



Guidelines for Producing RFIs and RFPs Related to Teacher Licensure Assessment Programs

Published by Educational Testing Service

Contents

Background	1
Options for Comparing Teacher Licensure Assessment Programs	2
Creating an RFI or RFP that Yields the Comparison the State Wants	4
Topics Needing Careful Consideration.....	4
Asking Vendors About New Ideas and Supporting Research.....	7
Basic Information to Include When Soliciting Comparative Information	7
Vendor Processes that States Should Ask Vendors to Describe	8
Organization of the RFP	9
Follow-up Presentation.....	9
RFI/RFP Scheduling Issues.....	10
Overall Characteristics of a High Quality RFI or RFP	10
For Further Help.....	11
Conclusion.....	11
Appendix A.....	12
Appendix B	13
Appendix C.....	15

Background

State education agencies (SEAs) are committed to seeking out the best possible materials, equipment, and services for the public they serve. Agencies are responsible for finding the best value and the best match to their state needs. One area of service that SEAs must select and manage is teacher licensure assessment. Every state and territory utilizes licensure assessment scores for the purpose of issuing initial teacher licenses, and most states also use these scores for Highly Qualified Teacher compliance.

The past ten years have brought many changes to educational systems. In addition, state needs have evolved as policy mandates change, as technology is replaced, as program requirements shift, as new leaders bring new visions, and as educational systems are re-conceptualized. It is important for those responsible for teacher licensure assessment to validate that their assessment program remains supportive of the state’s goals and responsibilities and meets the needs of its stakeholders.



ETS wholeheartedly supports the periodic review of a state's assessment program with the intention of making sure it satisfies the needs of the state. We provide this short guide for Departments of Education and Professional Standards Boards to share how some SEAs and Boards across the country have undertaken such reviews and also to communicate suggestions for how to frame the state needs when reaching out to vendors for information in order to elicit some of the best possible comparisons among available assessment programs.

Options for Comparing Teacher Licensure Assessment Programs

Some stakeholders in state systems believe that comparisons of teacher licensure assessment programs can only be accomplished through a Request for Proposals (RFP), i.e., a formal procurement process. This is not the case, although the RFP process is indeed one option. Because state funds are not directly used for the purchase of teacher assessment services, most states do not require a formal procurement process to select and implement a program. If this is the case in your state, depending on the need or mandate behind the impetus to compare programs, one of the following options could be more beneficial in a particular situation.

Internal Review by State Agency Staff

Internal review of a teacher licensure testing program typically involves comparing the services from one vendor, with which the state is familiar, with services offered by other vendors with which the state is less familiar. State agency staff charged with comparing two or more programs may find it helpful to organize a formal, internal review of the available services offered by vendors. This better informs state agency staff of services provided by vendors prior to taking the discussion to a board or external stakeholders.

Board Agenda Item

One approach for a formal comparison of available teacher licensure assessment programs is to make it an agenda item for the state board of education, an advisory board or council, or a professional standards board, depending on the state and its governance of teacher licensure. Those who staff the board or council can approach this comparison through a variety of methods: the staff can produce a comparison document within the department or office and present it to the board/council; the staff can ask vendors to answer questions in written form, which can be shared with the board/council; or vendors can be asked to present information in-person to the board/council. We have provided a model comparison template in Appendix A.

After the comparison is shared with the board, the board can decide what to do, either through a formal vote or through informal discussion. If the comparison shows that the state's needs are met most effectively by the current vendor, the board can affirm that and take no further action until it makes sense to undertake a similar comparison in the future. If there seems to be an interest in a deeper comparison, the staff can be assigned to create a more detailed comparison for consideration at a future meeting or move to a different mode of comparison (RFI or RFP). We have provided a model template for a more detailed comparison in Appendix B.

Request for Information (RFI)

An RFI allows a state to issue a formal request for information, in order to compare offerings as well as find out what various vendors have planned for future innovations. An RFI does not bind the state to award a contract to a vendor, nor does it require that the state specify all its requirements related to teacher licensure assessment. A state is free in an RFI to ask only the questions it wants to ask.

Some states use an RFI to gather desired comparative information on which to base a board or council vote or discussion. Other states use an RFI as a prelude to an RFP: i.e., the state asks about various possible solutions to particular challenges and then uses the information to create the specifications for an RFP. Some states focus an RFI on just one aspect of the assessment program, e.g., the entry assessment of academic skills; other states focus on what is new and cutting-edge; and still others issue a comprehensive RFI in order to gather a full picture of offerings available to cover all their needs.

RFIs are usually most effective for the state when the state is clear about the “what” and lets the responding vendors provide the “how.” For example, if a state is interested in having candidate written responses scored online by in-state scorers, or in having tests that get closer to teaching practice than their current assessments, the state should make that clear in the RFI. The vendors will then provide possible solutions and specifications in their responses as well as relevant trade-offs and implications that will help the state think through the most important aspects of the requirement.

