



Lexington County School District One

**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION
PT2024.7 Instructional Design and Curriculum Development**

Solicitation Number: **PT2024.7**
Date Issued: **06/03/2024**
Procurement Officer: **Elizabeth Marsh**
EMarsh
Phone: **803-821-1176**
E-Mail Address: **emarsh@lexington1.**

AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO: **One**

1. ISSUED BY: **Lexington County School District One
100 Tarrar Springs Road, Procurement Office
Lexington, South Carolina 29072
Attn: Elizabeth Marsh, Director of Procurement**

2. CONTRACTOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS:

3. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.:

Amendment Sol. PT2024.7

4. THIS BLOCK APPLIES ONLY TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS:

THE ABOVE NUMBERED SOLICITATIONS IS AMENDED AS SET FORTH IN BLOCK 5.

5. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT:

Vendor questions and answers start on page 2.

6. [N/A] CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR IS TO SIGN THIS DOCUMENT AND RETURN TO LEXINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT ONE AT ADDRESS SHOWN ABOVE. FAILURE TO RETURN WITH BID MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.

7. CONTRACTOR'S SIGNATURE

8. CONTRACTOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS:

BY : _____
(SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE)

9. DATE SIGNED : _____

10. LEXINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT ONE

11. NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

BY: *EMarsh*
(SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE)

**Elizabeth Marsh, CPPB, NIGP-CPP
Director of Procurement**

12. DATESIGNED:4/19/2024

Amendment

THE SOLICITATION IS AMENDED AS PROVIDED HEREIN. ANY RESTATEMENT OF PART OR ALL OF AN EXISTING PROVISION OF THE SOLICITATION DOES NOT MODIFY THE ORIGINAL PROVISION EXCEPT AS FOLLOWS: UNDERLINED RED TEXT IS ADDED TO THE ORIGINAL PROVISION. STRICKEN TEXT IS DELETED.

Instructions for Technical Proposal- Section 3 the following is stricken:

~~2. Service Provider Security Assessment Questionnaire — Offerors must complete and submit a copy of the Service Provider Security Assessment Questionnaire (Attachment 2 to this solicitation)~~

~~4. Provide a sample of your software licensing agreement or SaaS agreement and service level agreement. Offeror must label these documents as “sample”.~~

End Modifications

Questions Received:

Question 1. Is it correct that the curriculum is to be fully developed by the selected vendor? In other words, you do not have existing instructional materials (course outlines, instructional materials, etc.) that we would be starting from or otherwise leveraging?

District Answer: Portions of the modules would be developed by the vendor but please review the names of the modules within the request. “Data-Based Individualization” (DBI) DBI is a research-based process for individualizing and intensifying interventions through the systematic use of assessment data, validated interventions, and research-based adaptation strategies from the National Center for Intensive Intervention and “High Leverage Practices” (HLPs) are practices that were developed and published by the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) for special educators and teacher candidates.

The expectation would be that the vendor has the correct knowledge and background of special education and with those nationally recognized methodologies and practices; and the vendor leverages them to develop instructional materials individualized to Lexington County School District One and our specific needs and know the existing research base.

Question 2. We'd like to know whether the stakeholder/program manager has socialized the idea of what they need by speaking with other vendors prior to the release of this RFP. Usually, that has happened as part of their research. If that has happened, those vendors have much more information than we can ever get via written Q&A. Please let us know whether that happened.

- District Answer:** The district consulted with the following:
- National Center for Intensive Intervention
 - National Center for Systemic Improvement
 - American Institutes for Research
 - National Dropout Prevention Center
 - University of South Carolina

The district initially approached these entities, governmentally funded technical assistance centers, with the intent to Sole Source directly to one of the technical assistance centers, but unfortunately our project was too small in scale to be an option they could consider and instead they provided us with technical assistance and guidance on the things to consider and content to include within the grant.

