

Vendor 1: Strategic Measurement & Evaluation (SME)

(Ratings: Highly Advantageous, Advantageous, Not Advantageous; HA = 3, A = 2, NA = 1)										
	Vendor's Exp.	Bias-free	MCF Standards	Cog. Demand	Acc - SW D	Acc - EL	User Interface	Overall Min. Req. Tables	TECH. PROPOSAL TOTAL	PRICE RATING
JE	HA	A	A	A	HA	A	HA	NA	18	NA
MV	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	NA	22	NA
BK	HA	A	A	HA	HA	A	A	A	19	
AC	A	NA	A	A	A	A	A	NA	14	NA
DG	HA	A	A	A	A	NA	A	NA	15	NA
MPC	A	NA	A	A	HA	NA	A	HA	16	NA
CL	HA	A	A	NA	A	A	A	NA	15	
								Average	17	

Technical Proposal Rating:

Not Advantageous

Overall Proposal Rating (Technical and Price):

Not Advantageous

Notes:

Highlights	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Custom assessment allows the district to uniquely develop every detail and item specifically for the BPS exam schools admission process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No assessment offered for November 2020 The timeline for customization would require significant stakeholder engagement over a 16 month period A high level of work on the district, i.e. recruitment of teacher panels, students, other stakeholders Price exceeds budget

According to their proposal response, SME will be able to provide almost all of the requirements that we are looking for, including support with registration processes. The vendor responded yes to 48 items, no to 4, 'CR' to 10, however because they are proposing a custom assessment, several key components

would require a significant amount of customization for high stakes costs. Most of the ratings would constitute 'Under Development' or 'Customization Required' based on the proposal. Additionally, their timeline is over a 16 month period for a November 2021 test. BPS would still need a solution for 2020. The RFP was for a three-year contract for test administrations beginning in the fall of 2020.

Vendor 2: NWEA

(Ratings: Highly Advantageous, Advantageous, Not Advantageous; HA = 3, A = 2, NA = 1)										
	Vendor's Exp.	Bias-free	MCF Standards	Cog. Demand	Acc - SW D	Acc - EL	User Interface	Overall Min. Req. Tables	TECH. PROPOSAL TOTAL	PRICE RATING
JE	HA	A	A	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	22	HA
MV	HA	HA	NA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	22	HA
BK	HA	HA	A	HA	A	A	A	A	19	
AC	A	HA	HA	HA	A	HA	HA	HA	22	HA
DG	HA	HA	HA	HA	A	A	HA	HA	22	HA
MPC	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	Abstain	HA	21	A
CL	HA	HA	HA	HA	A	A	HA	HA	22	
								Average	21.4	

Technical Proposal Rating:

Advantageous

Overall Proposal Rating (Technical and Price):

Advantageous

Notes:

Highlights	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strong standards alignment ● Best capacity to meet EL needs ● CAT offers off-level testing for assessing more accurately (below and above grade-level) ● Strongest and most complete review for bias, including bias-review committee and detailed DIF analysis ● DOK and Blooms used for cognitive demand ● Translated/trans-adapted Spanish assessment included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dual use of assessment - formative and for admissions decisions ● BPS already using it for formative/ instructional purposes (formative tests will be administered at end of Sept. in BPS and some private schools) ● Very strictly stated MAP Growth should not be used as sole admission criterion (use of grades are also of concern - not normed, grade inflation, impact of COVID-19) ● Computer adaptive format results in no paper-based test option for students whose

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sample online practice test and platform navigation tutorial included ● Significantly under-budget and all-inclusive; detailed and organized proposal; price per value is good ● Significant level of support available from their team, including research consultation and tech support. ● Experience working with BPS ● Able to work within district's timeframe ● Has worked with other districts/ schools using MAP Growth for high stakes purposes ● Score reports include lexile level 	<p>IEP require it; possibly an alternative process required for these students; Would need to understand implications and develop solutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strictly emphasized testing everyone same day, neutral proctors, same conditions ● Understanding that the intended use of the assessment will determine how students take the assessment, is there a difference in the time that students take when taking the assessment formatively as opposed to a summative assessment. How long does it take students to complete this assessment specifically for the selective admissions process? What information do you have for assessment time for districts/schools that use this assessment for admissions decisions? ● Are we able to reduce items to be sixth grade learning standards (e.g. administer CAT items after grade-level standard items)? ● Based on performance standards, which performance measure describes performance on current grade level standards? RIT score may not give us that information, what measures do they have that will tell how students performed on grade level standards? ● No test registration support ● Test administration may need additional test security protocols
---	---

The proposal was very strong and the quality of the assessment is most advantageous but we will need to consider if it is most advantageous for our purpose. Key concerns are about the dual purpose of the test for the district, no paper-based test option, and how to use scores reflective of standards that students have actually been taught by the time of testing. All grades through grade 10 (or 11) currently take MAP Growth formatively; it's available to all schools to use. Transformation schools will be required to use it formatively. The RIT score by skill domain is based on student's performance on difficulty of the item; BPS may potentially set a cut-score. NWEA insists that MAP Growth should not be the sole measure so BPS may need to continue using grades. Overall, the issues are with how we would operationalize the test but not the quality. Impressed with the breadth and depth of their proposal.

