



Francis Howell R-III School District Request for Proposals K-12 Assessment Management and Instructional Assessment Platform

Addendum I October 16, 2026 - Questions and Clarifications Pertaining to the RFP

Vendor 1:

1. Before the October 14 question deadline, would FHSD accept a proposal led by the platform provider with BlueLine identified as a disclosed subcontractor? If so, may the required comparable-district references be supplied by the prime platform provider for the platform scope, with each party's responsibilities and experience clearly separated?
 - a. The proposer does not have to disclose subcontractors in the RFP response. If the platform provider submits a response and in order to fulfill the requirements of the RFP, they require subcontractor work, that is solely on the proposer to monitor the subcontractor. The contract will be between the proposer and the District.
 - b. References are needed for the proposer only. Subcontractors will have no weight on the decision by the District. Our reference review will solely be done on how the proposer is qualified and whether they meet the requirements of the RFP. How they come to a final product being requested is completely up to them.

Vendor 2:

1. The RFP states on page 2 that proposals must be mailed to you, however on page 13 it says the proposals can be emailed or mailed. Please confirm that we can email our response.
 - a. The certification form is part of the submission requirements. By signing the certification form you are agreeing to send in one physical copy of the RFP and/or one digital copy of the RFP (email is fine). So either method of delivery is acceptable.
2. Please clarify that a project plan/timeline is NOT required in the written proposal for phase 1.
 - b. A detailed implementation schedule is not required as a separate deliverable during Phase 1. However, vendors should address the implementation and transition requirements outlined in the Scope of Work, including their proposed approach and ability to support implementation. The selected vendor will be required to provide a detailed implementation schedule following Board approval and execution of the agreement.

Vendor 3:

1. What is the current assessment platform being replaced, and can FHSD provide details/sample exports of the data expected to be migrated?
 - a. The current platform is Instructure Mastery Connect.
 - b. A sample export cannot be provided as the current platform does not support all requests from the District listed in the Scope of Work
 - c. Vendors should describe their migration capabilities, limitations, and associated costs as requested in the RFP.
2. What volumes are expected to be migrated: assessments, items/questions, student historical results, standards, users and years of history?
 - a. The District has not specified migration volumes or the number of historical years. Vendors should identify the types of data they can migrate and any limitations or associated costs.
 - b. We would like to migrate all assessments that are in use K-12 in our current platform during the 26-27 SY. We currently have approximately 2500 district created assessments that are CFAs and Summatives on our essential priority standards. Each assessment has between 5-20 questions.
3. Is migration of historical student results mandatory for go-live, or can historical data remain accessible through an archive/export?
 - a. We will house our historical student assessment data in our data warehouse and the new vendor will not need to house that information.
4. Please confirm the systems vendor must integrate with at go-live, including the LMS, SSO/identity platform, data warehouse/reporting systems and other instructional platforms.
 - a. Infinite Campus, Clever, eduCLIMBER, Canvas
5. For Infinite Campus, what integration scope is required? Rostering only, or also courses/classes, demographics, accommodations, assessment results and gradebook write-back? What integration method/version is currently used or preferred (OneRoster/API/SFTP/etc.)?
 - a. OneRoster is what we are currently using- it needs to include our courses/classes, demographics, accommodations, etc
 - b. Vendors should identify supported integration capabilities, methods, and any additional fees.
6. Which SSO solution will FHSD actually use at launch (Google, Microsoft, Clever, ClassLink, SAML/OAuth), and is automated user provisioning/de-provisioning required?
 - a. Clever
 - b. Vendors should identify support for the authentication options listed in Section 3.0 and describe their available user-management capabilities.

7. Please provide expected licensed-user volumes by type: students, teachers, administrators and other staff, and clarify whether pricing should cover all 17,000+ students / 2,200+ employees / 23 campuses.
 - a. The District can not currently specify licensed-user quantities by role.
 - b. Vendors should clearly identify their pricing assumptions and any associated user or licensing limits.
8. What are FHSD's expected peak concurrent-user volumes and major district-wide assessment windows?
 - a. We have quarterly assessment windows that fall at the end of each quarter and are open for 2-3 weeks (October, November, March, May)
 - b. Vendors should describe system availability, capacity, and performance capabilities as requested in the RFP.
9. For paper/pencil assessments, what capability is expected—printable assessments only, or scanning, answer-sheet generation, automated ingestion/scoring, and associated hardware/software?
 - a. The RFP identifies paper/pencil assessments as a supported administration option where available. It does not specify a requirement for scanning, automated scoring, answer-sheet generation, or associated hardware.
 - b. Vendors should describe their available capabilities and any additional fees.
10. Which accessibility/accommodation capabilities are mandatory for go-live versus desirable, particularly text-to-speech, alternative formats and individual accommodations? Is WCAG 2.1 AA sufficient, or will FHSD require a specific VPAT/ACR result/remediation commitment?
 - a. The District requires compliance with WCAG 2.1 AA and requests an Accessibility Conformance Report (ACR/VPAT) or equivalent documentation.
 - b. Vendors should identify their compliance and available capabilities in their response or provide a roadmap for compliance.
11. What level of report/dashboard configurability is expected: configuration of existing reports, creation of new reports by FHSD administrators, or vendor-developed custom reports?
 - a. The RFP requests configurable reports and identifies capabilities such as filtering, customization, saving configurations, exporting, printing, scheduling, and sharing reports. Vendors should describe the reporting capabilities available in their proposed solution.
12. What training delivery and quantities should be included in the base price—number of sessions, attendees, on-site days, virtual sessions and train-the-trainer expectations?
 - a. Vendors should identify their proposed services and associated costs.

