REGION 9 EDUCATION COOPERATIVE
2002 SUDDERTH DRIVE, RUIDOSO, NM 575-257-2368 WWW.RECNM9.ORG

Region 9 Education Cooperative
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 27008
Kindergarten-3rd Grade Screening, Diagnostic, and Progress Monitoring Assessment Tools

Addendum #A
Questions & Answers

1. Appendix F financial terms (§ iii.O.2; Appendix F, Articles 2.E, 3.D, 3.E, and 9) Will the Agency require a performance bond (Art. 3.E), 20% retainage (Art. 3.D), source-code escrow (Art. 2.E), and Agency ownership of work product (Art. 9) as written? If these terms are negotiable, may Offerors propose alternative language in Appendix E without the response being deemed non-responsive under § iii.O.2? **Yes, the PED expects to require a combination of performance insurance measures to include performance bonds, retainage, and/or source code escrow as well as potential ownership of work product. On Appendix E offerors can mark the second box and suggest alternative contract language. This response will still be considered Responsive as long as Appendix E is signed, included in the proposal submitted and additional contract terms are provided for review as part of the proposal.**

2. Term (§ i.C; § iii.O.6; Appendix F, Article 5) Please confirm the start date of the initial one-year term and whether the 2026–27 planning year falls within it. Does the four-year maximum include that year? Article 5 references an exception under NMSA § 13-1-150. Please describe when that exception would apply. **The initial 2026-27 contract begins upon award and finalization of contract(s). Any subsequent contracts will not exceed past December 10, 2030. No exception will apply: The statute lists exceptions for certain information systems, Education Trust Act services, conservation-related services, and specified public works design and engineering services.**

3. Federal funding (§ iii.EE) Will any portion of this procurement be funded with federal dollars? If so, please confirm whether the New Mexico resident preference is unavailable and whether 2 CFR 200 requirements apply. **Yes, a portion of the procurement will be funded with federal dollars. The New Mexico resident business preference is unavailable for this procurement, and the full requirements of 2 CFR 200 strictly apply to this RFP.**

4. Spanish-language supports (§ i.B, Spanish-Language Assessments; Response Evaluation)For Spanish-transadapted mathematics items and accommodations, will NMPED require New Mexico-specific norms, cut-score validation, or classification-accuracy evidence for students using the Spanish accommodation? Or may comparable evidence from an existing, unmodified product be submitted? Please specify minimum sample sizes. Is Spanish-language oral reading fluency scoring expected? **Yes. NMPED requires evidence that scores from students using Spanish-language accommodations, including Spanish-transadapted mathematics items, support the same interpretations as scores from students who do not use them. The Offeror should propose methods to support this claim. For an existing product that the Offeror does not intend to modify for New Mexico, the Offeror may instead submit comparable evidence already established. NMPED is not prescribing a fixed sample size, but Offerors should provide technical justification of their sample sizes by grade. Spanish-language oral reading fluency scoring is not expected.**

5. Scoring basis (§ iv.A; § i.A; § iv.F.1.d; § iv.G) Offerors may propose any combination of Components A–C and must include Component D. Are the 175 evaluation points (75 General Technical, 50 Corporate Capacity, 25 Personnel, 25 Cost) assigned per proposal or per component? Will partial proposals be scored on the same scale as comprehensive proposals? **All proposals will be evaluated using the established scoring criteria and point scale set forth in this RFP. The points awarded will be based on the extent to which each proposal addresses the applicable requirements and evaluation criteria. Proposals addressing multiple components may demonstrate a broader scope of services; however, all proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the same stated criteria.**

6. Corporate Capacity references (§ iv.F.1.b) The RFP refers to "comparable statewide assessment programs" and to "projects of similar size, scope, and complexity." Must reference projects be statewide? Do multi-district K–3 screening or progress-monitoring deployments qualify? Is there a minimum student volume? Do in-progress projects qualify, given the "completed within the past 5 years" requirement? **The RFP does not require reference projects to be statewide. Each must be of similar size, scope and complexity. Multi-district assessment programs may qualify if they meet that standard. There is no minimum student volume. In-progress projects do not qualify. Reference projects must have been completed within the past five years.**

7. Page limit (§ iv.E) Do the 100-page limit and single-spacing requirement include Appendices A–E and supplemental information? **The proposal may be no longer than 100 single-spaced pages as a whole and include all required sections of the Technical Proposal. Supplemental information may be appended to the proposal.**

8. Independent alignment study (§ i.B, Cross-Cutting Design Guardrails) Is there a list of acceptable independent organizations? Must the study cover only items administered in New Mexico? Should alignment study costs be included in component pricing?
NMPED does not provide a list. The Offeror identifies the independent organization. The study must cover the instruments proposed for administration in New Mexico. Alignment study costs are part of component pricing.

