 Price Schedule for Option Year One
B.3.3 Price Schedule for Option Year Two
B.3.4 Price Schedule for Option Year Three
B.3.5 Price Schedule for Option Year Four

The next few pages just request a break-up for the Base Period, Year Four and Year Five. Please clarify what is really needed.

Answer: See Amendment.

Question: Please clarify (typo) → Page 25 -- DC-4 Security – *"Provide a system that provides schools with to have their own direct meal certification role in the SLED System."*
Answer:- Provide a system that provides schools with ***the ability*** to have their own direct meal certification role in the SLED System.

Question: The DW-nn requirements and the R-nn requirements indicate that the SLED will have more than 25 Subject Areas (see Appendix A for a list). Experience in implementing LDS projects at other states has shown that the best implementation technique is a phased approach wherein 4-5 Subject areas are rolled out as part of each phase. This phased approach makes sense not only from a development and monitoring perspective, but also from an end user training and rollout perspective. Have you done any prioritization of Subject Areas by phases?
Answer: Yes, the project shall be rolled out in phases. In general, those phases correspond in rank order to the components listed in C.3.1.2. For greater detail, consider the following Subject Areas to be within the scope of work, in order of priority:

Subject Areas
1) Student
2) Grade
3) Enrollments (includes enrollment, withdrawals, completions, promotion, graduation)
4) School
5) Assessment
6) Teacher
7) Highly Qualified Teachers
8) Attendance/Truancy
9) Course Titles
10) Linkage of Students and Teachers Course
11) Discipline
12) Interventions
13) Student Schedules
14) Special Education
15) Language Skills
16) Early Childhood Service Program Comparison and Tracking
17) Post Secondary Transition
18) Report Card Workflow
19) Corrective Action Plan Reporting
20) College Credits
21) Transcripts
22) Employment
23) Extra Curriculum Programs
24) Environment
25) ECE Locations
26) Health
27) Food and Nutrition

28) Homeless Data

Question: Please clarify the specific integration requirements specified in Section C.3.5 DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT.
Answer: This requirement has been removed- See Amendment XYZ.

Question: Please clarify the LDAP requirements in Section C.3.6.3 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION. More specifically -- What LADP system do you use today? Are all the end users of the system already created in this LDAP system?
Answer: Our LDAP is an ADAM solution by Microsoft (Active Directory Application Mode). All end users are not in LDAP.

Question: Is there a need to synchronize from this LDAP system?
Answer: It would be advantageous for offerors to submit solutions which are LDAP compliant. Note: All end users are not in LDAP.

Question: To clarify Section C.3.7.2, are you referring to consulting services during development? Or is this a reference to a dedicated help desk? Or do you mean support from our support organization?
Answer: - This is referring to maintenance when the SLED is live in the production environment.

Question: To clarify Section C.3.7.3, are you referring to support from our support organization?
Answer: Yes

Question: Does the diagram in Section C.3.10 represent your systems? Or is this a generic diagram to illustrate the SIF descriptions?
Answer: No, it is simply a model illustration for the SIF. This diagram was taken from the SIFA website for purposes of illustration only.

Question: Has the Original Change Management Plan been inadvertently been omitted from Section B.3.1 COMPONENTS OF THE SYSTEM?
Answer: It is found in B.3.1, on page 4, under number 0015.

Question: Will the Sandbox Demo in section L.16 performed at the cost of the implementers?
Answer: Yes

Question: Section L.20.4.4 – "The Offeror shall state whether the costs for its proposal include the cost of the ZIS and implementation." Implies that we can respond to the RFP a not include the cost of the ZIS. Is that correct?
Answer: The offeror's proposal should include the cost of the ZIS.

Question: Is the Pre-Proposal Conference mandatory for vendors to physically attend? Would there be the possibility to attend by phone conference call?
Answer: No, it is not mandatory for vendors to physically attend. The pre-proposal conference has already occurred.

Question: Do the Past Performance forms need to be filled out by the LSDBE subcontractors and the Prime, or is "just the prime" okay?
Answer: Past performance forms are only required for the Prime.

