## **Request for Proposals**

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Diagnostic Review and Monitoring

## **Questions and Responses**

#	Question	From	Response
1	May the following components of the proposal be submitted as appendices? 8.2.2. Three (3) letters of recommendation; 8.2.3. Any product that may demonstrate your level of expertise; and 8.2.4. A current resume.	Heflin	Yes the three letters of recommendation, product and current resume may be submitted as appendices.
2	Is the Budget proposal to be submitted as a separate document?	Heflin	No the budget proposal does not need to be submitted as a separate document but rather part of the proposal.
3	Per item 6.11 on Page 4 of the RFP bidders are instructed to submit a letter addressing proprietary information: "If you believe any information being submitted in response to a request for proposal, bid or information should be kept confidential as financial or proprietary information, you must specifically identify that information in a letter to the agency."  Can you please provide further instruction as to who we should submit this to and whether this is to be provided prior to our proposal submission or with the application package?	Heflin	If bidders believe any information falls within these parameters, a letter may be submitted, with the application package
4	Is it the expectation that 20 diagnostic reviews will be required annually or over the two years of the contract?	Hearns	The diagnostic reviews must be completed on all CSI schools identified within a few months of identification as this information will be used by the schools to develop their improvement plans. This will only be completed in the first year and monitoring will be completed both years. Monitoring in the first year can be on evaluating the school improvement plans and the schools process for development (ensuring that development process meets all state and federal requirements (i.e. stakeholder engagement)).
5	Is a recent financial statement and Certificate of Good Standing only required	Hearns	Priority 3 of the RFP states: Design tools and monitoring protocols for CSI

		Γ	T
	to be submitted if you are the successful		schools and implement those protocols
	bidder, similar to the Certificate of		at the end of the 2018-19 school year
	Authority requirement?		and during the 2019-20 school year.
			Section 2.8 of the RFP states: Design
			tools and a protocol to monitor
			improvement plans and use of school
			improvement funds through annual
			onsite monitoring and desk audits. We
			expect that only monitoring will be
			conducted in year two of the contract
			and not diagnostic reviews. We look
			forward to seeing the bidders' ideas on
			the best ways to organize and
			•
			implement this priority and section that
			will provide the greatest understanding
			of how schools are doing in their
			development and implementation of
			their improvement plans.
6	If a Certificate of Good Standing is required		The Certificate of Good Standing is not
	with the bid, can it be from our state of	Hearns	required with the bid. However, when
	incorporation?		submitted, it must be from the
			Secretary of State in NH. If the contract
			recipient is a nonresident, nonprofit,
			they do not need to submit a Certificate
			of Good Standing at all.
7	Can you provide more information about		Priority 3 of the RFP states: Design tools
	NH DOE's expectations for year two of the		and monitoring protocols for CSI
	contract (i.e., other activities that will occur		schools and implement those protocols
	in year two, expectations for the number of	Hearns	at the end of the 2018-19 school year
	monitoring visits for each school, etc.)?		and during the 2019-20 school year.
			Section 2.8 of the RFP states: Design
			tools and a protocol to monitor
			•
			improvement plans and use of school
			improvement funds through annual
			onsite monitoring and desk audits. We
			expect that only monitoring will be
			conducted in year two of the contract
			and not diagnostic reviews. We look
			forward to seeing the bidders' ideas on
			the best ways to organize and
			implement this priority and section that
			will provide the greatest understanding
			of how schools are doing in their
			development and implementation of
			their improvement plans.
	Are there any formatting or page limit		No there are no formatting or page
8	requirements that proposers should	Nathan	limit requirements for proposals.
"	follow?	Nacrian	mine requirements for proposals.
1	TOHOW:	1	1

-				
	9	On page 2 of the RFP section 1.3 in states that the provider must have "Internal capacity to complete approximately 20 school visits in a short period of time across NH using an approved protocol with fidelity." For planning purposes can NH DOE provide more information? Specifically, does 20 school visits mean visiting approximately 20 schools once per school? Or does NH DOE envision fewer schools with multi-day visits at each school (for example, 10 CSI schools visited for 2 days each = 20 visits)?	Nathan	The number of days for each diagnostic review is not dictated in the RFP. It is expected that a bidder will understand their protocols and be able to articulate the number of days it will take to implement the review at each school. All CSI schools (approx. 20) must have a diagnostic review in the fall of 2018 after identification. For some protocols, that may take one day at each school, for other protocols that may take several days at each school. We look forward to reviewing innovative ideas to ensure the reviews are completed in a comprehensive manner, and also timely, so that schools may use the reviews to develop their improvement

Total Number of Proposals as of 9/14/18 4