9. Gifted screener (§ i.B, Component C) What administration window is required for the gifted screener ("before the end of grade 3")? May Component C be offered independently of Components A and B?

Pursuant to 6.31.3.11(B) NMAC, each local education agency must establish a procedure to ensure every student's potential to qualify as gifted is assessed by the end of third grade. The rule does not prescribe a specific semester or testing window. District practices include screening during the second semester of second grade or the first semester of third grade.

Yes, Component C can be offered independently of Components A and B.

10. Classification accuracy for Components A and B (§ i.B, Cut Scores and Classification Accuracy) May an Offeror submit classification-accuracy evidence (sensitivity, specificity, predictive value) from an existing, unmodified product? Or is a New Mexico-specific validation study required? If so, please specify minimum sample size, grade coverage, and timing relative to the first 2027–28 administration. **Yes. For an existing product that the Offeror does not intend to modify for New Mexico, the Offeror may submit classification-accuracy evidence already established. Otherwise, the Offeror should propose methods to establish it. NMPED is not prescribing a fixed sample size or timing, but Offerors should provide technical justification of their sample sizes and timing by grade.**

11. Cut-score approval (§ i.B, Cut Scores; Testing Design) Will NMPED approve cut scores proposed by the Offeror, or will NMPED convene a standard-setting process? Does the approval process apply in the same way to adaptive designs?
NMPED will review and approve cut scores proposed by the Offeror for all assessments. NMPED does not plan to convene a standard-setting process. The same approval process applies to adaptive designs.

12. Linking design and sample (§ i.B, Cross-Vendor Comparability and Linking Studies) Will NMPED select the linking design (reference assessment or embedded common items) before or after award? May data from New Mexico districts already using the Offeror's product count toward the minimum of 1,500 students per grade per administration window?
NMPED will select the linking design after award with input from the NM TAC. Yes, data from New Mexico districts and charter schools using the Offeror's assessment may count toward the minimum, provided the data meet the requirements of the selected linking design. Only data from operational administrations beginning in 2027-28 will count.

13. Linking scope (§ i.B, Cross-Vendor Comparability and Linking Studies) Please confirm that linking requirements apply only to the Component A and B assessments that NMPED specifies, and not to diagnostic or progress-monitoring tools. How will NMPED specify those assessments? **Linking requirements apply only to the Component A and B assessments that NMPED specifies. The RFP does not exclude diagnostic or progress-monitoring assessments. NMPED will specify the assessments after award, with input from the NM TAC.**

14. Ed-Fi and ILIAD (§ i.B, Technology Integration and Interoperability; Transition Planning) Is full Ed-Fi compliance required at award, or is a documented plan with a proposed timeline sufficient, provided compliance is in place by the first 2027–28 administration? Is a current ILIAD integration specification available? **A documented plan with a proposed timeline is sufficient for the proposal.**

15. Human oversight of automated scoring (§ i.B, Testing Design; Generative AI) For speech-recognition scoring of oral reading fluency, what level of human oversight does NMPED expect? Must disaggregated accuracy evidence use New Mexico student data, or may national data be submitted? **NMPED does not prescribe a specific level of human oversight. The Offeror should describe its approach, addressing at a minimum the elements in § i.B,**

Generative Artificial Intelligence, Human Oversight. National data may be submitted, provided the evidence is disaggregated for English Learners, Spanish-speaking students and Native American students.

16. Scope of "GenAI" (§ i.B, Generative Artificial Intelligence) Does the term include instructional AI features, such as AI-driven tutoring, lesson sequencing, or intervention recommendations? Or does it cover only assessment development, scoring, and reporting? **Yes. The GenAI requirements apply across development, administration, scoring, reporting and support, whenever such tools are used. This includes instructional AI features in intervention resources.**

17. Intervention resources (§ i.B, Component A) Must intervention resources be standalone instructional materials? May AI-driven tutoring and instructional recommendations satisfy the HQIM requirement? What evidence will NMPED accept to support the three-cueing attestation? **No. The RFP does not require standalone instructional materials. Intervention resources in any format, including AI-driven tutoring and instructional recommendations, must meet the HQIM requirements in Components A and B. For the three-cueing requirement, NMPED will accept the Offeror's attestation that its intervention materials do not use the three-cueing model and a description of how they avoid it, as stated in Component A.**

18. Family communication (§ i.B, Component D; Public-Facing Reports) Component D states that the Offeror is not expected to communicate directly with parents or guardians. Student-level reports must be accessible to families through a secure platform in English and Spanish. Who is responsible for delivering reports to families? Is direct parent portal access required? **Local education agencies communicate student-level reports to parents and families. The reports provided to local education agencies through the Offerors secure portal must be accessible, or easily understood, and clearly communicate the student's current standing, risk status, and/or growth, and what it means. Direct access to a portal for parents is not required.**