Related to the testing calendar:

- Would we use the September test scores for admissions purposes? - Not recommended
- MCAS may be moved to fall for rising 11th graders; unclear what the decision will be for 3-8 at this time - impression that it is canceled for this year not to be postponed into the fall.

Vendor 3: Riverside Assessments / Insights

(Ratings: Highly Advantageous, Advantageous, Not Advantageous; HA = 3, A = 2, NA = 1)										
	Vendor's Exp.	Bias-free	MCF Standards	Cog. Demand	Acc - SWD	Acc - EL	User Interface	Overall Min. Req. Tables	TECH. PROPOSAL TOTAL	PRICE RATING
JE	HA	A	A	HA	NA	NA	HA	HA	18	A
MV	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	24	A
BK	HA	HA	HA	HA	HA	A	A	HA	22	
AC	HA	A	A	A	HA	A	HA	HA	20	A/ NA
DG	A	A	A	A	NA	NA	A	A	14	N/A
MPC	HA	HA	A	HA	HA	A	A	HA	21	A
CL	HA	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	17	
								Average	19.4	

Technical Proposal Rating:

Advantageous

Overall Proposal Rating (Technical and Price):

Advantageous

Notes:

Highlights	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good standards alignment ● Offers both paper-based and computer-based format for their assessment - broadly meeting all 4 components of the RFP. ● Straightforward platform ● Bias review meets standard psychometrics; process includes a bias review committee and DIF analysis ● Vendor is able to work within district's timelines and meet expectations. ● Offers 'Logramos', Spanish version of IOWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Length of the test but BPS would be able to select specific subject areas to administer and decrease overall test time ● Lexile level of sample passage was significantly below grade level but the questions were on-level ● Limited accommodations for ELs and SWD (no text-to-speech) ● Assessment and platform felt uninspired ● Price proposal lacked clarity, e.g. their CogAT test was strongly recommended to be administered with IOWA throughout their technical proposal, but they did not include pricing for CogAT ● Additional costs for test preparation materials

Overall Riverside Insights' proposal is good, as it meets all of the components of the RFP. Key concerns are regarding the length of the test (nearly 4 hours) and limited accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners (specifically no text-to-speech via online testing platform). Vendor will not manage registration but their solution meets many of our logistical test administration needs (especially PBT and CBT); however, the quality of the assessment and platform, while standard, feels uninspired for testers. Bias-reviews meet psychometric standards. Proposal is good overall regarding standards alignments and rigor (with the exception of lexile level of sample passage at 3rd/4th grade level for 9th/10th grade level questions).

Comparative Evaluation Criteria

A. Vendor Experience with Similar Projects (Consider a Review of References)

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating six (6) or more years of verifiable experience successfully providing goods and/or services to public school districts similar in size (i.e., 30,000+ students) and with similar student demographics as BPS for work substantially similar to the work described in this RFP.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating four (4) to five (5) years of verifiable experience successfully providing goods and/or services to public school districts similar in size (i.e., 30,000+ students) and with similar student demographics as BPS for work substantially similar to the work described in this RFP.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating three (3) years or less of verifiable experience successfully providing goods and/or services to public school districts similar in size (i.e., 30,000+ students), similar student demographics and with similar student demographics as BPS for work substantially similar to the work described in this RFP.

B. Item Quality: Bias-free and Fair

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating deep understanding and ability to create items that are culturally responsive for racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse testing populations, and inclusive of students regardless of socioeconomic status. A wide range of items and tasks reflecting inclusion of diverse experiences, perspectives and cultures.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating understanding and ability to create items that are culturally responsive for racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse testing populations, and inclusive of students regardless of socioeconomic status. A moderate range of items and tasks reflect inclusion of diverse experiences, perspectives and cultures.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating minimal understanding and ability to create items that are culturally responsive for racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse testing populations, and inclusive of students regardless of socioeconomic status. A limited range of items and tasks reflect inclusion of diverse experiences, perspectives and cultures.

C. Item Quality: Standards Alignment

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating deep understanding and ability to create items that are uniquely aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for ELA and Mathematics, not simply the generic Common Core Standards. As evidence, the vendor provides affirmative findings from an independently-conducted alignment analysis. Item tasks in Mathematics also demonstrate strong awareness of, and alignment to, the Mathematical Practice Standards.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating understanding and ability to create items that are uniquely aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for ELA and Mathematics. As

evidence, the vendor provides affirmative findings from an internally-conducted item-standard crosswalk or an internally-conducted alignment analysis.

- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating minimal understanding and ability to create items that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for ELA and Mathematics. As evidence, the vendor provides insufficiently compelling findings from an internally-conducted item-standard crosswalk or an internally-conducted alignment analysis.

D. Item Quality: Cognitive Demand/Rigor

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating a collection of items that represent a wide range of cognitive demand/rigor. All items are aligned to a specific level of rigor (e.g., Bloom's and/or Depth of Knowledge). Items and tasks reflect the rigor necessary to meet Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Across content areas, item responses require that students demonstrate conceptual understanding in addition to specific skills and knowledge domains.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating a collection of items that represent a moderate range of cognitive demand/rigor. All items are aligned to a specific level of rigor (e.g., Bloom's and/or Depth of Knowledge). Items mostly reflect the rigor necessary to meet Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Across content areas, item responses require that students demonstrate conceptual understanding in addition to specific skills and knowledge domains.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating a collection of items that represent a limited range of cognitive demand/rigor. Some items are aligned to a specific level of rigor (e.g., Bloom's and/or Depth of Knowledge). Items and tasks somewhat reflect the rigor necessary to meet Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

E. Accommodations/Modifications for Students With Disabilities

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating the provision of almost all of the accommodations/accessibility features that students receive in computer-based and paper-based test settings during state assessments. Vendors should consult the Next Gen MCAS accommodations manuals for the full list of accessibility features, which include magnification, large print, text to speech, answer masking, audio amplification, bookmark icon, color contrast, highlight tool, headphones, line reader, pop-up glossary, etc.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating moderate provision of the accommodations/accessibility features that students receive in computer-based test settings during state assessments.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating limited provision of the accommodations/accessibility features that students receive in computer-based test settings during state assessments.

F. Accommodations/Modifications for English Learners

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating provision of almost all of the modifications that English learners receive in computer-based and paper-based test settings during state assessments

according to their language acquisition. Vendors should consult the Next Gen MCAS and ACCESS for ELLs accommodations manuals for the full list of accessibility features. These modifications include the option for a student to have audio support at any time during the assessment and word translation available in multiple languages.

- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating moderate provision of the modifications that English learners receive in computer-based test settings during state assessments according to their language acquisition. These modifications include the option for a student to have audio support at any time during the assessment and word translations available for questions and reading passages.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating provision of limited modifications for English learners according to their language acquisition.

G. User Interface and Usability of Products

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating—via account access to a trial demonstration site—a user interface that requires minimal clicks/navigation on the part of the user. The teacher and administrator portal has easy-to-use and intuitive menus, which are available on every page either in a sidebar or a title bar. Use of color, graphics, and space produce a clean and straightforward user interface. The user experience is consistent across multiple devices and platforms (e.g., Chromebooks, iPads, MacBook, etc.).
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating—via account access a trial demonstration site—a user interface that requires moderate clicks/navigation on the part of the user. The teacher and administrator portal has easy-to-use menus, which are available on most pages either in a sidebar or a title bar. Use of color, graphics, and space produce a clean and straightforward user interface. The user experience is consistent across multiple devices and platforms.
- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category to a vendor demonstrating—via account access to a trial demonstration site—a user interface that requires considerable clicks/navigation on the part of the user. The teacher and administrator portal has unintuitive menus, which may not be available on every page either in a sidebar or a title bar. The user experience is variable across multiple devices and platforms.

H. Utilizing the Proposal Responses Table in Section 3 and the descriptions in Section 2, BPS will assess how well the vendor’s product/service meets the requirements of the District’s need for an admissions assessment.

- A rating of **Highly Advantageous** shall be assigned for this category when the vendor’s admissions assessment solution, based on review by the BPS evaluation committee, shows that the proposed solution substantially meets BPS requirements, as indicated by an overwhelming preponderance of “Yes” responses in the proposal responses table.
- A rating of **Advantageous** shall be assigned when the vendor’s admissions assessment solution, based on review by the BPS evaluation committee, shows that the proposed solution meets BPS requirements, as indicated by a preponderance of

“Yes” responses in the proposal responses table as well as select “CR”/“UD” responses with short implementation timelines.

- A rating of **Not Advantageous** shall be assigned when the vendor’s admissions assessment solution, based on review by the BPS evaluation committee, shows that the proposed solution does not substantially meet BPS requirements, as indicated by “No” responses in the proposal responses table as well as “CR”/“UD” responses with extended or unclear implementation timelines.

Component 1: Assessment Specifications (A. - N.)
Component 2: Paper Based Testing (Preferred) (O. - Z.)
Component 3: Computer-Based Testing (Preferred) (AA. - II.)
Component 4: Online Assessment Platform (Preferred) (JJ. - PP.)