

**Attachment A: Statement of Work
Solicitation: #ED-NAG-09-0007**

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD

Statement of Work

Survey of Use of Placement Tests and Cut Scores by Postsecondary Education Institutions

June 12, 2009

Contents

1. Introduction and Background	1
2. The National Assessment Governing Board.....	1
3. The Governing Board’s Requirements	2
4. Contract Vehicle and Period of Performance	3
5. Technical Direction of the Contract.....	3
6. Scope of Work	3
Task 1: Attend an In-person Initial Planning Meeting	4
Task 2: Design the Data Collection Methodology and Sample for the Field Test and Main Samples	4
Task 3: Production of Survey Instruments	6
Task 4: Technical Review Panel	6
Task 5: Data Collection.....	7
Subtask 5.1 Field Test.....	7
Subtask 5.2 Conduct Survey	8
Subtask 5.3 Obtain Required Response Rates	8
Task 6: Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance.....	9
Task 7: Data Analysis and Presentation	9
Task 8: Project Planning, Management, and Oversight	10
Task 9: Survey Report.....	11
7. Schedule of Project Deliverables	12
8. Instructions to Offerors.....	15
8.1 Organization and Content of the Technical and Business Proposals, and Past Performance Report.....	15
8.1.2 Technical Proposal.....	15
8.1.3 Business Proposal	17
8.1.4 Award Fee Plan.....	18
8.1.5 Past Performance Report.....	18
8.2 Use of Subcontractors	18
APPENDICES	20
Attachment B: Past Performance Report.....	31

1. Introduction and Background

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), also known as “The Nation’s Report Card,” is the only nationally representative, continuing assessment of U.S. student achievement in key academic subjects. Since its authorization by Congress in 1969, NAEP has provided an independent, objective measure of achievement in reading, mathematics, science, writing, U.S. History, civics, economics, geography, the arts, and other subjects, while also monitoring student educational progress over time. Through reports of NAEP results, the public is informed about the academic achievement and progress over time of elementary and secondary students at the national, state, and local levels in the United States.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001¹ greatly expanded the role of NAEP by mandating biennial participation in reading and mathematics assessment at grades 4 and 8 by all states receiving federal Title I funds. In addition, Congress provided funds for a pilot program for NAEP to measure 12th grade achievement in reading and mathematics, which began in 11 states in 2009. With the advent of Trial Urban District Assessments (TUDA) in 2002, NAEP now includes 18 large urban districts, such as New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. The web link to the legislation as it pertains to NAEP and the Governing Board is provided in Appendix A.

NAEP is a project within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. It is administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) under the policy guidance of the National Assessment Governing Board.

2. The National Assessment Governing Board

The National Assessment Governing Board is an independent, bipartisan board that sets policy for NAEP. Created by Congress in 1988, the Governing Board is made up of 26 members, including governors, state legislators, local and state school officials, educators, researchers, business representatives, and members of the general public. Governing Board members are appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Education. More information on the Governing Board is available at www.nagb.org.

Section 302 of the NAEP Authorization Act requires the Governing Board to oversee and set policy for NAEP. This includes, among other responsibilities, identifying subjects to be tested, determining the content and achievement levels for each assessment, approving all test questions, and taking steps to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of results. The Governing Board works to inform the public about The Nation's Report Card by communicating NAEP results to a wide range of audiences including elected officials, educators, and the media.

Concerned that a significant decline in school and student participation rates in 2002 threatened the validity and viability of 12th grade assessments, the Governing Board established in November 2002 the National Commission on NAEP 12th Grade Assessment and Reporting to

¹ Public Law 107–279 amended P.L. 107–110, and was signed by President Bush on January 8, 2002.

study and make recommendations on needed changes. Among the Commission's recommendations was that NAEP should be designed to report on the readiness of 12th grade students for college, training for employment, and entrance into the military (see Appendix B).

The President, the U.S. Secretary of Education, Governors, Chief State School Officers, and leaders in business and education all have come to recognize the need for all students to be prepared for postsecondary education and training for occupations. This is viewed as critical to furthering the nation's economic well being and security and to fostering each individual's potential. As the only regular, continuing source of national and state-representative information on student achievement at grades 4, 8, and 12, policymakers are looking to NAEP as an important source of information on 12th grade students' preparedness for postsecondary education and training for occupations.

Reporting to the public on 12th grade student preparedness is a new undertaking for NAEP. Recognizing that the validity of the statements to be made in NAEP reports is a central issue to be addressed in reporting on 12th grade students' preparedness for postsecondary education and training, the Governing Board has approved a program of related research, based on the recommendations of a technical panel. One of the research studies to be conducted is the survey described in this statement of work. An overview of the program of research is at Appendix C; the technical panel's report is available at Appendix D. The survey to be conducted under this Statement of Work will be used, in conjunction with the other planned studies, as evidence to develop and/or validate statements about 12th grade student preparedness to be used in NAEP reports.

3. The Governing Board's Requirements

The purpose of this statement of work is to define the requirements for conducting a nationally representative survey of 2-year and 4-year postsecondary education institutions to determine the tests and cut-scores in reading and mathematics used to place entry-level students into standard, credit-bearing coursework that fulfills the respective institutions' general education requirements, to place students into coursework generally referred to as developmental or remedial, and to exempt students from placement testing.

The Governing Board seeks a contractor to conduct the survey and prepare data tables of the results **within 12 months of the contract award**. Proposed work includes the following:

- Develop the survey instrument, utilizing the draft survey instrument provided in Appendix E to this Statement of Work as a starting point;
- Establish and use a technical review panel;
- Design the sample;
- Collect the data;
- Analyze the data;
- Present the data in tables;
- Prepare technical and final reports.

The proposed work will require close coordination and cooperation between the contractor and the Governing Board's Contracting Officer's Representative (COR).

4. Contract Vehicle and Period of Performance

The proposed contract will be executed as a performance based, Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) contract with a 16-month period of performance. The contract will be negotiated with a base fee, and an award fee administered in accordance with an award fee plan, negotiated at contract award. The contract is anticipated to be awarded no later than September 25, 2009. Offerors should propose a project timeline commencing September 28, 2009.

5. Technical Direction of the Contract

The performance of work requested in this RFP shall be subject to the direction of the Governing Board Contracting Officer (CO) with regard to contract matters, and technical direction through the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). Such technical direction shall consist of, but shall not be limited to the following activities:

- Monitoring the contractor's performance to ensure compliance with the technical requirements of the contract;
- Providing direction to the contractor to ensure compliance with appropriate Board policies and specifications and as communicated through regularly scheduled reviews of work-in-progress. These are communicated to the contractor through the COR; and
- Recommending to the Contracting Officer final acceptance or rejection of all deliverables.

The contractor shall work closely with the COR for all aspects of the work and communicate as stipulated on task progress. The ability of the contractor's staff to communicate effectively and productively with the COR is critical. The COR will closely monitor the contractor's work to ensure performance of activities as specified in the contract and to guarantee technical quality, policy relevance, and objectivity. All contract-related communications or proposed changes in the scope of work will be directed to the Contracting Officer.