19. Pricing volume (§ i.B, Student Population; § iv.F.1.d) Should cost per student be based on all K–3 students (approximately 82,876 in the enrollment table) or only on students in districts that select the Offeror? Is any minimum volume guaranteed? **Vendors should submit proposals based on the approximated enrollment count provided. Vendors may include any pricing structures that may impact total cost based on student volume.**

20. Training assumptions (§ i.B, Component D) Is the planning assumption of approximately 20 regional trainings included in each component's price? Are travel costs included or billed separately? **Yes, per page 19 of the RFP, "As a planning assumption, the Offeror should propose approximately twenty (20) regional trainings across the state during the first two years of the contract, with a proposed approach to coverage, scheduling, and regional distribution;" Travel costs are not to be billed separately.**

21. Deadline (§ ii.A) Given the number of required deliverables, will the November 20 submission deadline be extended? Please confirm that the redacted proposal copy is due on the same date as the proposal. **There will be no extension of the proposal submission deadline. Yes, the redacted proposal copy, if submitted, will be due on the same date as identified in the RFP Sequence of Events: *Submission of Proposal.***

22. Cost Proposal Form or Template RFP Reference: Section IV.F.1.d, Cost Proposal (p. 53) Section IV.F.1.d requires Offerors to price each assessment component separately on a cost-per-student basis and to break out training costs by component. We did not find a cost proposal form, pricing worksheet, or template in the RFP or its appendices. Is there a required cost proposal form or template that Offerors should use? If not, please confirm that Offerors should create their own cost proposal in a format that addresses all of the requirements in Section IV.F.1.d. **Offerors should create their own cost proposal in a format that addresses all of the requirements**.

23. Placement of the Cost Proposal RFP Reference: Section IV.C, Submission Format (p. 50), and Section IV.F.1.d, Cost Proposal (p. 53) Section IV.C states that all information for the technical proposal must be combined into a single PDF. Please confirm that the cost proposal should be included within that single PDF, rather than submitted as a separate file. **The cost proposal should be included in the technical proposal as a single PDF.**

24. Page Limit RFP Reference: Section IV.E, Proposal Format (p. 51), and Section IV.F.1.d, Cost Proposal (p. 53). Section IV.E limits the proposal to 100 single-spaced pages. Does the cost proposal, including any pricing tables, count toward the 100-page limit, or may it be included as supplemental information appended to the proposal? **Refer to the answer to #23 herein, and per the RFP, the proposal may be no longer than 100 single-spaced pages as a whole. Supplemental information may be appended to the proposal.**

25. May an offeror submit a proposal exclusively for Component D, without proposing assessment tools under Components A, B, or C? **No.**

26. If a Component D-only proposal is permitted, may it focus on mathematics assessment training and implementation support, or must it cover all assessment components purchased by NMPED? **N/A, per response to question 25.**

27. Would an independently awarded Component D contractor coordinate directly with NMPED and separately awarded assessment providers, with access to the instruments, technical documentation, reporting systems, and training resources necessary to perform the work? **N/A, per response to question 25.**

28. How should a Component D-only offeror address technical requirements outside its proposed scope, and how would its qualifications and pricing be evaluated? **N/A, per response to question 25.**

29. Do we need to answer requirements i. to v. (found on page 51), or are these simply listed as guidelines? **N/A, per response to question 25.**

30. When it comes to answering components A to C, it is our understanding that we do not need to answer all three components. For example, if we decide to only apply for components A and B, we simply need to answer all requirements listed from pages 9 to 11 included? Can you confirm that no other requirements within that "technical scope of work response" section would need to be included? **Component D would need to be included. Per page 4, " Note: Offerors are not required to submit proposals for all Components A–C and may submit proposals for any combination of these components for which they are qualified to provide services. All proposals must include Component D. Offerors shall clearly identify the component(s) addressed in their proposals. This RFP seeks to maximize service coverage and coordination; therefore, offerors capable of providing services for all four components (A–D) are encouraged to submit a comprehensive proposal."**

31. Can you confirm where the requirements for component D ends? **Component D requirements conclude just before the "Overarching Considerations" subsection on page 19.**

32. If we are misunderstanding the format requested, can Region 9 please provide us with which specific requirements we are expected to answer within the "technical scope of work response" section? **Per RFP 27008, iv., F. Response Organization: The proposal must be organized in the following format and must contain, at a minimum, all listed items in the sequence indicated. Offerors should respond in the form of a thorough narrative to each specification in correlation unless otherwise instructed. The narratives, including required supporting materials will be evaluated and awarded points accordingly. Per RFP 27008, iv., F. Response Organization, 1. Technical Proposal: Offeror shall provide a *Technical Proposal* (a. - d. detailed below) on page 50-52.**