Question: Section M.4 Evaluation Criteria (rubric) has a table that is cut off.
Answer: See the Amendment. There are only 3 columns in this table. The table displays the information that it should. It did not copy neatly from the spreadsheet.

Question: We didn't see in the RFP any requirement for the proposal format. Is there a response format / outline for the vendor's response?
Answer: Yes. See the Attachment in the Amendment *"Cost / Price Data Package"*

Question: What are the base period durations (1 year or 3 years) and option periods for this contract?
Answer: See the Amendment

Question: For Student Tracking System Requirement# STS-11 (Remediation Data), Please describe the source of this data and where it comes from?
Answer: Accuplacer is a testing program administered by the College Board (http://professionals.collegeboard.com/higher-ed/placement/accuplacer) for UDC.

Question: For Data Warehouse Requirement # DW-17 (Assessment), Please describe where we would get this data from and the source?
Answer: SAT, AP, PSAT are college board. IB is international baccalaureate. DC-CAS/BAS is OSSE.

Question: For Data Warehouse Requirements # DW23 through 27 for Early Childhood Service:

a. There is no reference to any requirement about Early Childhood Service in Student Tracking System, so what will be the source of this data into the Data Warehouse?

Answer: The sources of this data are the databases maintained by the Early Care and Education Administration Office (ECEA) which are ECEA db 1, 2 and 3.

Question: Are there any ECE programs that are not associated with LEA/Schools (either DCPS LEA or charter schools)? How many ECE programs associated with LEA / Schools vs not associated with LEA/Schools? What will be the source for all of the ECE Programs whether associated with LEA/Schools or not?
Answer: The ECE programs are not associated with LEA schools. The programs are administered by the Early Care and Education Administration.

Question: For Data Warehouse Requirements # DW32 (School Data), what is the source of this data? Is there an Asset Management System that tracks all of this information?
Answer: There is no asset management tool currently in place.

Question: Section L.16.1 "Sandbox Demo"; What is the anticipated timeline/duration for this demo/prototype event?
Answer: Vendors within the competitive range will have approximately a month to develop the demo and train the Evaluation Team.

Question: Given that this 'demo' is to run for one month, how does this impact your desired target date of July?
Answer: The USI deadline has been moved to 60 days from award of contract.

Question: Requirement USI-10- *Ideally, it shall also allow for integration with "best of breed" data analysis tools such as Trillium Software.* Please provide additional details regarding specific functionality of the data analysis tool(s).Please clarify difference in tools referenced in USI-10 and TTS-18.

Answer: Trillium provides both advanced data matching capabilities and data quality tools for cleansing and standardizing data. Integration to Trillium is provided through a real-time web services architecture as well as offline batch processes. The following URL provides information regarding integration to Trillium through the SOA.
http://www.trilliumsoftware.com/home/products/enterprise-integration/soa-integration.aspx

- Trillium provides advanced data matching capabilities through a web services interface. Please reference the above URL.
- Both sections reference the same tool (Trillium). Trillium provides both data cleansing and data matching capabilities.

Question: *"...provide a system to support a workflow process that allows for manual review of records that require additional validation prior to ID assignment. This shall support issue tracking and resolution. The tracking and workflow interface shall be web-based."* Who will resolve the possible matches the system detects based on matching?
Answer: - Any issues regarding assignment of IDs should be addressed at the school level. The system should support workflow to the schools.

Question: *"Requirement USI-15:* Provide a tracking and workflow interface that is web-based via a dashboard." Please clarify the tracking and workflow dashboard.
Answer: - Users should be able to log into a web-based system that provides an intuitive interface for displaying open data issues that require that users input. The dashboard should be a simple 1 – screen view of all of these issues and their current status. Most often these will be issues that need to be addressed at the school level, therefore a school user would log in daily and view all open issues in the dashboard.

Question: Requirement USI-16: *" Provide a USI solution that has the ability to* interface *with various SIS's and function without depending on a specific SIS."* Please describe how the systems would interface.