6. Scope of Work

The Governing Board requires services in support of the Board's requirements described in Section 3 above, and as detailed in specific tasks below. Bidders are to propose technically sound, effective, and cost-efficient approaches to accomplish the tasks described. Bidders must adhere to appropriate federal and generally accepted professional standards for sampling, survey development, data collection, data security, quality control, privacy and confidentiality. A technical plan and estimated budget should be proposed for each of the tasks described below, with a cumulative total for all tasks presented as well:

- Task 1: Attend In-Person Meeting
- Task 2: Design of the Methodology and Selection of the Field Test and Main Samples
- Task 3: Production of Survey Instruments
- Task 4: Technical Review Panel
- Task 5: Data Collection (Field Test; Survey Administration; Obtain Required Response Rate)
- Task 6: Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance
- Task 7: Data Analysis and Presentation
- Task 8: Project Planning, Management, and Oversight
- Task 9: Optional task for survey report

The Governing Board has developed a draft survey instrument for use with 2-year and 4-year institutions (see Appendix E). The contractor shall review this instrument, using it as a draft, and refine the survey instrument, making modifications as necessary and appropriate.

Task 1: Attend an In-person Initial Planning Meeting

Within seven calendar days of the contract award, the contractor's project director and other key project staff, as identified in the contractor's technical and business proposals, shall meet in person in Washington, D.C. at the Governing Board offices with the Governing Board's Contracting Officer (CO), Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), and other Governing Board staff as appropriate.

The purpose of the meeting will be to identify the roles and responsibilities of Board staff and contractor staff; to review and discuss proposed contract work; and to discuss aspects of contract management, such as submission of reports, deliverables, and invoices, and establish communication procedures.

Deliverable:

1. Within seven calendar days following the initial planning meeting, the contractor shall submit a written report (in Microsoft Word 2007 or 2003) to the CO, with a copy to the COR, documenting agenda items discussed at the meeting and highlighting outcomes agreed upon by both parties.

Task 2: Design the Data Collection Methodology and Sample for the Field Test and Main Samples

The purpose of the survey is to determine the most prevalent tests used for placement of students into credit-bearing coursework and into remedial/developmental courses in reading and mathematics, and to determine the cut-scores on these tests used in making the placement decisions, as well as the tests and cut scores used to exempt students from placement testing.

The contractor shall propose a suggested design for the data collection methodology, including whether the data collection shall be by paper and pencil survey, web-based survey, or some other alternative. The contractor shall discuss the strengths and limitations of the proposed design in light of other survey options, including cost, efficiency, and response rate.

The contractor shall design a small-scale purposive sample for the field test (see Task 5) and, for the main survey administration, a representative national sample of degree granting 2-year public and private postsecondary education institutions and of 4-year public and private postsecondary education institutions, both profit and not-for-profit (see Task 5). In addition, the main sample shall provide for analysis by selectivity of institution and size of institution; the contractor shall propose an indicator for selectivity and criteria for size of institution for use in the study, describing the strengths and limitations of the proposed selectivity indicator and criteria for size in comparison to other potential selectivity indicators and criteria for size of institution.

The contractor shall propose a sample design that provides for analysis by level of institution, control of institution, selectivity, size and program rigor for the frequency of use of the ACT, SAT, Accuplacer, COMPASS, and ASSET assessments in reading and mathematics and the mean, median, range and standard deviation of the cut-scores on these tests used in making the placement decisions. Program rigor refers to two levels of cut-scores used for placement decisions:

- (1) The first level represents 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 meet the institution's general education requirements; and
- (2) The second level is for a program, major, or course of study for which higher cut-scores are required by the institution (or subunit of the institution, e.g., a college or department), such as engineering. The contractor shall propose options for addressing this second level of rigor efficiently in the survey.

The contractor shall also provide for reporting on the frequency of use, but not the cut-scores, of tests developed by the respective institutions for use in placement decisions. The contractor shall provide weights, as needed, to compensate for unequal probability of selection. The contractor shall indicate how known and measurable sources of error will be used to adjust final estimates; what procedures will be used to test for non-response bias if needed; and how weighting and other adjustment procedures will be used to provide final estimates. The contractor shall document all non-response and refusals along with their reasons, and submit plans for adjusting the sampling weights for non-response and for imputing for item non-response.

Deliverables:

- 2.1 Draft methodology and sampling plan for field test for review by Technical Review Panel and COR.
- 2.2 Revised methodology and sampling plan for use in field test
- 2.3 Draft methodology and sampling plan for survey administration for review by TRP and COR

2.4 Revised methodology and sampling plan for survey administration

Task 3: Production of Survey Instruments

As noted in Section 6 above, a draft survey instrument has been developed by the Governing Board. The contractor under this RFP shall be responsible for modifying and finalizing the survey instrument. This work shall include the following

- (a) Review the draft instrument and redesign as needed to finalize the survey instrument;
- (b) Provide for institutional identification numbers to link survey responses to data in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Providing for IPEDS institutional identification numbers will reduce burden on respondents and, potentially, enhance the analysis;
- (c) Provide for review by a Technical Review Panel (TRP) (see Task 4) and the Governing Board through the COR;
- (d) Format the items for the survey instruments; and, if administered by paper and pencil, prepare final camera ready copy and produce sufficient numbers of copies of the survey instrument for distribution to respondents, both for the field test and for the main survey administration. It is expected that only minor changes, if any, will be needed for the final survey instrument based on the field test. It is possible that separate, but similar, surveys may be needed for 2-year and 4-year institutions.

Deliverables:

3.1 Draft survey instrument(s) for review by TRP and COR

3.2 Revised survey instrument(s) for use in field test

3.3 Recommendations for revised survey instrument(s) for use in survey administration for review by COR, and by TRP as needed

3.4 Revised survey instrument(s) for use in survey administration

Task 4: Technical Review Panel

To obtain peer review of project plans and products, the contractor shall establish a Technical Review Panel (TRP). The contractor shall submit names of proposed TRP members in its proposal. Before appointing the TRP, the contractor shall consult with the COR in the further identification (if necessary) of TRP members and obtain the approval of the COR in the final selection of the TRP. For the purposes of costing out each TRP meeting, the contractor should assume that there will be approximately 5-7 members on the panel with appropriate experience and expertise. The contractor shall pay for all associated expenses, including travel, lodging, and meals consistent with federal regulations as well as honoraria, both for meeting attendance and other work, which panel members may perform on the project. For budgeting purposes, assume four (4) 2-day meetings, to be held in the Washington, DC metropolitan area.

The contractor's responsibilities for the TRP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Identify the proposed TRP members, for COR approval;
- Prepare, for COR approval, letters of invitation to join the TRP;
- Establish a schedule, for COR approval, to obtain guidance and feedback from the TRP in support of the progress of the project;
- Prepare and disseminate all materials required for TRP consideration and review (i.e., pre-meeting information packets and meeting materials), and secure the Panel's advice; and
- Prepare meeting minutes and submit them to the COR within 5 working days after the meeting.

Deliverables:

- 4.1 Letters of appointment confirmation
- 4.2 Pre-meeting information packets, including agendas
- 4.3 Meeting materials
- 4.4 Minutes of meetings

Task 5: Data Collection

Subtask 5.1 Field Test

The contractor shall conduct a purposive, small scale field test. The contractor shall use the field test to evaluate the quality and clarity of the survey instrument and the approaches to be used in conducting the survey, including, but not limited to:

- (1) Identifying appropriate respondents within institutions
- (2) Securing respondent cooperation
- (3) Achieving at the least the required response rate
- (4) Designing effective training for project staff
- (5) Managing the flow of materials and data
- (6) Evaluating the accuracy of its assignment of IPEDS identification numbers to survey booklets, and
- (7) Reporting on the progress of data collection.