33. Retainage and performance bond (§ iii.O; Appendix F, Articles 1.O, 3.D, and 3.E; Appendix F, Exhibit A, Deliverable Number 4) Does NMPED intend to apply retainage and a performance bond to awards under this RFP? If so, at what retainage percentage and bond amount? Article 3.E applies a bond to agreements over $1 million, to custom developed software/applications, and to COTS software with more than 20% Enhancement. Does NMPED consider a commercial off-the-shelf, software-as-a-service solution with no custom development or Enhancement to fall outside the custom-development and Enhancement triggers? **NMPED does not intend to require retainage or a performance bond for awards under this RFP. Therefore, no retainage percentage or performance bond amount applies. Commercial off-the-shelf, software-as-a-service solutions are acceptable, provided they meet the RFP requirements. NMPED may require modifications or enhancements to meet those requirements, with the scope of such work specified in the resulting contract. A commercial off-the-shelf solution with no custom development or enhancement would fall outside the custom-development and enhancement triggers referenced in Article 3.E.**

34. Software license and source code (Appendix F, Articles 2.D, 2.E, and 2.F.1) For a hosted software-as-a-service solution, will NMPED apply a term-of-agreement license under Article 2.D, Choice #2, without the source-code escrow and release provisions in Articles 2.D.1–2.D.2? Will NMPED also select Article 2.E, Choice #4 (Not Applicable), and Article 2.F.1, Choice #2? **Yes. For a hosted software-as-a-service solution, NMPED intends to apply a term-of-agreement license under Article 2.D, Choice #2, without the source-code escrow and release provisions in Articles 2.D.1–2.D.2. NMPED will also select Article 2.E, Choice #4 (Not Applicable), and Article 2.F.1, Choice #2. NMPED does not require ownership of the vendor's software or access to its source code. These selections do not alter NMPED's**

ownership of and rights to its data, including the ability to retrieve and export its data upon expiration or termination of the agreement.

35. Alignment study commitment letter (§ i.B, Cross-Cutting Design Guardrails, Content Standards Coverage, Cognitive Complexity, and Alignment) May the letter of commitment from the independent alignment organization be provided after award, before the first operational administration, rather than with the proposal? **Yes. The letter of commitment from the independent alignment organization may be submitted after award. However, the proposal must identify the proposed organization, describe its qualifications and independence, and include the proposed study methodology, responsible personnel, and timeline.**

36. QTI delivery and item ownership (§ i.B, Item Ownership and Interoperability)
Does the requirement to deliver all operationally used items and associated metadata in QTI format apply only to items developed for and paid for by NMPED? Or does it also apply to proprietary or licensed items from an Offeror's existing bank? **If applicable, only the custom items developed and owned by PED.**

37. Reference assessment, study count, and data exchange (§ i.B, Cross-Vendor Comparability and Linking Studies; Data Privacy and Security; § iv.F.1.d) Under the reference-assessment design, will NMPED provide the reference assessment and bear its licensing and administration costs? The RFP calls for annual linking studies with at least 1,500 students per grade per administration window. Should Offerors price one study per grade and content area per year that covers all windows, or a separate study for each window? Will student-level and item-level data be exchanged only with NMPED or its designee under a data sharing agreement, rather than directly with other awarded Offerors? **NMPED will designate the reference assessment and cover its licensing costs. All other costs of the Offeror's participation must be included in the Offeror's component pricing. Offerors should price one annual linking study per grade and content area, using a full year of data from all administration windows. The minimum of 1,500 students applies to each window. Yes, Offerors will provide student-level and item-level data to NMPED or its designee, under data-sharing terms NMPED specifies.**

38. WCAG 2.2 Level AA (§ i.B, Accessibility and Accommodations; Transition and Implementation Planning; Appendix G) By what date must the platform conform to WCAG 2.2 Level AA: proposal submission, contract execution, or first student-facing administration in 2027–28? **This can be determined in the contracting process.**

39. Speech-recognition evidence (§ i.B, Generative Artificial Intelligence; Testing Design and Administration Model) Will the requirement be met by evidence of automated speech-recognition scoring performance from other states, broken out by student group and including populations comparable to New Mexico's? New Mexico-specific evidence would then be produced during the 2026–27 planning year. **Yes.**

40. Ed-Fi and ILIAD pricing (§ i.B, Technology Integration and Interoperability; Transition and Implementation Planning; § iv.F.1.d; Appendix F, Article 14) Should Offerors price ILIAD integration and future API development as fixed deliverables? Or will they be scoped and priced through the Article 14 Change Request process as ILIAD develops? **No. ILIAD integration and future API development will be scoped and priced through the Article 14 Change Request process as ILIAD develops. Delivery of required data files to NMPED-designated systems, including ILIAD, remains part of component pricing (§ i.B, NMPED Data Systems Integration).**

41. We would like to request clarification regarding the purpose of the QTI format item delivery and need to "cooperate with any state platform provider." Would this be for the purposes of making released items available for NM educators to utilize formatively in the classroom? **Yes**