RFI responses from vendors are due by a formal deadline, and the staff can either share results with a board or council, or use an internal decision-making process to decide what further steps to take. If the state’s needs are most effectively met by the current vendor, the staff can decide to make no changes in its programs. If there seems to be the possibility that the state could find a better match with its needs, it could move to an RFP or even simply make a decision to change vendors.

Request for Proposals (RFP)

An RFP is used to gather legally binding proposals for services, and the intent of the RFP process is the award of a contract to the vendor rated highest on the basis of the information in the proposal. Licensure staff members work with the procurement staff within the Department of Education to create a formal RFP containing a complete description of the program requirements. Potential vendors are usually invited to a Q&A session a week or two after the RFP release to ask clarification questions of the Department staff. Then the potential vendors are given some number of weeks or months to respond. Once the proposals are received, a team put together by the department evaluates the proposals and awards the contract to the bidder with the highest number of points according to the evaluation system shared in the RFP.

It is important that department staff understand their state’s RFP process and the variations that are possible depending on the goal and circumstances of the activity. Some states have explicit requirements about who can review proposals, how much weight various factors must carry (e.g., price), and what terms and conditions the RFP and resulting contract must contain. Procurement is a complex and rigorous process with many built-in requirements, and understanding these as deeply as possible before writing the RFP is highly recommended.



All Departments of Education reserve the right to withdraw the RFP or decline to make an award at their discretion.

Creating an RFI or RFP that Yields the Comparison the State Wants

It is difficult to produce a good RFI or RFP, with “good” meaning that the state receives proposals that contain the information the state wants to see and that can be fairly compared. Such a document must not only communicate the state’s overarching vision and goals, but also very specific details about its requirements and instructions for vendor responses in a way that will allow an apples-to-apples comparison during the evaluation period.

Those who have created RFIs and RFPs in the past often mention that they did not realize the ambiguity that their document contained until they received the responses from vendors and did not get the information they wanted to receive or were not able to compare vendors because of the different ways the instructions were interpreted. Therefore the following sections are intended to share some of the elements that often present a challenge to the state to describe clearly in the RFI/RFP and a challenge to the vendors to understand. We hope that the suggestions here are helpful in building specifications that ultimately give states a full and fair picture of available vendor services and plans.

Topics Needing Careful Consideration

There are particular issues that can lead to vendor confusion or uncertainty, which in turn can lead to extra work for states after the resulting proposals are received by the state. We recommend that states be as specific as possible about the requirements in the areas that follow.

Pricing is an especially difficult area to lay out in an RFP because of the nature of the teacher licensure assessment business model. The state can help get the information it wants by laying out a clear statement of what materials and services must be covered by the vendor’s bid price and a clear methodology for collecting the various elements of the pricing.

Most states want to know what fee the vendor will charge the candidate for each test. In order to get accurate comparisons, we recommend that the state include a list of anticipated annual volumes for each test title/area, and, if there will be a mix of paper and computer delivery, an estimate of annual volumes for paper and volumes for computer for each title. The state should ask for the candidate fee for each “cell” in a table containing this volume information. Note that tests of different lengths and with different types of tasks or tests that are broken into two or more subtests may require different prices. (If a state is not interested in having its program utilize subtests—e.g., instead of a single test for secondary level Biology, two subtests that comprise a complete test—the state should articulate that subtests are not permitted.) The state should also provide detail about how it will calculate the pricing comparisons and how it will take ancillary fees such as registration fees into account.

We have provided an example of a pricing template in Appendix C.

A final word about pricing: most states are not simply looking to choose the lowest-priced vendors. Most states understand that their responsibility is to find the best *value* for their state and constituents. To this end, the state can adjust its evaluation criteria to reflect the appropriate weight of price in the evaluation equation, so that the criteria adding up to the 100% reflect a balanced sense of value.

National vs. State Tests, and Reciprocity Issues with other states, are important to clarify. Many states want test scores that are useable in and portable to neighboring states and vice-versa, in order for their candidates not to have to take new tests if they cross state lines for a job and in order to increase the candidate pool within the state. In fact, according to USED's Title II information, about twenty percent of initial teacher licenses each year are issued to candidates who received their training in a state other than the one where they were licensed. If this broader pool of teacher candidates and portability of scores for candidates are important to the state, then that requirement should be made explicit in the RFI or RFP, i.e., that the state requires a program that offers scores that are accepted in other states in the region.

Many states need some state-specific elements in their program. Given the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in over forty states and the fact that the knowledge in many subject areas (e.g., mathematics) is not state-specific, the state can consider asking for a "national program with customized elements" in order to enjoy the benefits of reciprocity with other states as well as fulfill state-specific needs. Vendors can develop scoring models in such a way that the candidate receives two scores: one that is based on the portion of the test coming from the national battery, and one that encompasses both the national and state portions. This increases the portability of the scores.