The contractor shall document the field test preparations, training, procedures, operations, results and all findings in a report submitted to the COR. Based upon field test results, modifications may be called for in the survey instrument and data collection plan. The contractor shall, as needed, design alternative strategies, provide a rationale for its proposals, revise procedures and instruments, and assist the COR in preparing a revised OMB clearance request, if required.

Deliverable:

- 5.1 Field Test Report

Subtask 5.2 Conduct Survey

The contractor shall conduct a survey of the use of tests and cut-scores used for placement decisions at postsecondary education institutions consistent with the technical plan and survey objectives outlined above. The survey should be administered to a representative national sample of degree granting 2-year and 4- year public and private postsecondary education institutions, both profit and not-for-profit. The contractor shall document all aspects of the main data collection in the technical report submitted to the COR.

Deliverable
5.2 Technical report

Subtask 5.3 Obtain Required Response Rates

The offeror shall submit a plan in its technical proposal providing a detailed description of how the offeror will obtain at least the required minimum response rate and of all measures it will take to maximize participation in both the field test and survey administration, including how it will identify a reliable, appropriate source at each institution to respond to the survey.

The minimum required response rate for the survey administration is 85% for all institutional reporting categories. An award fee schedule based on meeting response rates at or above the 85% minimum response rate will be negotiated at contract award. (See Section 8.1.4 of the Statement of Work for the Award Fee Plan).

The technical proposal shall include a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) designed to evaluate performance in relation to achieving or exceeding the required response rate. The QASP will address what will be monitored, how monitoring will take place, who will conduct the monitoring, and how monitoring results will be documented. It will also describe the following:

- Procedures in place to attain required survey response rates, or procedures employed to attain response rates above the minimum 85%
- A description of follow up measures to monitor and implement responses rate strategies
- Communication mechanisms with the COR during survey implementation phases to facilitate regular monitoring of the response rates
- How response rate efforts and results will be documented.

In its technical proposal, the contractor shall describe the methods it will use -- such as by letter, e-mails, and telephone calls -- to contact and encourage participation of sampled institutional respondents. The contractor shall obtain endorsements of appropriate organizations to encourage participation in the survey. The contractor shall offer institutional respondents reasonable reimbursement for the administrative costs of responding to the survey if the respondent provides the completed survey in a timely manner. In addition, the contractor shall provide an effective, time sensitive means for respondents to ask questions or obtain clarification in completing the survey, such as through a help desk.

Task 6: Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance

The contractor shall include its proposed plan for Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance in its technical proposal. The plan shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- (1) Providing the means for monitoring completion, receipt, control, and storage of surveys;
- (2) Transforming the raw survey data into a machine-readable, edited, efficiently organized data base;
- (3) Providing quality control procedures to ensure 100 percent accuracy of the data base and of the data presented in the table shells produced under Task 7. (See Section 8.1.4 of the Statement of Work for the Award Fee Plan for this objective).
- (4) Maintaining the computer software required to develop, maintain, merge, and analyze this data base,
- (5) Generating and maintaining sufficient back-up files to take care of all contingencies to ensure against data loss;
- (6) Preparation of a code book to document the data coding criteria and to provide locations of the data in the files; and
- (7) Ensuring that respondent confidentiality is appropriately protected. This shall include specifying how respondent confidentiality will be maintained, from the field test through the main data collection to delivery of data to the COR and submission of the final Technical Report, and procedures to be used to limit the risk of releasing information about a respondent.

Under no circumstances shall the contractor release any personally identifiable information about respondents, unless such release is authorized in advance by the COR. The contractor shall employ strict procedures for ensuring that all project staff adhere to this requirement.

The contractor shall maintain complete data files for all components of the study, and all supplemental files created and obtained in support of the study, for the life of the contract. Maintenance of data files means keeping data file documentation available for reproduction on request of the COR. Data files shall be forwarded to the Governing Board CO, with a copy to the COR, at the end of the contract.

The technical proposal shall include a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) designed to evaluate performance of Task 6 in general and in relation to achieving 100 percent accuracy of the data base and of the data presented in the table shells produced under Task 7 in particular. The QASP will address what will be monitored, how monitoring will take place, who will conduct the monitoring, and how monitoring results will be documented.

Task 7: Data Analysis and Presentation

The contractor shall be responsible for data analysis and the presentation of the results of the survey in data tables. The data analysis will include appropriate links with the IPEDS database. The contractor shall prepare a comprehensive set of draft table shells, consistent with the survey

objectives, for review by the COR, and a final set of table shells, for approval of the COR. The contractor shall complete the analysis of the survey data collection and prepare draft completed tables for review by the COR and final tables for approval by the COR. **The contractor shall prepare final completed tables within 12 months of the contract award.** (See Section 8.1.4 of the Statement of Work for the Award Fee Plan for this objective).

The technical proposal shall include a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) designed to evaluate performance in relation to submitting final completed data tables within 12 months of contract award. The QASP will describe procedures for ensuring that this is achieved and will address what will be monitored, how monitoring will take place, who will conduct the monitoring, and how monitoring results will be documented.

Deliverables

- 7.1 Draft table shells
- 7.2 Final table shells
- 7.3 Draft completed tables
- 7.4 Final completed tables

Task 8: Project Planning, Management, and Oversight

The contractor shall manage the tasks under this contract in an efficient manner and will keep the project on schedule, within budget, and in accordance with generally accepted statistical standards. The contractor shall include in its technical proposal an overall management plan that provides details on how the project will be organized and managed to accomplish the scope of work and a detailed master schedule for all activities to be performed during the life of the contract.

As a part of project planning, management, and oversight, the contractor shall:

- (1) Meet periodically in person at the request of the COR in Washington, DC, but not more than six times during a twelve-month period;
- (2) Confer periodically by conference call throughout the contract period;
- (3) Develop, in consultation with the COR, the goals and agenda for each in-person meeting and prepare a summary of the discussion and decisions made at each meeting or conference call;
- (4) Prepare, at the request of the COR, materials and PowerPoint presentations about the project for use with the Governing Board and other agencies and organizations;
- (5) At the request of the COR, provide project update reports at Governing Board meetings, which are scheduled for November 20, 2009 and March 5, May 14, and August 6, 2010 (for budgeting purposes, the contractor should assume that two of the meetings will be in Washington, DC and two will be outside of Washington, DC); and
- (6) Submit **monthly progress reports** summarizing contractual activities and financial expenditures for the duration of the project, to include:
 - The progress and accomplishments made on each task and activity

- Problems that have been resolved and/or are in need of resolution
- The work to be performed during the next monthly reporting period
- Any anticipated technical and/or budgetary problems and proposed solutions
- Decisions that may be needed from the CO or COR

These progress reports shall be submitted by the 15th day of each month, covering activities of the preceding month. The CO, through the COR, shall respond within five calendar days to each monthly progress report with any technical direction or re-direction that may be warranted in order to carry out task activities.