42. Our understanding of this RFP is that there will be at maximum one vendor awarded for each Component (reading, math, gifted), which could result in a maximum of three vendors being awarded overall but also possibly a single vendor for all three purposes (Component D is understood to be required for each category). Is this interpretation correct? **More than one vendor may be awarded components A, B, and C. However, any vendor awarded A, B, and C must also include training information (component D) for their associated component submissions for A, B, or C.**

43. The RFP states on page 8 that the "request for proposals (RFP) solicits proposals for the development, administration, scoring, and reporting of a culturally and linguistically responsive assessment and support suite." Is the Department looking to contract with a vendor for utilization of an existing assessment suite, or for an existing assessment suite enhanced with custom development through this RFP, for an assessment solely custom built for use in New Mexico, or for any of the above? **Vendors may propose any of the above.**

44. Planning-year pricing (Section IV.F.1.d, Cost Proposal; Section I.B, Component D). Because 2026–27 is a planning and training year with no student-facing administration, may Offerors

price planning-year work (for example, the implementation plan, alignment study and NMPED training) as fixed-price deliverables, in addition to the per-student price for each component? **Yes**

45. First-grade screening timing (Section I.B, Component A). Does the requirement for first-grade literacy screening within the first 40 days of the LEA school year apply in 2026–27, so that Offerors should price a grade 1 administration in the planning year? **Yes**

46. Component D pricing basis (Section IV.F.1.d; Section I.B, Component D). Should Component D be priced per student like Components A–C, or may training and implementation support be priced per training session or as fixed deliverables? **Offerors must submit Component D pricing in accordance with Section IV.F.1.d, including the required per-student pricing.**

47. Multi-year pricing (Section II.O.6; Section IV.F.1.d). Should Offerors provide per-student pricing for each potential contract year (the initial year and up to three renewal years), or a single per-student price for the initial term? **The initial year and up to three renewal years.**

48. Volume basis (Section I.B, Student Population; Section IV.F.1.d). Given that NMPED may make multiple awards and districts and charter schools may select among awarded Offerors, should per-student pricing assume the statewide K–3 enrollment shown in the RFP? Will NMPED provide any minimum or estimated volume per component? **Vendors should utilize the enrollment information as shown.**

49. Component C pricing basis (Section I.B, Component C; Section IV.F.1.d). Should the Component C gifted screener be priced per grade 3 student screened, or per enrolled grade 3 student? **Offerors should price Component C per grade 3 student screened. For pricing purposes only, Offerors should assume that 15 percent of grade 3 students will be screened, or about 3,264 students, based on the grade 3 enrollment. This assumption does not determine how districts and charter schools select students for screening.**

50. Post-contract item costs (Section I.B, Item Ownership and Interoperability). For the required line items distinguishing costs after the contract ends, should Offerors state an annual post-contract rate, and for what period? **No.**

51. Deliverables and payment schedule (Appendix F, Article 3 and Exhibit A). Will NMPED define the Deliverables and payment schedule in Exhibit A, or should Offerors propose a

Deliverable and invoicing structure (for example, annual subscription and training Deliverables) in the Cost Proposal? **Offerers should propose a deliverable and invoicing structure.**

52. Insurance requirements (Section V, Administrative Requirements; Appendix F). Section V requires proof of insurance as required in the Sample Contract. Please identify the required insurance types and minimum coverage limits so Offerors can include them in pricing. **Professional liability insurance shall be in an amount of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence and $3,000,000 in the aggregate.**

53. Items i–v under Section iv.F.1.a (Responsiveness and Completeness, Technical Soundness, Operational Specificity and Feasibility, Evidence/Quality Control/Risk Management, and New Mexico Fit and Continuous Improvement) read as criteria the Evaluation Committee will use to score the technical response, not as separate requirements. Please confirm whether: (a) these are evaluation criteria that Offerors should address throughout their response to the Scope of Work (Section i.B), with no separate subheadings for items i–v required; or (b) Offerors must address each of items i–v as its own section or subheading within the Technical Proposal. **(b)**

54. The formatting of the RFP makes it seem as though the Scope of Work described on pages 12-18 only apply to component C. However, the content of the requirements suggest they apply to multiple components. Can you please clarify which scope of work requirements on pgs. 11-19 apply to each component (Component A, B, C and D versus which are cross-cutting requirements that apply across all components? **Starting from page 12, under "Cross-Cutting Assessment Design Guardrails," through page 17 before Component D, applies to Components A-C.**

55. Can REC 9 confirm the requirements for component D begin on page 18 and end on page 19 above the "Overarching Considerations" section"? **Yes**

56. Can REC 9 please provide additional guidance on the Scope of Work requirements they wish for vendors to address in their "a.General Technical Scope of Work Response"? **This would be required for any or all components a vendor responds to.**

