

October 2, 2020

ADDENDUM NO. 1

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS  
REFERENCE: RFP# 2000003156  
FOR: Social Emotional Learning Universal Screener  
CLOSING DATE/TIME: October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020 @ 2:00 pm eastern

**RFP MODIFICATIONS:**

The referenced Request for Proposal is amended as follows:

1. **Special Provision 15.1: Contact for Contractual Matters** is revised to show the appropriate telephone number:  

Telephone: 571-423-3593
2. **Appendix F – Technical Requirements** shall now include the FCPS Security Profile referenced in T39 as seen in Attachment A of this Addendum 1.
3. **Appendix E – Functional Requirements**, under Section 7.7, Vendor Support, under “FCPS professional development...”, the third bullet shall be revised as such:
  - a. “Diagnostic protocol to determine specific learning gaps”.

**RFP CLARIFICATIONS:**

The following are responses to questions received via e-mail and at the Pre-proposal Conference held on September 29, 2020 at 2:00 pm eastern.

**Q1. Are there any incumbent products? If so, please describe how long they have been used and how widely they have been implemented.**

- A1. There are no SEL screeners currently being used in the division. Each year, all middle and high schools use the Signs of Suicide (SOS) program as a universal suicide prevention program, and as a component of this program we utilize the Brief Screen for Adolescent Depression (BSAD). This process will likely continue as a parallel process to our universal SEL screening.

**Q2. If a vendor does not have the requisite experience delivering the related services to K-12 or Higher Education institutions of over 90,000 students, would the vendor automatically be disqualified?**

A2. Special Provision 2: Minimum Qualifications states: *If an Offeror fails to respond to each qualification, or if FCPS determines from the response that an Offeror does not meet any one of the minimum qualifications, its proposal **may** be deemed non-responsive and disqualified from further consideration.* Each proposal will be vetted to make this determination.

**Q3. What is the process if you find that your requirements result in a lack of qualified vendors or only one vendor is identified, and therefore this is not a competitive bid? We ask because, to our knowledge there may be only one (and possibly none at all) vendor that would meet both your functional requirements (assuming you're looking for products that would comply with quality guidelines issued by organizations that are responsible for defining quality criteria for screeners – for example, APA, National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], and WHO) and organizational experience requirements (i.e., serving 90,000 or more students and for 5 years or more).**

A3. If it is agreed upon internally that these functional requirements are unattainable, those functional requirements will be amended before the solicitation closes via an addendum. In the event there is one or zero competitive proposals, the solicitation will be cancelled. Requirements will be updated and a new solicitation will be released.

**Q4. What is the District's anticipated budget for this program by year?**

A4. This information is not available at this time.

**Q5. Does the District have a plan for how it would like to scale implementation of the screener (e.g., district-wide year 1, 40% of schools year one, 100% year two, etc.) or would they like the vendor to make a suggestion?**

A5. We are in the process of developing a scaled implementation plan and are open to vendor suggestions.

**Q6. Are there page limits for responses to the Functional Requirements? Can one Append material that details applications or illustrates products that support a succinct text?**

A6. There is no page limit for responses to the Functional Requirements, however Special Provision 17.4 states: *"Unnecessarily elaborate brochures of other presentations beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal is not desired."*

**Q7. In the Scope of Services statement 1.1., do you consider an SEL Intervention Program a “related “service.” In other words, is FCPS requesting a description of an intervention program and its costs, if one is part of the proposed SEL system?**

A7. Yes.

**Q8. What is the expected Start Date for the contract?**

A8. The expected start date of the contract would be the 2021-2022 school year.

**Q9. In the *Background section, statement 5.5* stresses “students’ mental health” and “social-emotional barriers to students’ ability to access the academic curriculum.” Given this statement, is FCPS interested in a screening system that measures both positive, strength-focused SEL skills and related emotional behavior concerns (e.g., key internalizing and externalizing behaviors) or only positive strength-focused behaviors?**

A9. The focus is on a screening system that is strength-focused and measures SEL skills.