In addition to monthly progress reports, the contractor shall provide monthly reports on **financial expenditures** through invoice submissions. Each invoice shall include the following information:

- (a.) A summary of the overall project costs broken down by the tasks and subtasks indentified in the Scope of Work. The summary will include task/subtask contract funding; task/subtask costs by current reporting period; cumulative costs for each task/subtask; and a balance of funds remaining by task, subtask and the overall contract.
- (b.) Following this summary, the contractor shall provide, by task and subtask, a breakdown of labor and other direct costs. Labor hours will be depicted by individual staff and/or consultant tallied by approved labor rates and labor costs for staff. Detail for other direct costs shall be summarized by line item description and cost. Budgeted versus actual costs for each line item will be provided. Sufficient detail for each cost, such as reproduction costs, communications costs, etc. shall be provided to substantiate billed costs.

A sample of the suggested invoice information is provided in Appendix F.

The contractor shall work through the COR in all relationships and discussions with any other agencies or individuals related to the contract.

Deliverables:

- 8.1 Goals and agenda for in-person meetings
- 8.2 Summary of in-person meetings
- 8.3 Materials and PowerPoint presentations about the project
- 8.4 Monthly progress reports
- 8.5 Monthly financial expenditure invoices

Task 9: Survey Report

(This is an optional task to be budgeted at a later time, after completion of all tasks; offeror capabilities and experience in this area may be demonstrated in the narrative)

Based on the data resulting from the survey to be conducted under this statement of work, the Governing Board may, at its option, decide to have a written report prepared or conduct follow up work based on the outcomes of the survey.

If a final report is requested, it is anticipated that the report would have the following sections and that the COR would provide guidance and collaborate with the contractor staff, as a coauthor, for all phases of final report production .

- (1) Executive Summary
- (2) Introduction and background
- (3) Description of survey methodology
- (4) Survey results
- (5) Summary and conclusion

Appendices (e.g., summary description of technical aspects of the survey administration; endorsements; etc.)

Deliverable:

- 1. Draft Survey report
- 2. Survey report

7. Schedule of Project Deliverables

The following schedule provides a summary of the major project deliverables and the due dates for each deliverable.

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE (days are calendar days)
Task 1: Report Summarizing Planning Meeting	Seven days after the meeting
Task 2: Design of the Methodology and Selection of the Field Test and Main Samples 2.1 Draft sampling plan for field test for review by TRP and COR 2.2 Revised sampling plan for use in field test 2.3 Draft sampling plan for survey administration for review by TRP and COR 2.4 Revised sampling plan for survey administration	Dates are to be proposed by contractor to be accomplished during the contract performance period according to a schedule that permits completion of all tasks and related review procedures within 12 months of award date

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE (days are calendar days)
<p>Task 3: Production of Survey Instruments</p> <p>3.1 Draft survey instruments for review by TRP and COR</p> <p>3.2 Revised survey instruments for use in field test</p> <p>3.3 Recommendations for revised survey instruments for use in survey administration for review by COR and by TRP as needed</p> <p>3.4 Revised survey instruments for use in survey administration</p>	<p>Dates are to be proposed by contractor to be accomplished during the contract performance period according to a schedule that permits completion of all tasks and related review procedures within 12 months of contract award date</p>
<p>Task 4: Technical Review Panel</p> <p>List of potential TRP members</p> <p>4.1 Letters of appointment confirmation</p> <p>4.2 Pre-meeting information packets, including agendas</p> <p>4.3 Meeting materials</p> <p>4.4 Minutes of meetings</p>	<p>Include in technical proposal and finalize after consultation with, and review and approval by COR</p> <p>Mailed within 30 days of contract award</p> <p>Final materials delivered 7 days prior to meeting</p> <p>Final materials prepared 7 days prior to meeting</p> <p>Within 7 days of completion of meeting</p>
<p>Task 5: Data Collection</p> <p>Subtask 5.1 Field Test Report</p> <p>Subtask 5.2 Main data collection technical report</p> <p>Subtask 5.3 Plan for obtaining response rate, including the QASP</p>	<p>Within 14 days of completion of field test</p> <p>Within 45 days of completion of data collection</p> <p>Include in technical proposal</p>

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE (days are calendar days)
<p>Task 6: Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance</p> <p>Plan for Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance, including the QASP</p>	<p>Include in technical proposal</p>
<p>Task 7: Data Analysis</p> <p>7.1 Draft data table shells</p> <p>7.2 Final data table shells</p> <p>7.3 Prepare draft tables complete with data</p> <p>7.4 Submit final data tables</p>	<p>Dates are to be proposed by contractor to be accomplished during the contract performance period according to a schedule that permits completion of all tasks and related review procedures <u>within 12 months of award date</u></p>
<p>Task 8: Project Planning, Management, and Oversight</p> <p>Detailed management plan</p> <p>Master schedule of contract activities</p> <p>8.1 Goals and agenda for in-person meetings</p> <p>8.2 Summary of in-person meetings</p> <p>8.3 Materials and PowerPoint presentations about the project</p> <p>8.4 Monthly progress reports</p> <p>8.5 Monthly financial expenditure invoices</p>	<p>Include in technical proposal</p> <p>Include in technical proposal and finalize after Initial Planning Meeting</p> <p>Within 7 days of COR request</p> <p>Within 7 days of meeting completion</p> <p>Within 7 days of COR request</p> <p>15th of each month</p> <p>15th of each month</p>
<p>Task 9: Optional Task: Survey Report</p> <p>1. Draft Survey report</p> <p>2. Survey report</p>	<p>45 days after notice to proceed</p> <p>15 days after review by COR</p>

8. Instructions to Offerors

8.1 Organization and Content of the Technical and Business Proposals, and Past Performance Report

Offerors are required to follow the proposal format and content suggestions detailed in this section and in Section L of the solicitation. Each offer shall consist of three separately packaged proposals: a technical proposal, a business proposal, and a past performance report as described in detail below. Section M of the proposal provides the evaluation criteria for the proposal.

8.1.2 Technical Proposal

All information necessary to judge the technical soundness and the management capabilities of the offeror will be contained in the technical proposal. The technical proposal shall not exceed 60 pages, 8" by 11" paper, double-spaced, in 12-point font. Resumes and other supporting material may be provided in appendices and should not exceed 30 pages. The technical proposal must not contain reference to specific costs, but resource information may be included so that the offeror's understanding of the scope of the work may be evaluated. The technical proposal shall be organized as follows.

Table of Contents

The Table of Contents will outline the contents of the proposal and identify authors of the various sections of the proposal.

Introduction and General Approach

The Introduction and General Approach shall describe the offeror's overall understanding of the Scope of Work required by the Governing Board. A summary of the offeror's qualifications and unique strengths related to project tasks outlined in Section 6 must be presented in this section. Of particular relevance will be evidence of the offeror's experience with surveys of postsecondary education institutions and its achievements in obtaining the requisite sample participation rates in other studies and experience using IPEDS data. An overview of the general plan to accomplish the work and the rationale for the proposed approach will be provided by the offeror. The offeror is encouraged to demonstrate an understanding of effective and cost saving communication and outreach strategies.

