

**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT**

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

PAGE OF PAGES

1 | 1

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE JUL 02, 2009	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. EDNAGB-09-900046	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY National Assessment Governing Board 800 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 825 Washington DC 20002-4233		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) See Block 6	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. ED-NAG-09-R-0007
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) JUN 12, 2009
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

CODE FACILITY CODE

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers  is extended,  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 \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT 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 your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter 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)

See Schedule

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

CHECK ONE	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 FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor  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.)

The purpose of this amendment is to respond to questions received from bidders and interested parties. Responses are attached. The due date for proposal submission remains the same: July 24, 2009 at 12:00 P.M. Eastern Time.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	(Signature of Contracting Officer)

## Solicitation #ED-NAG-09-R-0007: Survey of Higher Education Institutions

### Response to Questions

July 2, 2009

1. Who developed the draft questionnaire and what is their affiliation?

*Answer: The draft questionnaire was prepared by Governing Board staff with assistance from ACT, Inc. under a prior contract with the Governing Board, and with input provided by the Chair of the Board's Technical Panel on 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Research, Michael Kirst.*

2. What level of precision in the survey estimates should be assumed when designing the sample of institutions? What are the statistical requirements in terms of the precision or margin of error of sample estimates, both overall and by important subpopulations?

*Answer: A primary objective of the study is to determine the mean, median, range and standard deviation of the cut-scores for the various tests used in making placement decisions for the major comparisons described on page 6 of the statement of work (2-year and 4-year institutions overall and by control, selectivity, and size).*

*ACT, SAT, ACCUPLACER and COMPASS use different score scales with different standard deviations of the mean. For the mean and median placement cut-scores reported for each assessment under the proposed survey, it would be desirable to be able to detect a significant difference of .2 SD of the respective assessment score scales, with an alpha of .05, for the major comparisons. However, this may not be feasible or practical; therefore, bidders should also propose samples that will detect significant differences at .4 SD and .6 SD, and may propose other options consistent with the objectives of the study.*

3. The Statement of Work does not include the preparation of an OMB clearance package. Is the Governing Board preparing the OMB package? If so, can NAGB provide bidders with a copy or otherwise information on what was included in that package, such as sample size, methodology, etc.? If an OMB package has not been submitted, does NAGB expect the contractor to prepare the package? Does the OMB package cover field tests with more than 9 institutions? If not, it will be difficult to evaluate some of the issues listed in the RFP (p. 7). Will the survey undergo normal clearance procedures or expedited or emergency procedures, i.e., how many months should be estimated for the clearance process? When does the Governing Board expect OMB clearance?

*Answer: The Governing Board will have primary responsibility for preparing the OMB clearance package. The Board expects that the contractor-prepared sampling and data collection plans will provide sufficient information for the preparation of the clearance package and that only minimal additional information would be requested from the contractor, if any.*

*The Governing Board submitted a clearance package and published the 60-day Federal Register notice in December 2008; the package was withdrawn after the 30-day notice was published. The Governing Board will work directly with OMB on whether an expedited review process will be possible. If an expedited review is not possible, then the project timeline will be adjusted after negotiations with the contractor.*

*The original clearance package provided for a census of higher education institutions; the RFP provides for a nationally representative sample and a response rate of at least 85 percent. The original clearance package provided for a paper and pencil survey; the RFP asks bidders to suggest the data collection response methodology, whether by paper and pencil or electronic. The original clearance package anticipated a pilot test of the survey of not-to-exceed nine respondents per item; the RFP asks bidders to propose an appropriately sized small-scale field test.*

4. How many reviews are anticipated for each deliverable? How much time should the contractor include in the schedule for review times?

*Answer: In general, one review is anticipated for each deliverable. Bidders should include 7 calendar days for Governing Board review.*

5. Could you elaborate on the requirement regarding analysis by program rigor? Our understanding is that, unlike level and control of institution, program rigor is a survey variable that is not available on the sampling frame and cannot be used to select the sample.

*Answer: It is correct that program rigor is a survey variable not available on the sampling frame. As discussed on page 6 of the statement of work, the objective is to be able to report on two levels of cut-scores used for placement decisions:*

*(1) The institution's general policy on the score below which students are deemed to need remedial coursework and at or above which students are deemed to have the skills and knowledge in reading and/or mathematics to be placed into standard, entry-level courses that met the institution's general education requirements; and*

*(2) A program, major, or course of study for which higher cut-scores are required. The intent is for the bidder to propose one or more survey items that will result in the collection of data to satisfy this objective.*

6. What is the type and amount of "other work" that the Technical Review Panel (TRP) will do beyond the four 2-day meetings?

*Answer: Under the statement of work, four 2-day meetings in Washington, DC are to be assumed for budgeting purposes. "Other work" has not been defined, but could include review of draft deliverables required in addition to scheduled meetings and preparation of analyses or issue papers on selected topics as an assignment, based on individual expertise. If further days are required for other work performed by panel members, the contract budget will be adjusted accordingly through contract modification.*

7. There appear to be contradictory statements about the award fee on page 6. Is the award fee negotiated or is it decided unilaterally?

*Answer: At contract award, the award fee amounts will be negotiated based on the task objectives identified in the Statement of Work (See Section 8.1.4 Award Fee Plan in the Statement of Work). However, as stated in the RFP, the government will make a subjective evaluation of the quality of the contractor's performance, based on the award fee plan. At contract award, after negotiations with the contractor, the award fee amounts will be stated clearly and will be based on detailed criteria for earning the award fee amounts. These measures will identify the expectations for performance and award fees upfront.*

8. Can the Governing Board provide guidance on the level of effort for this project? What level of effort does NAGB expect for this procurement? Has there been a level of effort established for this project?

*Bidders should review the Statement of Work carefully, and estimate labor costs based on proposed work plans for the 12 month contract duration.*

9. Is there any guidance in the daily rate for honoraria payments for the Technical Review Panel?

*Proposed payments for the Technical Review Panel members should not exceed \$750 per day.*

10. How many past performance reports should be included in the proposal? At some points, the RFP mentions 4, while at others it mentions 3-5.

*Answer: Four past performance reports should be included in the proposal submission.*