**Q10. Does FCPS have a specific set of SEL Competency Standards that guide instruction?**

A10. Not at this time. There work is in progress.

**Q11. Do they have an existing screening/progress monitoring system in place in the academic realm? (If so, which one and with what frequency?)**

A11. FCP uses, i-Ready through Curriculum Associates as the Universal Screener for reading and math. It is administered to all K-6 students twice a year.

**Q12. Do they have a student data dashboard system in operation, and if so, which provider do they use?**

A12. FCPS uses the Student Information System (SIS) to store and organize student demographic data and information related to scheduling, attendance, discipline, health, grades, test results, and academic programs. SIS is a secure, web-based system accessible by staff, students, and parents. FCPS also uses EDSL (Education Decision Support Library) – a web based data warehouse for school improvement planning, teacher training, program evaluation, and other resources.

**Q13. In *Requirements 7.1 and 7.2*, you use the terms “progress monitoring.” By this term, do you mean a specific assessment tool that is completed multiple times during the year and is sensitive to behavior/skill changes resulting from a program that teaches specific SEL competencies aligned with the CASEL framework? Alternatively, do you mean an assessment that simply is used at the beginning and end of year to provide a change score,**

**such as a Reliable Change Index? Also, as part of the Evidence you describe for Requirement 7.1, you identify students, parents, and teachers as respondents. What specific grades for student respondents are required to be included?**

A13. We are open to a variety of options. Progress monitoring may be as basic as a change score from the beginning to the end of the year, or more involved assessment that is sensitive to skill growth throughout the year. We have not predetermined what our progress monitoring process will entail, so there is room for flexibility. Regarding student respondents; we have not yet identified specific grades where student responses would be required.

**Q14. In Requirement 7.2, you ask for “resources ...to aid educators in instructional planning to meet the needs of students identified at-risk” and go on to describe intervention resources. If an intervention program exists that is aligned with the screening-diagnostic-progress monitoring assessment results, should it be built into the budget plan or provided as an Optional Cost?**

A14. Please provide it as an optional cost.

**Q15. Related to Requirement 7.2, is there one or more SEL intervention programs already in use in FCPS? If so, could you please identify these programs by name and indicated if they are aligned with the CASEL competency framework?**

A15. There are over 50 SEL programs/approaches currently in use within FCPS at the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 levels, all of which are aligned at least to some degree with the CASEL competency framework. Some of the more commonly used Tier 1 approaches include RULER, Second Step, Positivity Project, Responsive Classroom, Kimoichis, Mind Up, Strong Start/Strong Kids/Strong Teens, and Zones of Regulation.

**Q16. In Requirement 7.3.A, you ask about sensitivity and specificity. Is any particular outcome or classification (e.g., special education placement, ODRs, academic performance, performance on more comprehensive assessment) of particular interest?**

A16. Broadly speaking, we are interested in both short-term outcomes (e.g., SEL skill acquisition, improved attitudes, enhanced learning environment) and behavioral/academic outcomes (e.g., positive social behavior, fewer conduct problems, reduced emotional distress, improved academic performance).

**Q17. In Requirement 7.3. E, you ask about “item difficulties, as well as item classifications based on thinking level (e.g., Webb’s depth of knowledge, Bloom’s taxonomy). These are item characteristics typically associated with academic achievement tests, not behavior rating scales or social behavior measures. Is this requirement still relevant to this RFA or perhaps left from a previous RFA?**

A17. These need not be provided if they are not available or relevant to the proposed solution

**Q18. In Requirement 7.3.I. You ask for details on number and comparability of available test forms. Are multiple or alternate forms required?**

A18. They are not required. We only ask that these details be provided if multiple/alternate forms are available.