Technical Work Plan

The technical work plan shall provide a detailed discussion of how each task described in Section 6 of this document will be accomplished. Matters affecting scope and cost shall be proposed specifically, including but not limited to: (1) the sample size for the field test and main data collection, (2) the activities to be conducted and level of effort required to obtain the requisite sample participation rate under subtask 5.3, including the QASP, and (3) the plan for Data Receipt, Processing, Quality Control, Confidentiality, Delivery, and Maintenance under Task 6, including the QASP. The technical work plan should clearly and directly support the business plan and should include explicit statements of the offeror's assumptions.

The plan should include: the list of proposed TRP members, along with their background and experience; options, with a discussion of pros and cons for each, for an indicator of institutional selectivity; and options with a discussion of pros and cons, for the criteria for size of institution. The plan should also include a discussion of the offeror's proposed procedures and implementation strategies and issues related to completing each task. Offerors should propose efficient and cost effective approaches to accomplish each task.

Management Plan

The management plan will describe how work will be accomplished for each task and will identify staff members who will play a major role in task completion. For a successful outcome, the project will require an effective management system that enables the contractor to complete tasks on schedule and within budget. The system shall include procedures for coordinating and controlling project personnel and tasks; ensuring adherence to schedules and deadlines; ensuring high quality products and outcomes; identifying potential problems early; maintaining close, effective communication with the COR; and accounting for and controlling project expenditures. Offerors must verify the availability of the resources and technology, in-house and through outside consultants or subcontractors, if necessary, to undertake tasks detailed above.

Offerors will identify a single person as Project Director to provide leadership and direction to the contractor's project staff. The Project Director shall serve as the contractor's primary contact with the Governing Board. All personnel, including subcontractor staff and consultants, shall be identified and their positions in the contract's management structure detailed in a staff organization chart. This chart shall depict clear lines of authority and responsibility for all persons involved in the conduct of this project.

The Management Plan shall also include a Gantt chart depicting the timelines for all major tasks and subtasks, including deliverables. Included in this Gantt chart shall be the start and completion dates for each task, as well as appropriate intermediate dates for precursor steps and draft deliverables, as appropriate. Staff responsible for each task shall also be included on the chart. In all cases where personnel external to the offeror's organization are proposed, letters of agreement (with proposed staff) and letters of availability (endorsed by the primary institutions with which they are affiliated) shall be included.

Related Experience of Proposed Staff

This section of the technical proposal shall identify proposed staff and their educational background and expertise relevant to the proposed work. To plan, conduct, and complete the work successfully, offerors shall propose staff with the following knowledge and experience:

- Large-scale survey and sample design;
- Large scale postsecondary data collection;
- Obtaining respondent cooperation and specified sample response rates;
- Experience in postsecondary education surveys;
- Effective data management and control;
- Success in obtaining organizational endorsements for surveys;
- Effective quality control;

- Protection of respondent confidentiality;
- Strong client service orientation.

Vitae of proposed staff shall document the educational background, knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience relevant to proposed tasks. The proposed Project Director must have demonstrated project management skills that include successful project planning and execution, with effective contingency planning. Successful oversight for project cost controls is essential to the contract. The Project Director and other key staff must have demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and produce high quality products within budget. The Project Director will communicate frequently with the COR and will play a lead role in project oversight. Changes or substitutions of the key personnel will require written advance approval by the Contracting Officer.

Related Organizational Experience

The Related Organizational Experience section shall describe the offeror's past experience relevant to the bulleted items above. This should include:

- A list of at least three, but no more than five, current and past clients (served within the last two years) and the name and phone number of the principal contacts at those organizations.
- List of similar surveys conducted currently and within the last 3 years and final reports from those surveys.
- Summary of bidder's general qualifications to carry out required tasks and fulfill statement of work, including additional firm personnel and resources beyond those of the designated account project director.

In addition, the organization undertaking the work must demonstrate:

- Low staff turnover
- Ability and success in meeting high survey response rates
- High quality data security and privacy standards
- Adherence to budget limitations
- Responsiveness to the client needs
- Timeliness and acceptability of project deliverables

8.1.3 Business Proposal

The business proposal will contain all information related to the determination of the costs associated with each of the project's tasks. The Business Proposal shall be prepared in accordance with the solicitation requirements in Section L and shall include detailed labor cost information reported *by task as well as subtask* for all staff, consultants, and subcontractors assigned to work on the contract. In addition, the cost of labor per hour shall be provided by task for each staff assigned to work on the contract. Other costs such as reproduction costs, communication costs, and supplies should be separately listed by task. The offerors shall budget travel costs at government per diem rates posted on www.gsa.gov. The successful bidder must

present an overall budget for the entire project with separate budget breakdowns by task and subtask. A Microsoft Excel 2007 chart for the proposed contract budget shall also be submitted on a CD, together with the printed budgets in the business proposal.

8.1.4 Award Fee Plan

The proposed contract will be a Cost Plus Award fee contract, with a base fee negotiated at contract award. Offerors may propose an award fee plan to address the following specific areas of importance and objectives identified in tasks 5, 6 and 7 of the Statement of Work, not the overall contract tasks. The proposed award fee will be negotiated at contract award and will be based on the contractor accomplishment of the following three objectives:

- (1) Achieving survey response rates at or above the 85% response rates required in the contract (see Task 5, subtask 5.3);
- (2) Achieving 100% data accuracy (see Task 6).
- (3) Completing final data tables within 12 months of contract award (see Task 7).

The offeror's proposed award fee plan with defined evaluation measures and timelines will be reviewed and negotiated at contract award, and administered in accordance with applicable federal acquisition regulations and provisions. In accordance with FAR 16.405-2, the award fee amount and determination of the award fee eligibility are unilateral decisions made solely at the discretion of the Government and are not subject to disputes provisions of the contract.

8.1.5 Past Performance Report

The offeror shall also provide a Past Performance Report as part of the technical response to the Statement of Work. Section L of the solicitation provides information on the requirements for the Past Performance Report. This report shall consist of short abstracts of related work, for four previous projects completed during the past three years that identify clearly both the names of staff members who were participants and the name, current affiliation, and current telephone number of the sponsor's project officer. These project officers may be asked to report their experience with the bidder on relevant projects with regard to the size, problems (if any), cost overruns (if any), responsiveness, flexibility, and project quality. A form for filling in the Past Performance Report is provided as Attachment B to the solicitation.

8.2 Use of Subcontractors

Proposals may include plans to subcontract parts of the work, provided evidence is presented that the proposed subcontractor has agreed to participate and is fully capable of performing the assigned tasks and that the offeror will have effective control of the subcontractor's work on the project. Contracts that include subcontractors shall be executed in accordance with the

requirements of the prime contract, which is proposed as a Cost Plus Award Fee contract. For the purposes of responding to the solicitation, each proposed subcontractor shall submit detailed cost proposals adhering to similar requirements described in the RFP. Subcontractor cost proposals may, if the contractor desires, be sent separately to the Governing Board or may be included with the prime contractor's budget submission. Invoice submission by the subcontractors shall be through the prime contractor and shall provide detail as requested of the prime contractor.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Public Law 107-279, Title III: The National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, Sections 301-305; available at <http://nagb.org/who-we-are/naep-law.htm>

Appendix B: 12th Grade Student Achievement in America: A New Vision for NAEP, A Report to the National Assessment Governing Board; available at http://www.nagb.org/publications/12_gr_commission_rpt.pdf.