57. Pg. 51, req. b.i requires "professional reference letters for projects of similar size…". Does REC 9 require formal letters or will reference names, contact information and a description of the services suffice? **Yes.**

58. For vendors proposing both literacy (Component A) and math (Component B), should a single combined Component D training response be submitted, or are separate Component D training responses required for each component? **Vendors may take either approach.**

59. Please confirm which items count toward the 100-page limit. Specifically, are the following excluded from the 100 page limit: the cost proposal, the mandatory forms (Appendices A–E), reference letters, the independent alignment organization's letter of commitment (Section i.B), and resumes? **The proposal may be no longer than 100 single-spaced pages as a whole and include all required sections of the Technical Proposal. Supplemental information may be appended to the proposal.**

60. Does REC 9/PED require vendors to propose using generative AI if they are not already doing so in their proposal? **No.**

61. Will NM PED possibly award math and literacy components to different vendors? Will responses for each component be evaluated separately? **This may be possible.**

62. Are Spanish-language measures permitted as a way for teachers to gather additional information about a student's skills, based on English results and the student's language profile? **Yes. Offerors may propose a Spanish language measure.**

63. What expectations does NM PED have for assessment of Spanish-literacy skills as a way to understand a student's literacy assets and inform instruction to strengthen English literacy skills? **Offerors may propose a Spanish language measure.**

64. Constituent Engagement; Item Review; pp. 21, 27–28: Please clarify which constituent-engagement expenses the Offeror must fund, including stipends or honoraria, educator release time or substitutes, travel, lodging, meals, and facilities. Will NMPED provide participant lists or existing advisory groups for any of these activities? **If applicable, Offerors should include all expenses, and PED would assist with providing participant lists.**

65. Constituent Engagement; Cost Proposal; pp. 21, 53: If multiple Offerors receive component awards, will NMPED coordinate shared engagement activities, and how should shared costs be allocated to avoid duplication? **Offerors should not assume shared costs.**

66. Constituent Engagement; Cognitive Validation; Item Review; pp. 21, 27–28: For unmodified existing or licensed instruments, may comparable prior constituent engagement, cognitive

validation, and item-review evidence satisfy these requirements? How will NMPED define and approve additional engagement or review, and may work beyond the priced scope be addressed through a contract amendment? **PED does not require educator engagement for existing or licensed items.**

67. Item Ownership and Interoperability; pp. 17–18; Sample Contract, Articles 9–10; pp. 76–77: Please confirm that pre-existing proprietary and third-party licensed item banks, stimuli, rubrics, and associated intellectual property may remain owned by the Offeror or licensor, with NMPED receiving defined use rights rather than ownership. How will the final contract reconcile the ownership/licensing options on pp. 1718 with the sample contract's intellectual-property provisions, including treatment of New Mexico-funded adaptations and newly developed items? **Yes. Offerors propose their ownership and licensing approach, including for adapted and newly developed items. Final terms will be set in contract negotiation.**

68. Item Ownership and Interoperability; pp. 17–18: Please define the scope of transfer, ingestion, and rendering support required "at no additional cost," including the number of transfers, designated providers, testing cycles, and duration of support. Does this obligation include custom conversion, remediation of unsupported item types, or successor-provider fees, and how should Offerors price work that exceeds the agreed transfer scope? **The RFP does not define this scope. Offerors should state their assumptions in their proposals.**

69. Item Ownership and Interoperability; Test Administration; pp. 17–18, 28: Please reconcile NMPED's reserved right to deploy NMPED-owned items on a state-developed or state-administered platform with the requirement that the Offeror provide an administration platform.

> Is state-platform delivery required for the first operational administration, an optional future transition, or an additional delivery channel? **No**
>
> Will proprietary assessments administered on the Offeror's platform remain eligible? **Yes**

70. Item Ownership and Interoperability; Test Administration; Technology Integration; pp. 17–18, 28–29: If assessments are delivered through the state platform, which party is responsible for hosting, rostering, administration, scoring, psychometric calibration, accessibility, security, technical support, and reporting? Will NMPED require evidence that transferred assessments preserve score comparability and validity, and who will fund platform-specific validation or

revalidation? **The Offeror provides the administration platform. State-platform delivery is only for released items (see Question 40).**

71. Appendix F: Sample Contract: Please confirm a copy of the Sample Contract does not need to be included with proposal responses. **No, the sample contract does not need to be included.**

72**.** Purpose, p. 4; Item Ownership, p. 17: Please confirm that a commercially available, nationally normed screening, diagnostic and progress-monitoring suite built on an existing item bank fully meets the requirements, when supplemented with NM-specific alignment and validation evidence. **Existing item banks are allowed. Compliance will be determined through evaluation.**