**Q19. In Requirement 7.7. One of the PD needs listed is, 'Diagnostic protocol to determine specific learning gaps in students' mathematical competencies.' The reference to "mathematical competencies" appears to be a question from a previous RFA, but nonetheless, are you asking for a gap analysis of students' SEL competencies and strategies to reduce or eliminate gaps?**

A19. Please disregard the reference to "mathematical competencies," but we are interested in analyzing students' SEL profiles and determining both how to capitalize on areas of strength and how to identify and address SEL skill deficits. This is captured under the RFP modifications.

**Q20. Can FCPS please clarify which grades will be using the screener?**

A20. K-12.

**Q21. Can FCPS please identify the approximate number of students who will be using the screener?**

A21. Approximately 187,000.

**Q22. Of FCPS's 198 schools, how many will be "in-scope" for this SEL engagement?**

A22. All of them.

**Q23. When does FCPS anticipate making an award determination?**

A23. Depending on availability and scheduling, the RFP process can take 4 to 6 months after close.

**Q24. Section 10 of the RFP identifies the five separate files (Sections 1-5\_ that bidders should upload on Bonfire. In which of these sections should Appendix G (Price Summary) be included? Or should it be included within its own separate file as Section 6. Please provide specific instructions for submitting Appendix G.**

A24. Please see the Requested Documents section in Bonfire that details a submission area for Appendix G: Cost Proposal. The Price Summary should not be in any of the Sections, as the Sections are designated to the Technical Proposal, which is separate from the Cost Proposal.

**Q25. Would FCPS prefer the Technical Proposal to be uploaded as a single file or as multiple file attachments (one for each section)?**

A25. The preference is for a single pdf uploaded per section (Section 1-5, and Appendix G: Cost Proposal). If there is proprietary information and the Offeror chooses to submit a redacted copy, please submit as a separate file.

**Q26. Regarding Appendix E – Functional Requirements, would a PDF response addressing each required feature + provided evidence be acceptable (as opposed to responses in table format)?**

A26. Yes, this is acceptable.

**Q27. Regarding Appendix F – Technical Requirements, could FCPS please elaborate on what is to be provided for the “Short Link to Vendor Documentation?”**

A27. “Short Link to Vendor Documentation” should refer to a section in the proposal.

**Q28. Regarding Appendix F – Technical Requirements, does the “Short Link to Vendor Documentation” mean a link to a section of our proposal, or to a relevant documentation on a website?**

A28. “Short Link to Vendor Documentation” can reference a section in the proposal or relevant documentation on a website.

**Q29. Could FCPS please confirm that it is sufficient for offerors to include additional information/documentation at the end of Appendix F – Technical Requirements instead of providing a link?**

A29. The purpose of the link is to create an easy reference for the evaluation committee. If the information/documentation provided at the end of Appendix F can be easily referenced with the Technical Requirement, this is acceptable.

**Q30. Regarding Appendix F – Technical Requirements, Could FCPS please define a “Short” vs “Detailed” narrative?**

A30. Short implies 1 to 3 sentences, depending on the requirement. Detailed would exceed this.

**Q31. How many students does FCPS wish to serve through the social-emotional learning universal screener program in the first year?**

A31. We are in the process of developing a plan for how we would like to scale implementation of the screener, but this has not been finalized.

**Q32. How many students does FCPS wish to serve through the social-emotional learning universal screener program each year after the first year?**

A32. We are in the process of developing a plan for how we would like to scale implementation of the screener, but this has not been finalized.

**Q33. Which grade levels does FCPS wish to serve through the social emotional learning universal screener?**

A33. K-12.

**Q34. Whom (which roles) does FCPS envision as the primary users of the social-emotional learning data collected through this program?**

A34. School administrators, school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors.

**Q35. When does FCPS wish to roll out the social-emotional learning universal screener program?**

A35. During the 2021-2022 school year.

**Q36. To what degree does FCPS have embedded social-emotional learning practices and programs already in place in the division vs. desiring frameworks and recommendations from a vendor or a vendor's product?**

A36. There are over 50 SEL programs/approaches currently in use within FCPS at the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 levels, all of which are aligned to some degree with the CASEL competency framework, which guides our implementation practices. Work is currently underway to develop a division-wide implementation plan for SEL and related goals, guided by the CASEL competency framework and, ultimately, by the VDOE SEL Standards set to be released in July 2021. Vendors are welcome to share their own recommendations as well, as they relate to their proposed solutions.