- 13.** What are the expected scope, duration, number of users/schools and configuration/integration requirements for the finalist pilot? Will production integrations/data migration be expected during the pilot?
- a. The RFP states that finalist vendors may be asked to provide platform access or sample assessment materials for a limited pilot or hands-on evaluation by selected FHSD staff.
 - b. The District has not specified the pilot's duration, size, or required production integrations or migration.
- 14.** Please confirm the required production go-live/acceptance date and whether FHSD expects a phased rollout or a single district-wide launch. What constitutes formal implementation acceptance?
- a. The RFP identifies a target implementation of Summer 2027, with the system ready for District use before the start of the 2027–2028 school year or August 23, 2026.
 - b. The RFP does not specify whether rollout must be phased or districtwide at once, or define formal implementation acceptance.
- 15.** What contract term should pricing assume (initial term and renewal periods), and should implementation, migration, integrations, training, licensing and ongoing support be separately priced?
- a. Assume one year contract term and renewals
 - b. Proposal shall include total cost per year and any additional costs not included in the per year cost, shall be itemized.
- 16.** Please confirm whether the performance/payment bonds, prevailing-wage, OSHA training and drug-testing provisions in the General Terms apply to this SaaS/software implementation and remote professional services.
- a. Not required.
- 17.** Are there mandatory SLA targets for uptime, support response/resolution, disaster recovery (RTO/RPO), incident notification and service credits, or should vendors propose their standard SLA?
- a. The District has not established numerical SLA targets.
 - b. Vendors shall identify their support hours, response times, escalation procedures, service-level commitments, uptime commitments, disaster recovery, and applicable remedies or service credits; or
 - c. Standard SLA as long as it includes information in 17.b above.
- 18.** Are there any FHSD-specific security/privacy requirements, security questionnaires, penetration-testing requirements, data-residency requirements or contractual security terms beyond those stated in the RFP that the selected vendor must satisfy?
- a. Vendors need to negotiate a Data Privacy Agreement with our Student Data Privacy Consortium (<https://privacy.a4l.org/privacy-community/>)
 - b. As for penetration-testing requirements or other contractual security terms, we do not have any FHSD-specific requirements.

Vendor 4:

1. Please identify the District's current assessment platform and provide estimated volumes and available export formats for assessments, item-bank questions, standards alignments, student responses, scores, and historical results expected to be migrated.
 - a. The current platform is Instructure Mastery Connect.
 - b. A sample export cannot be provided as the current platform does not support all requests from the District listed in the Scope of Work.
 - c. Vendors should describe their migration capabilities, limitations, and associated costs as requested in the RFP.
 - d. The District has not specified migration volumes or the number of historical years. Vendors should identify the types of data they can migrate and any limitations or associated costs.
 - e. We would like to migrate all assessments that are in use K-12 in our current platform during the 26-27 SY. We currently have approximately 2500 district created assessments that are CFAs and Summatives on our essential priority standards. Each assessment has between 5-20 questions.
2. In addition to Infinite Campus, please identify the LMS, SSO or identity provider, data warehouse, and other instructional systems that must be integrated for initial launch, including the required standards, synchronization frequency, and authoritative source for users, enrollments, and course rosters.
 - a. Infinite Campus, Clever, eduCLIMBER, Canvas.
 - b. Clever for SSO launch.
 - c. OneRoster is what we are currently using- it needs to include our courses/classes, demographics, accommodations, etc
 - d. Vendors should identify supported integration capabilities, methods, and any additional fees.
3. Please confirm the anticipated initial contract term and renewal structure, the populations that must be licensed, expected peak concurrent student usage, and whether pricing should include unlimited assessments and assessment attempts.
 - a. Assume one year contract term and renewals
 - b. Proposal shall include total cost per year and any additional costs not included in the per year cost, shall be itemized.
 - c. The District can not currently specify licensed-user quantities by role.
 - d. Vendors should clearly identify their pricing assumptions and any associated user or licensing limits.

4. Is the selected vendor expected to provide pre-authored, standards-aligned assessment items or licensed item banks, or is the required scope limited to tools for creating, importing, organizing, and administering District-owned content?
 - a. The RFP seeks a K–12 assessment management and instructional assessment platform that supports assessment creation, item banks, standards alignment, and assessment administration. The RFP does not require vendors to provide pre-authored, standards-aligned assessment items or licensed item banks as a mandatory component of the proposed solution. Vendors should describe any available pre-authored assessment content or licensed item banks, including associated costs, as part of their proposals. The District will evaluate these capabilities in accordance with the requirements and evaluation criteria established in the RFP.
5. Please confirm whether the five required references must currently use the proposed K–12 assessment-management platform and whether references from public school districts outside Missouri are acceptable; please also clarify the Attachment 2A reference to “broker/consultant services.”
 - a. The RFP requires a minimum of five (5) references that are presently using services similar to those requested. References are not required to be using the exact proposed platform, provided they can speak to the vendor’s experience providing comparable assessment-management or instructional assessment services.
 - b. References from public school districts outside Missouri are acceptable. The RFP does not restrict references to Missouri school districts.
 - c. The reference to “broker/consultant services” in Attachment 2A is not applicable to this solicitation and is included in error. Vendors should instead list current public school district clients receiving services similar to those described in this RFP, including the district name and contact information.