73. Item Development, pp. 26-28: Please confirm that the needs analyses, item-writer training, cognitive labs and review panels apply only to items newly developed or adapted for New Mexico. Is there a minimum number of new NM-specific items that must be development? **Yes. Unmodified existing items need documentation of prior review. No minimum is set.**

74. Martinez-Yazzie, p. 8, Provide technical documentation and evidence supporting the State's Martinez-Yazzie evidentiary record. This includes documentation of item/task development processes, bias and sensitivity review, accessibility and accommodations policies, and classification-accuracy and fairness analyses disaggregated for the student groups named in the lawsuit. National samples of Native American students and English learners are small. What classification-accuracy evidence is expected at proposal versus during the contract? **The Offeror should provide any applicable documentation and existing evidence, along with a plan for New Mexico-specific evidence during the contract.**

75. Pages. 28-29, 32: The Offeror must provide NMPED with a real-time or near- real-time monitoring dashboard during administration windows, enabling NMPED to monitor completion rates at the state, district, school, grade, and content-area levels and to identify and respond to operational issues. Can the real-time completion-monitoring requirement be met through near-real-time data feeds to ILIAD or through a vendor-hosted state view? Please describe ILIAD's current ingestion capabilities, the Ed-Fi version in use and the expected data refresh frequency. **The vendor provided and hosted monitoring dashboard would meet this requirement.**

76. Page. 53: Reasonableness and allowability will be evaluated and lowest cost will not be a factor. Since lowest cost is not a factor, how will the 25 cost points be awarded? **The 25 cost**

points will be awarded based on the reasonableness, allowability, and overall justification of the proposed costs in relation to the services, activities, and deliverables outlined in the offeror's proposal. Evaluation will consider whether the proposed costs are adequately supported, appropriate for the scope of services, and reflective of the resources necessary to successfully fulfill the requirements of the RFP. The evaluation will not be based solely on the lowest proposed cost. Rather, points will be assigned based on the extent to which the proposed budget is reasonable, allowable, sufficiently detailed, and aligned with the proposed approach and anticipated level of effort.

77. Scope of Work, Component B, pgs. 10–11: The Offeror must provide a single, nondiagnostic early-years mathematics screener for students in grades K-3, administered at the beginning of the school year. And, The Offeror must provide early mathematics diagnostic assessments, on-demand progress-monitoring assessments and instructional intervention resources for students in grades K-3. Do the Math screener and diagnostic assessments need to be separate tests, or can one assessment accomplish both use cases? **These do not have to be separate.**

78. Page 35, C. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT CONTACT: Does NMPED anticipate a preference for a single integrated A+B+C+D provider, or will each component be evaluated and awarded independently? If evaluated and awarded separately, will each component be evaluated and scored according to the published evaluation criteria? **NMPED has not stated a preference for a single provider. Each component is priced separately so NMPED may award all or parts of the services to one or more Offerors. All proposals will be evaluated using the published evaluation criteria.**

79. Pages 15-16 and Pages 28-29, Testing Design and Administration Model & Test Administration: For pricing purposes, should vendors assume BOY/MOY/EOY diagnostic administration to the full K–3 population, even though local use may be discretionary? What participation assumptions should be used for monthly progress monitoring, biweekly intervention monitoring, and the Grade 3 gifted screener? **Vendors should use the full K-3 enrollment counts provided in the RFP. For the gifted screener, see question 48.**

80. Pages 31-32, Cross-Vendor Comparability and Linking Studies: What assessment does the NMPED currently anticipate serving as the reference assessment for the annual linking studies? Is it possible to use the Gr3 MSSA? If not MSSA, what options are available and who bears the cost and operational responsibility for administering the reference assessment to the required 1,500–3,000 students per grade/window? **This is to be determined.**

81. Page 31, Cross-Vendor Comparability and Linking Studies: If different providers receive Components A and B, does NMPED envision a single statewide linking design coordinated centrally, or separate provider-specific studies? **NMPED will determine the linking design with the NM TAC input.**

82. Page 24, Vendor Transition: What historical student-level assessment data from incumbent provider(s) does NMPED expect the new provider to ingest, display, or maintain, and in what formats will those data be provided? **None.**

83. Page 32, Reporting: What technical specifications, APIs, data models, environments, and implementation timelines currently exist for ILIAD and the state's Ed-Fi ecosystem? Which integration capabilities must be operational by the first 2027–28 administration versus developed during the contract? **This is to be determined.**

84. Page 7, Contract Length:Contract overlap budget: What budget is allocated for the 2026–27 school year specifically to cover the contract overlap? Spring 2028 administration: Please confirm that the new vendor is responsible for administering NM-MSSA in spring 2028. **No budget is specified to date. This RFP does not cover NM-MSSA.**