Appendix C: Overview of NAEP 12th Grade Preparedness Studies (appended)

Appendix D: Report of Technical Panel on 12th Grade Preparedness Research; available at <http://www.nagb.org/newsroom/PressReleasePDFs/12grade-preparedness-report.pdf>.

Appendix E: Draft Survey of Postsecondary Institutions (appended)

Appendix F: Sample Invoice Format (appended)

Appendix C: Overview of NAEP 12th Grade Preparedness Studies

OVERVIEW

The report of the National Commission on NAEP 12th Grade Assessment and Reporting included a recommendation that NAEP report on the readiness of 12th graders for college, the military, and workplace. Since that report was accepted by the Board in March 2004, an extensive array of information and data has been collected to inform our work, and each Board committee has engaged in activities related to this recommendation. Key activities have included:

- **September 2004 – February 2005:** Experts wrote five papers on specific issues regarding 12th grade preparedness.
- **April 2005:** A full-day interim meeting of each Board committee was convened to study the issues and reach agreement on next steps for preparedness and other recommendations of the National Commission.
- **2004 – 2006:** Two separate ad hoc committees of the Board were formed – the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP 12th Grade Participation and Motivation (formed March 2004) and the Ad Hoc Committee on Planning for NAEP 12th Grade Assessments in 2009 (formed November 2005). These committees studied the issues, consulted with experts, and made recommendations to the Board.
- **May 2005:** The Governing Board unanimously approved a resolution to “pursue assessment and reporting on 12th grade student achievement as it relates to preparedness for postsecondary pursuits, such as college-credit course work, training for employment, and entrance into the military, as measured by an assessment consistent with that purpose;”
- **2005 – 2006:** Revisions to the reading and mathematics frameworks and assessments for grade 12, based on recommendations from a review by Achieve, Inc., were approved by the Governing Board for measuring knowledge and skills needed for students to demonstrate academic preparedness in these subjects.
- **November 2006:** The Board approved appointment of the Technical Panel on 12th Grade Preparedness Research.
- **November 2008:** The Board accepted the final report of the Technical Panel including the general research approach and recommendations for research studies to report 12th grade preparedness for reading and mathematics in 2009.
- **March 2009:** The Board approved a program of preparedness research studies.

A foundational aspect of the program of research is in the categories proposed. Based on the Technical Panel report, four categories of research studies will be pursued:

1. statistical linking studies
2. content alignment studies
3. judgmental standard setting studies
4. surveys

Studies to Establish Statistical Relationships: Highest priority is generally placed on these studies that establish statistical relationships between NAEP and another assessment. The

College Board has agreed to partner with us for a study to relate SAT scores in reading and in mathematics to NAEP scores for grade 12. This will provide a statistical linking of SAT and NAEP scores for all students in the 2009 grade 12 NAEP who had taken the SAT by June 2009. Similarly, the Florida Department of Education has agreed to provide data for students who are 12th graders in 2009 to be merged with NAEP assessment records, as well as to update the data for those students to track their post-secondary activities related to academic preparedness in these subject areas. An elaborate design has been developed to accomplish the task of matching NAEP 2009 performance with SAT scores and Florida student data. The need for strict confidentiality, security, and quality control is extremely high on the part of all parties to these study plans. A plan to allow for electronic transfers of data has been developed to keep secure the identity of students, consistent with the NAEP legislation and requirements of each assessment program.

From NAEP's state-representative sample of Florida 12th graders, we plan to match NAEP scores for these subjects to ACT, ACCUPLACER, COMPASS, and WorkKeys. We will also gather employment data and salary data for Florida examinees, along with course grades in college and job training programs, but these data on post-secondary activities will not be available in the initial round of NAEP reporting on preparedness.

The Governing Board staff continues to seek opportunities for working with the ASVAB program and gaining access to data for use in preparedness for job training programs.

Content Alignment Studies: Content alignment studies are a basis for the trail of evidence needed for establishing the validity of preparedness reporting. The alignment studies will inform the interpretations of preparedness research data and help to shape the statements that can be made about preparedness. Content alignment studies will help evaluate the extent to which NAEP content overlaps with that of the other assessments to be used in preparedness research.

Judgmental Standard Setting Studies: A series of judgmental standard setting studies will be conducted to produce preparedness reference points on the NAEP scale for entry into job training programs, for placement in college credit-bearing courses (or remedial courses), and to represent criteria associated with college "readiness."

The plan is to convene panels of subject matter experts (SMEs)—content (reading or mathematics) experts and experts in college placement or job training, for example—to develop criteria to serve as the performance standards for the specific preparedness area (college or job training placement). After the criteria are established for preparedness in the relevant post-secondary areas, then judgmental standard setting studies will be implemented to set cut scores on NAEP to represent these criteria.

Surveys: A survey of two-year and four-year post-secondary institutions (study number 6 in the chart below), to include vocational training programs in two-year institutions, is underway to gather information regarding the course placement tests used, scores in reading and mathematics below which remedial reading and mathematics course placement results, and scores for placement in credit-bearing entry level courses in reading and mathematics. The survey will include a comprehensive sample of all accredited higher education institutions. Results will be

analyzed according to several attributes of the institutions, including enrollment size and level of selectivity for admissions.

The following chart includes the studies planned in each category. The studies, taken together, are intended to comprise a coherent program of research, aimed at providing mutually confirmatory and cross-validating information for reporting preparedness of 12th graders.

**Studies Recommended for 12th Grade Preparedness Research
Listed by Priority within Study Category**

Studies for Reading and Mathematics
Studies Completed or Underway
1. Preliminary Content Alignment Study NAEP–SAT
2. Draft Design Document for Content Alignment Studies
3. NAEP–WorkKeys Content Alignment
4. ID Exemplar Job Training Programs: Military & Civilian
5. ACT Standards for College Preparedness: Item Classification
6. Survey of course placement assessments and cut scores used by nationally representative sample of higher education institutions by type of institution (2-year & 4-year; public & private; open admission, & selectivity).
Develop Statistical Relationships between NAEP and Other Assessments
7. National NAEP Sample and SAT Examinees: Collect Data and Produce Statistical Relationship
8. Florida Study (Collect data to link NAEP with SAT, ACT, ACCUPLACER, COMPASS, WorkKeys): Collection and analysis for each assessment and subject
9. NAEP–ASVAB (Subject to data availability)
Content Alignment Studies
10. Full-Scale NAEP–SAT Content Alignment
11. Full-Scale NAEP–ACCUPLACER Content Alignment
12. Full-Scale NAEP–ASVAB Content Alignment
Judgmental Studies
13. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) develop job-training criteria to be used in standard setting studies for 5-7 exemplar jobs
14. Panel to Set Cut Scores for Job Training in Exemplar Job: Pilot (1)
15. SMEs Develop Course Placement Standards
16. Panel to Set Cut Scores for College Course Placement: Pilot (1)
17. Replicate Panels to Set Cut Scores for College Course Placement
18. SAT Standards for College Success: Cut Scores for NAEP Pilot (1)
19. SAT Standards for College Success: Cut Scores for NAEP

Appendix E: Draft Survey of Postsecondary Institutions

Draft survey begins on next page

DRAFT

**National Assessment Governing Board
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002
USE OF PLACEMENT TESTS AND CUT-SCORES IN
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

FORM APPROVED

O.M.B. No.:
EXPIRATION DATE:

This survey is authorized by law (P.L. 103-382). While participation in this survey is voluntary, your cooperation is critical to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

Definition of Remedial/Developmental Education Courses for Purposes of This Study:

Courses in reading or mathematics for college students lacking those skills necessary to be placed into standard, entry-level, credit-bearing college courses as determined by your institution. Throughout this questionnaire, these courses are referred to as "remedial/developmental." However, your institution may use other names such as "compensatory" or "basic skills," or some other term for such courses.