The district also spoke with the following vendors:

- American Institutes for Research
- Academic Alliance of South Carolina

The district approached in order to conduct research the Academic Alliance of South Carolina (AASC), is a state technical assistance center newly developed and funded by the South Carolina Office of Special Education Services through the University of South Carolina, AASC did provide guidance on things to consider and content to be included in the grant. The District also reached out to the American Institutes for Research in the process of researching this grant who provided information and guidance.

Question 3. Would you kindly confirm if this is an entirely new effort or is there an incumbent currently providing these services? If so, would you please provide the incumbent contract details?

District Answer: The district has spent the 23-24 school year working with the National Center for Intensive Intervention on Data-Based Individualization. While this solicitation would align the work already underway, this solicitation is intended as a new effort.

The work during the 23-24 school year was high level technical assistance to implement DBI. The National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII) provided face-to-face support to train 12 facilitators and all special education teachers at 12 schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools, who were designated at an ATSI school based on the disabled category. NCII worked alongside the district to conduct a 1 day training prior to the start of school with all teachers and facilitators then met quarterly face-to-face with all teachers from the 12 schools. NCII, as a technical assistance center, is funded by a federal grant to provide technical support to SEAs and LEAs, so there was no fiscal encumbrment on the part of the district. NCII is not providing the type of support described in the grant, as it goes beyond the scope of work allowed in their federal grant.

NCII is going to continue to collaborate with the district to continue our implementation of DBI, however not in the way intended in this solicitation. This solicitation is intended to be asynchronous material - provided in a self-paced format, with the ability to be delivered with some, even minimal, district provided facilitation. The work with NCII and the ATSI schools was far more intensive with far more layers of facilitation and accountability than is intended with the materials in this solicitation.

This grant will build on that effort as we will be implementing DBI district wide, in a soft roll out. Additionally the intention of the solicitation goes beyond the scope of work with NCII and includes engaging instructional practices and drop-out/chronic absenteeism portions. There is also a second portion of this grant that is not a part of this solicitation that was Sole Sourced to the state Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) that is about parent engagement and involvement with the intention of decreasing chronic absenteeism.

Question 4. Can you please clarify the meaning of or provide an example of how a vendor would show "record of performance" and "satisfactory record of integrity"? Is this the subcontracting agreements, testimonials, and case studies?

District Answer: The clause referred to is a standard clause in all Lexington County School District One RFP's. The information to be provided in each project would be different. This information is only to be provided if requested from the Procurement Officer.

Question 5. What makes a vendor "qualified legally to contract with the District and State"?

District Answer: The vendor cannot be debarred or suspended with the State of South Carolina or the Federal Government. The vendor must also be able to agree to and abide by all federal and state terms and conditions listed in the solicitation.

Question 6. Per the RFP, vendors are to complete and submit a copy of the Service Provider Security Assessment Questionnaire (Attachment 2). However, Attachment Two does not contain this questionnaire. If this document is applicable, can you please provide it?

District Answer: This requirement has been stricken.

Question 7. Will the organization consider a non-South Carolina business?

District Answer: Yes.

Question 8. What is the budget for this RFP?

District Answer: See page 3 of the solicitation.

Question 9. Can you provide additional information about the expected scale and reach of the learning programs? How many learners/employees are expected to be participants?

District Answer: The intended audience is special education teachers. There are 159 targeted special education teachers related to the grant because of the level of chronic absenteeism at their school, however all special education teachers will have access to the information, which is approximately 275 teachers. Additionally, regular education teachers would be allowed to access. Within school groups, there would be approximately 15 participants working together as cohorts through the courses. Multiple cohorts should be able to access at different points in the course at different times and in different places.

Question 10. Can you provide more specific details about the target audience for the courses/learning/training? Are there specific specialties or professions that should be prioritized?

District Answer: The intended audience is special education teachers. There are 159 targeted special education teachers related to the grant because of the level of chronic absenteeism at their school, however all special education teachers will have access to the information, which is approximately 275 teachers. Additionally, regular education teachers would be allowed to access. Within school groups, there would be approximately 15 participants working together as cohorts through the courses. Multiple cohorts should be able to access at different points in the course at different times and in different places.