**Q37. Does FCPS currently have a multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) data system in place that allows educators to track interventions for students?**

A37. Yes.

**Q38. Does FCPS use an MTSS framework for providing academic support to students, and how embedded is this framework?**

A38. Yes, each school provides academic support/intervention through an MTSS framework.

**Q39. Does FCPS currently take an MTSS approach to supporting social-emotional learning?**

A39. Yes.

**Q40. Does FCPS plan to take an MTSS approach to supporting social-emotional learning in the future as part of the universal social-emotional learning screener program?**

A40. Yes.

**Q41. Does the division have a desired criterion measure in mind for the screener (referencing the language “perform satisfactorily on a criterion measure”)?**

A41. Broadly speaking, we are seeking to promote and assess both short-term outcomes (e.g., SEL skill acquisition, improved attitudes, enhanced learning environment) and behavioral/academic outcomes (e.g., positive social behavior, fewer conduct problems, reduced emotional distress, improved academic performance).

**Q42. If the division does not have a specific desired criterion measure in mind for the screener (reference the language “perform satisfactorily on a criterion measure”), is FCPS thinking about performance on a more comprehensive social-emotional learning assessment? Or, academic performance, disciplinary outcomes, clinical assessment?**

A42. Broadly speaking, we are seeking to promote and assess both short-term outcomes (e.g., SEL skill acquisition, improved attitudes, enhanced learning environment) and behavioral/academic outcomes (e.g., positive social behavior, fewer conduct problems, reduced emotional distress, improved academic performance).

**Q43. What is the anticipated budget for the first year of this program?**

A43. This information is not available at this time.

**Q44. What is the anticipated budget for each year of this program after the first year?**

A44. This is unknown.

**Q45. How does the district prefer the format of the response to Appendix E & F (in the table provided on the form or as a narrative in a Word document with responses to each prompt)?**

A45. Appendix F: Technical Requirements should use the table provided. Appendix E may be provided in narrative form as long as each Functional Requirement is easily referenceable from the RFP. The preference for submission file type is pdf.

**Q46. Due to the RFP being an electronic submission, will the district also accept electronic signatures on the required forms?**

A46. Yes

**Q47. What personnel supports are in place to support the roll out and use of the data?**

A47. Classroom teachers, school administrators, school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors will support this process.

**Q48. Can you confirm we do not need to submit a sandbox environment with our response, but only if it is requested by FCPS after our proposal has been submitted? I see the sandbox environment language on page 3, section 9.2, but also see on page 8, section 21.6 that the sandbox evaluation is part of the evaluation criteria, so I wanted to double check**

A48. Offerors do not have to submit a sandbox environment with their response.

**Q49. Appendix F, T39 states, "The solution must meet or exceed FCPS Security Profile requirements below." However, there are no further security-related requirements below T39 – the next section is 8.8, Solution Architecture. Is there missing information here or is T39 able to be disregarded?**

A49. We have included the referenced FCPS Security Profile in this Addendum 1 under Attachment A.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.



Laila Sultan  
Coordinator

THIS ADDENDUM IS ACKNOWLEDGED AND IS CONSIDERED A PART OF THE SUBJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL:

---

Name of Firm

---

(Signature)

---

(Date)

RETURN A SIGNED ORIGINAL AND COPIES AS REQUESTED IN THE SOLICITATION.

Note: SIGNATURE ON THIS ADDENDUM DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR SIGNATURE ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT. THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT MUST BE SIGNED

## FCPS Security Profile

### Summary

This document seeks to define a set of minimum security standards that should be met by a solution when the solution is implemented on FCPS' behalf.