In addition to the words "remedial" or "developmental," such courses in reading may also have names like College Reading Skills or Critical and Evaluative Reading, and, in some cases, may make no reference to "reading" in their title. In mathematics, names for such courses may include Finite Mathematics, Basic Algebra and College Mathematics. In general, these courses are considered to be below standard, entry-level, credit-bearing courses and do not fulfill your institution's general education requirements.

Please answer the survey for any courses meeting the definition above, regardless of name; however, do not include English as a second language (ESL) when taught primarily to foreign students. . Please include the information requested, even if your students take remedial courses at another institution, if the placement decision is made by your institution.

Please answer for your regular undergraduate degree programs. Use data from your institutional records whenever possible. If exact data are not available, then give your best estimate.

NOTE: IPEDS INSTITUTIONAL ID NUMBER TO BE INCLUDED HERE

IF ABOVE INSTITUTION INFORMATION AND/OR IPEDS ID NUMBER IS INCORRECT, PLEASE UPDATE DIRECTLY ON LABEL.

Name of Person Completing This Form: _____

Title/Position: _____

Telephone Number: _____ E-mail: _____

THANK YOU. PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THIS SURVEY FOR YOUR RECORDS.

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED FORM TO:

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, CONTACT:

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is _____. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, OR If you have any comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, please write directly to: National Assessment Governing Board, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, Washington, DC 20002.

DRAFT

1. Did your institution enroll any first time beginning students who were recent high school graduates (i.e., who graduated in the last 1-2 years) in fall 2009?
 Yes..... 1 (*Continue with question 2.*) No 2 (*Stop. Complete respondent section on front and return questionnaire.*)

2. Did your institution offer any remedial/developmental reading or mathematics courses (as defined on the front of this questionnaire) in fall 2009?
 Yes..... 1 (*Skip to question 4.*) No 2 (*Continue with question 3.*)

3. Which of the following are reasons that your institution did not offer any remedial/developmental (R/D) courses in fall 2009? (*Circle "yes" or "no" on each line and all that apply.*)

	Yes	No
a. R/D courses are not needed by students at this institution	1	2
b. Students at this institution who need remediation take R/D courses offered by another institution	1	2
c. State policy or law does not allow this institution to offer R/D courses	1	2
d. Institutional policy does not allow this institution to offer R/D I courses	1	2
e. Other reason (<i>specify</i>) _____		

4. Enter information requested in Parts a-c for remedial/developmental courses in each subject area in **fall 2009**. For those subjects (*reading or mathematics*) in which you have no remedial/developmental courses, enter "no" in part a and skip parts b-c and questions 5. and 6.as appropriate.

Remedial/developmental course information	Reading	Math
a. Did your institution offer remedial/developmental courses in this subject in fall 2009? (<i>Enter yes or no.</i>)		
b.. What is your institution's general policy on the type of credit students earn from remedial/developmental courses? (<i>Enter the appropriate number under each column.</i>) 1 = Degree credit, meets institution's general education requirements 2 = Degree credit, elective only 3 = Institutional credit (e.g., counts toward financial aid, progression through R/D course sequence, campus housing, full-time student status, etc.) 4 = No credit		
c.. What is your institution's general policy on identifying students who should be placed into remedial/developmental courses? (<i>Enter the appropriate number under each column.</i>) 1 = All entering students are expected to take placement tests to determine need for remediation 2 = Entering students who score below a certain level on the SAT/ACT are given placement tests to determine need for remediation (indicate the score for reading_____ and for mathematics_____). 3 = Faculty or staff refer students for enrollment in remedial/developmental courses 4 = Students refer themselves for enrollment in remedial/developmental courses 5 = Other (<i>specify</i>) _____		

5. In fall 2009, what percentage of first time beginning students, who are recent high school graduates, enrolled in **any** remedial courses in reading?_____
6. In fall 2009, what percentage of first time beginning students, who are recent high school graduates, enrolled in **any** remedial courses in mathematics?_____

DRAFT

7. In the table below, please indicate the test(s) used for placement and the cut-score below which students are placed into reading and mathematics remedial/developmental courses (this should be the same score at or above which students are placed into standard, entry-level, credit-bearing courses).

If your institution **exempts from placement testing** students who score at a certain level on the ACT or SAT, please indicate that as well in the indicated column.

Please respond to questions 8 and 9 if your institution employs placement tests developed for use by your institution specifically or for use statewide, whether in addition to or in place of those listed in the chart below.

Assessments/Tests and Cut-Scores Used for Placement in Remedial Reading and Mathematics Courses and For Exemption from Placement Testing			
	Print the score below which placement is indicated for Remedial/ Developmental Reading Courses and at or above which students are placed into standard, entry-level credit-bearing courses requiring college level reading skills (e.g., psychology, history, etc.)	Print the score below which placement is indicated for Remedial/ Developmental Mathematics Courses and at or above which students are placed into standard, entry-level credit-bearing mathematics courses (e.g., college algebra, calculus)	Print the score at or above which exemption from Placement Testing is granted AND the percentage of first time beginning students who were recent high school graduates who were exempt in Fall 2009
<i>Check the assessment or test used.</i> ↓			
<input type="checkbox"/> ACT Composite			
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reading			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)			
<input type="checkbox"/> SAT I Composite			
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics			
<input type="checkbox"/> Verbal			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)			
<input type="checkbox"/> COMPASS			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reading Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> ACCUPLACER			
<input type="checkbox"/> Arithmetic Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary Algebra Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> College Level			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reading Comprehension			
<input type="checkbox"/> ASSET			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reading Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics Test			
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (specify test name and cut score)			

DRAFT

8. Please complete the table below, as appropriate to your institution, for tests other than those in question 7, which are developed for use statewide and/or for your institution.

Placement Tests Developed for Use Statewide and/or for Your Institution	Reading	Math
What was the source of the placement tests employed by your institution in fall 2009? <i>(Enter the appropriate number under each column.)</i> 1 = Developed for use statewide 2 = Developed for this institution only 3 = Other (please explain)		

9. Please describe briefly the reading skills required by your institution or system for placement into standard, entry-level, credit bearing courses that require college level reading, as measured by the placement test.