Answer: Basically this is a simple import/export mechanism between the SLED and the SIS. SIF is the ultimate goal for managing this process, but at a minimum, there should be a mechanism in place that allows for the upload of a standardized extract file from the SIS to the SLED. This should be managed through a web-interface. In addition, a file will be returned to the SIS (through the web interface) for import back into the SIS. This will contain the USIs for the submitted records.

Question: When a new student record is updated in USI, should it communicate with all the other data sources to push that information back to them to update as well?
Answer: Yes. A new student will typically be generated by the addition of that student in a school's SIS. The USI requirement is that the USI must be communicated back to the SIS. There should not be any other systems to be updated at that point as a new record would be triggered by the first system to share that information with the USI. In effect, the SLED would not know of any other system that the student would exist at that point.

Question: Requirement USI-17: *"Provide a system with the ability to accommodate standard middleware connections to Microsoft office productivity applications such as Excel and Access."* Please define how the system would utilize middleware connections.
Answer: If SIF is the process for managing the exchange of data from the SIS to the USI then this would be a SIF Universal Agent. If SIF is not going to be the initial implementation, then the vendors will need to develop a suitable approach for exchanging the data until SIF can be put in place.

Question: In our experience with previous state implementations, a 10 digit ID has been used. Will 10 digits be used in USI?
Answer: A 10 digit USI would be fine but is not a requirement.

Question: *"Requirement TTS-18: Possesses data cleansing capabilities (option to interface with Trillium as the cleansing tool) and recommends business practices to ensure that state level data has the maximum integrity practicable."* Please provide additional details regarding specific functionality of the data cleansing tool(s).
Answer: Trillium provides both advanced data matching capabilities and data quality tools for cleansing and standardizing data. Integration to Trillium is provided through a real-time web services architecture as well as offline batch processes. The following URL provides information regarding integration to Trillium through the SOA.
http://www.trilliumsoftware.com/home/products/enterprise-integration/soa-integration.aspx

a. Trillium provides advanced data matching capabilities through a web services interface. Please reference the above URL.

b. Both sections reference the same tool (Trillium). Trillium provides both data cleansing and data matching capabilities.

TABLE VIII

System	Definition	Operating System (If Known)	Owner
ENCORE	Special Education system	1. One Windows 2000- to be upgraded to Windows 2003 2. One Windows Server 2003 Enterprise Edition	OCTO
DTARS	Student Information System used by DCPS and approximately 6 charter LEAs	Currently Windows may migrate to Linux in the coming months.	OCTO
WINSNAPP	Food and Nutrition System	Windows	DCPS Food and Nutrition Services
OLAMS	DC Public Charter School Board sponsored Student Tracking System (currently tracks attendance)		PCSB
PowerSchools	Student Information System used by approximately 18 charter LEAs.		Some PCS's (see table of SIS use by LEA in the appendix)
ProjectWebstars	Out-of-School Time (OST) system for almost 200 grantees. Specific focus on middle school grades.	Web-based. Developed by Cityspan.	DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation
Blackbaud	Student Information System used by approximately 2 charter LEAs.		Some PCS's (see table of SIS use by LEA in the appendix)
MEAD	Education Audit Data System		OSSE
OneApp	Grant Programs for Students Attending Colleges and Universities	Windows, .Net application	OSSE
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #1	Contains ECEA daycare information	Windows	DHS

Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #2	Contains transition information when the children move from daycare to Pre-school (4 years old).	Windows	DHS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #3	Contains ECEA service provider licensing and accreditations status	Windows	DHS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #4	Database of Early Childhood Education program provider profiles, ratings and environmental assessments	TBD	Morgan State University
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #5	Aftercare For All childcare provider information	TBD	DCPS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #6	Childcare Center licensing database	TBD	DOH
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #7	Center for Applied Research in Urban Planning: database tracking enrollment in all/most ECEA sponsored programs, demographics, services provided, provider type, provider qualifications, provider billing rates, etc…broken down by ward	TBD	UDC