We categorize the application based on three different risk levels in an attempt to provide more accurate guidance on what security safeguards shall be implemented. The risk levels are determined by two major factors:

- What information is stored and managed by the solution
- How the information is accessed

Solutions that transmit, process, or store credit card and payment information should meet the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS). Details of the PCI standard can be viewed at [https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/security\\_standards/pci\\_dss.shtml](https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/security_standards/pci_dss.shtml).

### Part I: Risk Level Designation

We assign risk level based on the most sensitive information contained and managed by, as well as the accessibility of the solution/information.

Accessibility	Information Contained in the Solution		
	Public Data	Restricted Data	Private/Sensitive Data
Intranet	Low	Low	Medium-high
Extranet	Low	Medium	High
Internet	Low	Medium	High

**1. Public Data** — Information to which the general public may or must be granted access, according to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (VFOIA) and other applicable statutes. By way of illustration only, some examples of Public Data include:

- Publicly posted information, such as press releases and school calendars
- Personal information that can or must be released to the public without signed authorization, such as job title, date of last hire and date of separation if applicable, and salary or rate of pay and records of the allowances or reimbursements for expenses of employees whose annual rate of pay is more than \$10,000.

**2. Restricted Data** — Information that shall be guarded due to proprietary, ethical, or privacy considerations, is exempt from release under VFOIA, and shall be protected from unauthorized access, modification, transmission, storage or other use. Members of the FCPS community may be granted access to Restricted Data. Disclosure of Restricted Data to members outside FCPS may be granted based on business or educational need-to-know or as required by law, policy, or legal process. By way of illustration only, some examples of Restricted Data include:

- Employees’ names, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, work locations, home addresses, and employee ID numbers

**3. Private or Sensitive Data** — Information protected -- by statute, regulation, FCPS policy, or contractual language and personal information about an individual -- which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made available to the public. Mishandling of private information may affect FCPS through financial and legal sanctions, loss of public confidence, and damage to FCPS’ reputation. Access to private data shall be granted on a need-to-know basis only in accordance with statute, regulation, policy, and contractual language. By way of illustration only, some examples of Private or Sensitive Data include:

- Employee’s social security number and bank account number
- Employee’s medical records
- Student personally identifiable information (please see [FCPS Student Scholastic Records Manual](#) for the definition)

**Part II: Comprehensive Security Profile for FCPS Enterprise Applications**

Notes

- Requirements can be met by the solution as a whole, meaning either by the application itself, or by leveraging existing solutions that will enhance the security of the application.
- R-Required; D-Desired

SECURITY STANDARDS	RISK LEVEL		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
<b>LOGICAL ACCESS CONTROL</b>			
• Need-to-Know (aka. least privilege) Principle	D	R	R
• Role-Based Access		R	R
• Idle Time Out		R	R
• Configurable Idle Time Out		D	D
• Maximum Logon Attempts		D	R
• Tiered Solution (Application and Database on Separate Physical or virtual Servers)		D	R
<b>ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT</b>			
• Unique UserID	D	R	R
• Established Policies and Procedures for Account Provisioning, Modification, and Termination		R	R
• Providing Ability for FCPS to conduct periodic account audit		D	R
• Bulk Account Data Load Encrypted		D	R
• Use separate accounts for service and user/admin logins	D	D	D
<b>AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION</b>			
• Individual Login/Authentication for Users	D	R	R