10. Please describe briefly the mathematics skills required by your institution or system for placement into standard, entry-level, credit bearing courses in mathematics as measured by the placement test.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

**PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THIS SURVEY FOR YOUR
RECORDS**

Appendix F: Sample Invoice Format

Two original copies of invoices need to be submitted to:

Ms. Remona Flowers
 National Assessment Governing Board
 800 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 825
 Washington, DC 20002

Contract # ED-09-XXXXXXXXXX

Period of Performance:

Billing Period:

Direct Labor: \$

Other Direct Costs: \$

Description	Contract Budget	Current Expenditures	Cumulative Expenditures	Contract Balance	% of Budget Expended
<i>(Illustrative budget numbers & percentages)</i>					
Task 1 Attend In-Person Meeting	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 2 Design Methodology & select field test and main samples	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 3 Production of survey instruments	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 4: Technical Review Panel	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 5: Data Collection (Total and by subtask)	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Subtask 5.1 Field Test	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Subtask 5.2 Survey Administration	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Subtask 5.3 Obtain required Response Rate	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 6: Data receipt, processing...etc	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 7: Data analysis and presentation	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Task 8: Project planning, management, oversight	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	20%
Total Contract	\$1,100,000	\$55,000	\$220,000	\$880,000	80%

Attachment B: Past Performance Report

U.S. Department of Education

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE INFORMATION		
Contractor Name and Address (Identify Division)		1. Contract Number:
		2. Type of Contract:
		3. Contract Value (Current plus any unexercised options): \$
(Please correct the above as needed.)		4. Period of Performance (including any option periods):
5. Description of Requirement:		
6. Ratings. Summarize contractor performance and circle or type in the number below that corresponds to the performance rating for each category. Please see the attachment, which explains the rating scale.		
Quality:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
Problem Resolution:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
Cost Control:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
Timeliness:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
Business Relations:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
Customer Service:	0 1 2 3 4	Comments:
7. Total score:		

Evaluated by:

Agency/Organization _____ Date _____

(In accordance with the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, the following information will not be released to the contractor.)

Name and Title:

Telephone Number:

Signature:

E-Mail Address:

Please return this form to the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
National Assessment Governing Board
800 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 825
Washington, DC 20002-4233

Or e-mail to: Stephen.Swearingen@ed.gov
Or fax to: [202-357-6945](tel:202-357-6945)
Attn: [Stephen Swearingen](#)
RFP # **ED-NAG-09-0007**

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION—SEE FAR 3.104

Information entered on this form will be used in source selection decisions and is protected under subsection 3.104 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Do not disclose information entered on this form to the contractor or to any other person except as authorized by the Department of Education contracting officer.

Supplementary Questions

To assist the Department of Education Contracting Officer, we would greatly appreciate your taking the time to answer the following questions, if any, related to the contractor's past performance:

1. How effective was the contractor in achieving required survey respondent participation rates?
2. What was the required respondent participation rate under your contract and what was the achieved rate?
3. What strategies for reaching the achieved respondent participation rate were particularly effective?

Contractor Performance Evaluation

Instructions for Completing Contractor Performance Information Form

Based on the rating area elements presented below and the rating guidelines on the back of this sheet, please evaluate contractor performance in each of the rating areas. On the “Contractor Performance Information” form, circle (or type in the “Comments:” area) the rating from 0 to 4 that most closely matches your evaluation of the contractor’s performance. Please add written comments for each rating. If you wish, you may attach additional comments or information. We would also appreciate your answers to the specific questions, if any, on the back of the form. Please return the form to the address indicated on the back of the form. Thank you for your time and your cooperation.

The Department of Education will use the information from this form to evaluate offerors competing for contract awards. We may release the information from this form to the contractor during negotiations or debriefings. If we release information from this form, we will not release your name to the contractor.

Elements within Each Rating Area

Quality of Product or Service

- Compliance with contract requirements
- Accuracy of reports
- Appropriateness of personnel
- Technical excellence

Problem Resolution

- Anticipates and avoids or mitigates problems
- Satisfactorily overcomes or resolves problems
- Prompt notification of problems
- Pro-active
- Effective contractor-recommended solutions

Cost Control

- Within budget
- Current, accurate and complete billings
- Costs properly allocated
- Unallowable costs not billed
- Relationship of negotiated costs to actual
- Cost efficiencies

Timeliness of Performance

- Meets interim milestones
- Reliable
- Stays on schedule despite problems
- Responsive to technical direction
- Completes work on time, including wrap-up and contract administration
- No liquidated damages assessed

Business Relations

- Effective management
- Use of performance-based management techniques
- Business-like concern for the customer's interests
- Effective management and selection of subcontractors
- Effective small/small disadvantaged business subcontracting program
- Reasonable/cooperative behavior
- Effective use of technology in management and communication
- Flexible
- Minimal staff turnover
- Maintains high employee morale
- Resolves disagreements without being unnecessarily litigious.

Customer Service

- Understands and embraces service and program goals
- Team approach with the customer
- Satisfaction of end users with the contractor's service
- Positive customer feedback
- Prompt responses
- Courteous interactions
- Effective escalations and referrals
- Initiative and proactive improvements
- Creative service strategies

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Nonconformance jeopardizes the achievement of contract goals; default.
- 1 – Poor Nonconformance requires major agency intervention to ensure achievement of contract goals; show cause or cure notices.
- 2 – Fair Quality meets specifications in most cases, however, some agency intervention required to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
- 3 – Good Quality meets specifications in all cases.
- 4 – Excellent Quality exceeds specifications in some cases.

Problem Resolution

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Inadequately resolved problems jeopardize contract goals.
- 1 – Poor Significant agency intervention required to resolve problems jeopardizing contract goals.
- 2 – Fair Some agency intervention required to resolve problems jeopardizing contract goals.
- 3 – Good Successfully overcomes or resolves all problems and achieves contract goals with minimal agency intervention.
- 4 – Excellent Anticipates and avoids most problems and successfully overcomes all unforeseen problems.

Cost Control

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Cost increases jeopardize achievement of contract goals; or billings routinely include unallowable costs.
- 1 – Poor Significant cost increases; or some inaccurate billings including some with unallowable costs.
- 2 – Fair Minor cost increases; or some inaccurate billings, but a minimal (1-2) number with unallowable costs.
- 3 – Good Contractor performed within costs; but some late billings, none with unallowable costs.
- 4 – Excellent Costs were less than the amount cited in the contract; and billings accurate and timely.

Timeliness of Performance

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Delays jeopardize the achievement of contract goals.
- 1 – Poor Other significant delays.
- 2 – Fair Minor delays.
- 3 – Good All deliverables on time.
- 4 – Excellent All deliverables on time with some ahead of schedule; or stays on schedule despite unforeseen circumstances.

Business Relations

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Unethical or illegal business practices.
- 1 – Poor Business practices are not attuned to customer support.
- 2 – Fair Business practices are somewhat attuned to customer support.
- 3 – Good Business practices focus on customer support.
- 4 – Excellent Highly effective, proactive business practices focused on customer support.

Customer Service

- 0 – Unsatisfactory Response to service requests is routinely late, ineffective, or rude; customers express frustration or anger about many interactions; complaints are unresolved; contractor seems unaware of service issues.
- 1 – Poor Response to service requests is often late, ineffective or rude; some complaints are resolved.
- 2 – Fair Response to service requests is uneven in timing or effectiveness; customer interactions are tenuous; contractor is trying hard and understands service issues.
- 3 – Good Response to service requests is timely, effective and courteous; customers express positive feedback; delivery of service is smooth and organized; collects customer feedback; customer problems are resolved well.
- 4 – Excellent Highly effective, focused on customer support and satisfaction.