85. Page 60, Cost Proposal: Please clarify whether vendors are expected to prepare a separate cost proposal template for each service component (A, B, and C) or whether the DOE will provide templates for submission. Please also specify the Gross Receipts Tax percent that vendors are required to include? **Offerors shall provide their own Cost Proposals, no template will be supplied. Offers should include the applicable New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (GRT) rate based on the location and tax requirements applicable to the services or deliverables provided. Because GRT rates vary by location, a single fixed percentage cannot be specified for all Offerors. Offerors should identify the applicable GRT rate and separately itemize the tax in their cost proposal, as applicable. Current rates may be verified through the New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department's Gross Receipts Tax Rate Lookup.**

86. Page 8, Service Components: Please confirm whether service components A, B, and C will all be awarded to a single vendor. Please provide the current budget for each service component. **Please see question 41 and question 83.**

87. Page 61, Evaluation Factors: Please clarify how the 25 points allocated to the Cost Proposal will be awarded? Will the vendor submitting the lowest cost receive the full 25 points, with other

vendors receiving proportionate scores? **The 25 cost points will be awarded based on the reasonableness, allowability, and overall justification of the proposed costs in relation to the services, activities, and deliverables outlined in the offeror's proposal. Evaluation will consider whether the proposed costs are adequately supported, appropriate for the scope of services, and reflective of the resources necessary to successfully fulfill the requirements of the RFP. The evaluation will not be based solely on the lowest proposed cost. Rather, points will be assigned based on the extent to which the proposed budget is reasonable, allowable, sufficiently detailed, and aligned with the proposed approach and anticipated level of effort.**

88. Page 54, Contract Terms and Conditions: Cost Proposal Evaluation: Please clarify whether the cost proposal will be evaluated based on the initial one-year contract period only or the combined cost of the initial period and all multi-year renewal options. **The cost proposal be evaluated based on the reasonableness, allowability, and overall justification of the proposed costs in relation to the full services, activities, and deliverables outlined in the offeror's proposal and the Scope of Work in the RFP.**

89. Contract Periods and Renewal Dates: Given that the initial 2026–27 contract period is a transition year, please confirm whether 2027–28, 2028–29, and 2029–30 are the full contract years. Please confirm whether the 2026–27 contract begins upon award and ends on June 30, 2027. Please clarify the start date of the first renewal for 2027–28, including whether the stated July 1, 2028 date is correct. Please provide the complete contract terms, including the start and end dates for the initial period and each renewal option. **The 2026-27 begins upon award and the end date shall be determined during the contracting negotiation process. All subsequent contracts start/end dates shall be determined during the future contracting negotiating process and no contract will exceed past December 10, 2030.**

90. Page 19-24, Data Transition: The RFP asks offerors to plan a handoff from the current early grades provider and to preserve historical results where feasible. Will the NMPED or the current provider supply historical student results to awarded offerors? If so, in what format and on what timeline? **NMPED will work with the awarded Offeror(s) to determine what is needed.**

91. Page 28-29, Virtual Schools: For one-to-one components, will NMPED accept remote, video-based facilitation for students in virtual schools? **The platform must support fully virtual administration. Offerors should describe their approach.**

92. Page 8,25,27,33, Evidence Requirements: For evidence the RFP requires, which items must exist at proposal submission, and which may be produced during the 2026–27 planning year or after the first administration using New Mexico data? Examples include classification accuracy broken out by student group, predictive evidence to NM-MSSA, report comprehension studies and cognitive labs. Where existing technical samples did not collect a student-group flag (for example, English learner status), will NMPED accept a plan to complete those analyses with New Mexico data? Will NMPED accept national or other-state evidence and published independent reviews in the meantime?" **The Offeror should submit existing evidence with the proposal and plan for New Mexico-specific analyses during the contract.**

93. Audio Retention, Page 16: For components that record student audio only to support educator scoring, with no automated speech recognition, does NMPED require a set retention period or deletion schedule? Must districts be able to turn recording off? **These would be determined at contracting.**

94. Progress Monitoring, P 9, 11, 16: Must every measure given at BOY, MOY, and EOY also have progress monitoring forms? Or may progress monitoring use a subset of skill-specific measures? **Vendors should propose their best model.**

95. QTI Delivery, P 17-18: Does the QTI delivery requirement apply to proprietary or licensed items, or only to items NMPED will own? For proprietary items, does continued access through the offerors platform under license agreement meet the post contract use requirement? **Only to NMPED owned items.**

96. Intervention, p. 9-10: Is the NMPED open to intervention alignment to HQIM that districts currently use rather than embedded intervention resources? May the offeror propose an integrated approach that combines internal and 3rd party (HQIM provider) resources? **Yes.**

97. How many grade 3 students will be assessed with the gifted screener? **See question 48.**

98. What is the anticipated testing window for that screening? **The assessment must be given by the end of grade 3. No specific window is set.**

99. Are there administration time limits for the screening? **No**.

100. Does NM require that the gifted screener be administered in the State's online system? **The Offeror should provide the platform.**