Educator License Information System (ELIS)	Teacher Certification and Licensing. Includes the certification information on all certified teachers in all DC LEAs. For certified teachers includes education test information, schools attended, licensure information (including type and expiration). Currently produces the DC highly qualified report.		OSSE- OELA
Candidate Performance Assessment System (CPAS)	Contains various data (college grades, assessment scores/data, course taken, GPA,) of those persons who are aspiring to be teachers (referred to as candidates).	Windows	OSSE-OELA
GEARS	Grants Evaluation, Analysis and Reporting System	Windows NT, IIS	DCPS
Employed Educator Reporting (EER)	EER is a data collection system that captures specific data about educators employed in DC public, charter and/or private schools in order to determine Highly Qualified status for courses that are being taught in DC LEAs.		OSSE-OELA
Discipline Pro	COTS software for storing discipline incident and case management data	Windows	Individual DCPS and/or PCS schools

Educational Testing Service (ETS)	National high stakes testing Contractor		Public Domain
National Student Clearinghouse (NSC)	National database of post-secondary degree and enrollment data		Public Domain
Destiny	School textbook and library management system	Windows 2003	DCPS
DC Human Services Modernization Program (HSMP)	DC Health & Human Services Longitudinal Data-warehouse		OCTO
Federal Grants Database	Contains information on federal grant awards and locations.		OSSE-OFGP
Transportation Database	Contains information on transportation pick up and drop off locations, passengers, routes, and times.		DCPS (moving to OSSE in Jan 08)
LitPro			OSSE- Even Start
Gear Up Database	Contains information on early intervention services	Access	OSSE- GEAR Up
SASI	Student Information System		Some Public Charter Schools (see Attachment)
CAPPS	HR & Payroll System		DCPS
National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) Clearinghouse	Database containing teacher information such as teacher discipline, mobility across states, and standards.		NASDTEC
UDC SIS	Student information system for the University of the District of Columbia		
PeopleSoft			
SOAR			

OSSE Assessment Databases	Contains all assessment data for the DC-CAS and DC-BAS		Operated by third party vendors

TABLE VIII

System	Definition	Operating System (If Known)	Owner
ENCORE	Special Education system	1. One Windows 2000- to be upgraded to Windows 2003 2. One Windows Server 2003 Enterprise Edition	OCTO
DTARS	Student Information System used by DCPS and approximately 6 charter LEAs	Currently Windows may migrate to Linux in the coming months.	OCTO
WINSNAPP	Food and Nutrition System	Windows	DCPS Food and Nutrition Services
OLAMS	DC Public Charter School Board sponsored Student Tracking System (currently tracks attendance)		PCSB
PowerSchools	Student Information System used by approximately 18 charter LEAs.		Some PCS's (see table of SIS use by LEA in the appendix)
ProjectWebstars	Out-of-School Time (OST) system for almost 200 grantees. Specific focus on middle school grades.	Web-based. Developed by Cityspan.	DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation
Blackbaud	Student Information System used by approximately 2 charter LEAs.		Some PCS's (see table of SIS use by LEA in the appendix)
MEAD	Education Audit Data System		OSSE
OneApp	Grant Programs for Students Attending Colleges and Universities	Windows, .Net application	OSSE
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #1	Contains ECEA daycare information	Windows	DHS

Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #2	Contains transition information when the children move from daycare to Pre-school (4 years old).	Windows	DHS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #3	Contains ECEA service provider licensing and accreditations status	Windows	DHS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #4	Database of Early Childhood Education program provider profiles, ratings and environmental assessments	TBD	Morgan State University
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #5	Aftercare For All childcare provider information	TBD	DCPS
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #6	Childcare Center licensing database	TBD	DOH
Early Childhood Education Admin. (ECEA) Db #7	Center for Applied Research in Urban Planning: database tracking enrollment in all/most ECEA sponsored programs, demographics, services provided, provider type, provider qualifications, provider billing rates, etc…broken down by ward	TBD	UDC