Question 11. Is there an incumbent?

District Answer: See question 3.

Question 12. Can the chosen vendor work remotely?

District Answer: Yes.

Question 13. What is the typical learning time (hours/minutes) and the duration of each course/module?

District Answer: This is included in Part A. Refer to the table, the number in parentheses are by the hour. (1)=1 hour (.5)=½ and hour

Question 14. What needs to be designed/developed? Please elaborate. Facilitator/Participant Guide, Lesson Plan,s Supplemental Learning Material, PowerPoint

District Answer: All course materials including syllabus or course guide (participant guide), materials should include video and audio, any powerpoints should be voiced over and any supplemental materials to complete the course.

Question 15. Can you provide an example of the course topics for this RFP?

District Answer: All course topics are in part A of the RFP.

Question 16. In deciding key personnel, the answer to this question is very helpful. Can you please clarify that instructional design and curriculum development is the only thing that's needed (Yes/No)? Please clarify.

District Answer: Instructional design, and curriculum development in a format that is defined in the RFP. The technology requirements are expected to be met.

Question 17. Does the organization have a Subject Matter Expert (SME) who suggested the topic(s)?

District Answer: See question 2.

Question 18. Does the organization currently have any existing material (e.g., manual, PowerPoint, etc.) that speaks to the course topics?

District Answer: See question 2.

Question 19. Do you desire blended learning (e.g., virtual, eLearning/digital learning, etc.)?

District Answer: The materials developed are virtual and asynchronous, the district will use them in blended learning cohorts, but the modules must stand alone.

Question 20. If eLearning is desired, which language(s) should the eLearning modules be developed (e.g., English, Spanish, etc.)?

District Answer: English.

Question 21. Voice-Over/Narration: If eLearning is desired, what is the organization's preference—high quality text-to-speech or human narration?

District Answer: Human narration.

Question 22. Please clarify—Does the organization have its own LMS and a designated LMS administrator to oversee courseware?

District Answer: We have an LMS, but the contracted LMS is subject to change over time. The content needs to be able to transfer to other LMS as needed.

Question 23. Question [(a) This section establishes special standards of responsibility. UNLESS YOU POSSESS THE FOLLOWING MANDATORY MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, DO NOT SUBMIT AN OFFER: Must have within the last three years developed online training using Data-based Individualization (DBI) Framework.] Does the vendor need to have developed intervention-based curricula explicitly? or Does the vendor qualify if they have experience in training districts on how to implement DBI frameworks?

District Answer: The vendor must be able to provide evidence of training of DBI framework.

Question 24. What is your maximum budget for this project?

District Answer: Refer to page 3 of the solicitation.

Question 25. In the instructions for the technical proposal, the district asks that offerors "Provide a sample of your software licensing agreement or SaaS agreement and service level agreement. Offeror

must label these documents as “sample.” If we are not software developers, this is not required, correct?

District Answer: This requirement has been stricken

Question 26. In the instructions for the technical proposal, there is a reference to an attachment (“Service Provider Security Assessment Questionnaire”), which was not included. Will this questionnaire be provided? Or, is it not needed?

District Answer: This requirement has been stricken.

Question 27. In the scope of work (attachment one), the district states that there are two target audiences (educators and parents/guardians). Can the district clarify if each module requires two “tracks” (e.g., one for educators and one for parents/guardians), if there are specific modules that should be targeted for parents/guardians, and/or if each module needs to incorporate elements of parent/family engagement (e.g., resources/handouts that educators can share with parents/guardians about the topics)?

District Answer: The parents and guardians section has been sole sourced and is not part of this RFP.

Question 28. What does the district envision as being the key difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2 modules, aside from their length? For example, is more interactivity expected for the Tier 2 modules? Are they geared to different audiences?

District Answer: Tier 2 would be facilitated by district level staff using the developed modules.

Question 29. Is the train-the-trainer session expected to be in-person?

District Answer: Preferred in person.

Question 30. What is the budget for this RFP?

District Answer: Refer to page 3 of the soliciaiton.

End Amendment