• Individual Login/Authentication for Administrators	R	R	R
• 2 Factor Authentication for Privileged Access			D
• Ability to Work with FCPS LDAP/IDM		D	D
<b>PASSWORD POLICY</b>			
• Enforcing Password Length		R	R
• Enforcing Password Complexity		R	R
• Enforcing Password Expiration		D	R
• Capacity to Force Initial Password Change		R	R
• Transmission in Encrypted Format		R	R
• Stored in Encrypted Format		R	R
• Ability to Generate Initial Password Based on FCPS Requirements		R	R
• Ability to Provide Notification for Password Change		R	R
• Password Not Viewable in Clear-Text on Screen		R	R
• Password Can Be Changed on Demand		D	R
• Username and Password Not Sent in the Same E-Mail		R	R
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
• Encryption Enforced for Login Page		R	R
• Encryption Enforced for All Pages		D	R
• Encryption Enforced for Bulk Transfer		D	R
• Server-Side Enforcement of TLS1.2 and Up		D	R
• Server-Side Enforcement of Cipher Strength AES-128 and AES-256 only		D	R
<b>DESKTOP SECURITY</b>			
• Cache Cleared Upon Exit of the Application		D	R
<b>STORAGE</b>			
• Storing Data That Is Minimally Necessary	R	R	R
• Encrypt Data at Rest on Local Devices		D	R
<b>SECURE WEB DEVELOPMENT</b>			
• No Persistent Cookie for User Data		D	R
• Remove Unused Default Pages and Extensions		D	R
• Directory Browsing Disabled		R	R
<b>SECURE APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT</b>			
• Validation and Sanitization of All User Input; Rejection of Malicious Input		R	R
• Application Components Run with Least Amount Privilege Necessary		R	R
• An application that provides system-wide directory listing must also provide a method to delist a student in the directory		R	R
• Processes and procedures for periodical security updates		R	R
<b>AUDIT</b>			

• Audit Trails for Logon and Logoff		R	R
• Audit Trails Capture Source IP Addresses and Timestamps		D	R
• Activity-Based Audit Trail		D	R
• Audit Trails for Privileged (System Administration) Activities		R	R
• Capability to Report against Audit Trails		D	R
• Proactive Alert		D	R
• Mechanism to Protect the Integrity of the Log File		D	R
<b>MOBILE APPLICATION</b>			
• Designed for and Tested on Mobile Devices		R	R
• Storage NOT on the Mobile Devices		R	R
• Password Protection on Mobile Client Application		R	R
<b>HOST SITE SECURITY</b>			
<b>Access Control</b>			
• Physical Access Control		R	R
• Visit Log and Sign-in		R	R
<b>Antivirus</b>			
• Processes and Procedures for OS, Application, and Virus-Protection Updates		R	R
<b>Backup</b>			
• Backup and Tape Storage Policy		R	R
• Secure Off-Site Tape Storage		D	R
• Off-Site Tape Encrypted			D
<b>Server and Network Infrastructure</b>			
• Server and Network Devices Hardening		R	R
• Dedicated Server or Separate Instance			D
• Complex Passwords for System Administrator Accounts		R	R
• Dual Factor Authentication for Privileged Access			D
• Encrypted Session for Remote Administration		R	R
• Audit Trail for System Administration Activities		R	R
• Perimeter Firewall		R	R
• Firewalls That Protect from Both Outside and Inside Intruders		D	R
• Firewalls That Deny by Default and Grant on Request		R	R
• Firewalls That Conduct Stateful Inspection		R	R
• Separation of Internal Resources and Public-Access Servers		R	R
• Secure and Segregated Wireless Network		R	R
• Intrusion Protection Systems		R	R
• Maintaining and Reviewing Activities Logs for Critical Components		D	R
<b>Media Reuse and Disposal</b>			

Addendum No. 1  
RFP# 2000003156  
Attachment A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and Procedures to Properly Reuse and Dispose Electronic Media</li> </ul>		<b>D</b>	<b>R</b>
<b>Disaster Recovery and Emergency Response Planning</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing and Maintaining a Disaster Recovery and Emergency Response Plan</li> </ul>		<b>D</b>	<b>R</b>
<b>Change Management</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and Procedures to Manage Configuration Changes</li> </ul>		<b>R</b>	<b>R</b>
<b>Incident Response</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification to FCPS within 24 Hours of a Security Breach</li> </ul>		<b>R</b>	<b>R</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy and Procedures to Handle Security Incidents</li> </ul>		<b>R</b>	<b>R</b>
<b>Others</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-Disclosure Agreement Signed by Contractors</li> </ul>		<b>R</b>	<b>R</b>