Educator License Information System (ELIS)	Teacher Certification and Licensing. Includes the certification information on all certified teachers in all DC LEAs. For certified teachers includes education test information, schools attended, licensure information (including type and expiration). Currently produces the DC highly qualified report.		OSSE- OELA
Candidate Performance Assessment System (CPAS)	Contains various data (college grades, assessment scores/data, course taken, GPA,) of those persons who are aspiring to be teachers (referred to as candidates).	Windows	OSSE-OELA
GEARS	Grants Evaluation, Analysis and Reporting System	Windows NT, IIS	DCPS
Employed Educator Reporting (EER)	EER is a data collection system that captures specific data about educators employed in DC public, charter and/or private schools in order to determine Highly Qualified status for courses that are being taught in DC LEAs.		OSSE-OELA
Discipline Pro	COTS software for storing discipline incident and case management data	Windows	Individual DCPS and/or PCS schools

Educational Testing Service (ETS)	National high stakes testing Contractor		Public Domain
National Student Clearinghouse (NSC)	National database of post-secondary degree and enrollment data		Public Domain
Destiny	School textbook and library management system	Windows 2003	DCPS
DC Human Services Modernization Program (HSMP)	DC Health & Human Services Longitudinal Data-warehouse		OCTO
Federal Grants Database	Contains information on federal grant awards and locations.		OSSE-OFGP
Transportation Database	Contains information on transportation pick up and drop off locations, passengers, routes, and times.		DCPS (moving to OSSE in Jan 08)
LitPro			OSSE- Even Start
Gear Up Database	Contains information on early intervention services	Access	OSSE- GEAR Up
SASI	Student Information System		Some Public Charter Schools (see Attachment)
CAPPS	HR & Payroll System		DCPS
National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) Clearinghouse	Database containing teacher information such as teacher discipline, mobility across states, and standards.		NASDTEC
UDC SIS	Student information system for the University of the District of Columbia		
PeopleSoft			
SOAR			

OSSE Assessment Databases	Contains all assessment data for the DC-CAS and DC-BAS		Operated by third party vendors

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

M.4.1 The Offeror shall respond to each factor in a way that will allow the District to evaluate the Offeror's response. The Offeror shall submit information in a clear, concise, factual and logical manner providing a comprehensive description of program supplies and services delivery thereof.

Technical Evaluation Sheet
RFP: DCTO-2008-R-0019
Assessment Data Collection System

Contractor: ______________________

Number of Points (60 Points Possible)	SLED System Component	Evaluation Category
15	**Statewide Longitudinal Education Data Warehouse (SLED)**	Data Warehouse Core Functionality
		ETL
		Student Teacher Link
		Student Data
		Programs
		Assessment
		Electronic Transcripts
		Early Childhood
		School Data
		User Community Requirements
		Decision Support Core Functionality
		Decision Support Technical
		Decision Support Report Function
		Decision Support Reporting
6	**Ease of Use**	

6	**Technical**	
		Architecture
		Hosting
		Security
		Operations / Capacity
5.4	**Student Tracking System**	
		STS Core Functionality
		Graduation / Drop out
		Reports
5.4	**Teacher Tracking System (TTS)**	TTS Core Functionality
		Highly Qualified Teachers
		Test IDs
		USI Architecture
2.4	**Past Performance**	Points in this category will be awarded based on evaluation of responses of the offerors references and the performance of same or similar systems installed in similar locations.
5.4	**Unique Student Identifier (USI) System**	USI System Core Functionality
		Matching / Tracking
		SIS Agnostic
		Auditing
		Test IDs
		USI Architecture

3.6	**Direct Certification for USDA Free and Reduced Meal Program**	Direct Certification Core Functionality Reports
3.6	**Integration**	Application of Data Quality Coalition SIF Integration
3.0	**Change Management Services**	Training Change Management Plan
2.4	**Project Management**	Points in this category will be awarded based on evaluation of the offeror's detailed project plan with descriptions of the major respondent tasks through implementation of the recommended solution to completion.
1.8	**Technical Support Services**	Documentation Points in this category will be awarded based on evaluation of the offeror's plan to meet the technical support services requirements including system documentation, the technology transition process and the user support / help desk service. User Support
60	**TOTAL**	