If a state does require state-specific elements, such needs should be clarified specifically. For example, if a state requires secondary or middle-school social studies teachers to have a mastery of state history, such a requirement should be stated. Or if the state has a mandate that all teachers demonstrate knowledge of working with English language learners, that should be specified. There are many ways to achieve that end goal through test design approaches.

If a state desires a fully state-specific program, that desire needs to be spelled out clearly in the RFP. The advantage of such a system is that it reflects the unique traditions and vision of the state. One drawback that needs to be recognized when crafting an RFP is the issue of low-volume tests, e.g., business education, music, and other content areas. A completely state-customized program means that these tests will be configured for the state, and the volumes will be so low that even basic psychometric procedures to achieve quality measurement will not be feasible. If a state decides on a completely state-specific approach, the state should understand the risks related to inability to conduct psychometric quality-control commensurate with national standards for assessment quality.

Test administration has changed dramatically in a computer-delivery world. Phrases like "on-demand" and "continuous testing" are attractive, sometimes conjuring up the idea that the tests are available every day of the year, every hour of the day. No high-stakes program is offered this way, nor should it be. Consider, for example, low-volume assessments on computer. It is essential to have a sufficient volume of candidates take the assessment in order to conduct the necessary psychometric analysis to report legally defensible scores. Restricting availability to specific windows maximizes volumes within those windows, thus allowing for timely and defensible score reporting. Not utilizing fixed windows allows volumes to be spread over larger periods of time. In some cases it could take months to accrue the

necessary volumes to complete the psychometric analysis necessary to report scores. This means candidates could potentially wait for months to receive a score, an unintended consequence of offering some assessments continually over longer periods of time.

It is helpful to think about computer-delivered test administration as being comprised of two main components: geographic proximity and number of days the test is available. When doing a comparison, a state should ask for a map of test centers in the state. Some states even require at least one test center “no more than x miles from each preparation institution.” Per the example given above, the state should also ask for information about testing frequency: how many days per year will various tests be available at the computer test sites? There will likely be different frequencies for different tests depending on characteristics like test volumes, types of items or tasks, and test design. Given the importance of test security for protecting the validity of scores, a careful vendor will take all these characteristics into consideration when developing a plan that is right for the testing program.

Assessment approach can be difficult to describe but is important to get right. If the state desires constructed-response questions or any kind of performance assessment, it helps if the state makes that explicit. Given that costs of development, administration, and scoring differ widely depending on the types of tasks in an assessment, it makes sense to be as detailed as possible about what the state wants.

A practical matter many states struggle with is whether or not to require constructed response (CR) items in an assessment. From a technical measurement perspective, it is true that CR can measure things that multiple-choice (MC) items cannot, like written or spoken proficiency in a foreign language, or complex critical thinking skills. But in many cases the constructs to be assessed, including critical thinking ability and analysis and interpretation skills, are measurable with MC items or other machine-scorable items. With the increase of technological tools available to test vendors, the richness of general and content specific pedagogy measured within machine-scorable items has increased. Items using scenarios, simulations, video, and other approaches allow us to measure instructional decision-making and applied content knowledge through machine-scorable items.

There are a number of issues for the state to take into consideration when weighing whether to require CR items. First, having several CR items in a test usually lengthens testing time, because if the testing time is not lengthened, there may not be enough total items to achieve the needed level of test and score reliability. Also, human scoring of the items adds to the overall expense of the program, which is reflected in the price charged to candidates. From the perspective of computer delivery of tests, the use of CR items increases concerns about test security, since they are easier to remember and ultimately share. This leads to strategies to limit their exposure, such as moving to fixed windows instead of having continuous testing. (This is less of a concern with high-volume tests that have multiple forms in circulation at any given time.) Finally, requiring CR items for computer-delivered tests limits the possibility of reporting unofficial scores to the candidate immediately after testing, because CR items need to be scored by humans after the test administration.

With all these considerations, and with the advancements item types that can be machine-scored, states are encouraged to think fully through their decisions about assessment approaches. In fact, test design in general is an exercise in tradeoffs. In meeting the requirements of an RFP vendors have to balance domain coverage, testing time limitations, score reporting requirements, cost, security, statistical requirements for reliability, and population size, to name just a few. The more explicit states can be about their overall priorities—what counts the most to them—the

better vendors can respond to the RFP and most often the easier the proposal will be for the state to review and evaluate.

Alignment with standards is important to states. We recommend that states ask vendors to describe the depth and breadth of the alignment of their tests with the state or multi-state standards that the state presents as relevant to the assessment program. RFPs often do not seek in-depth evidence of alignment to standards, although the response of vendors to a line of inquiry of this kind might reveal a great deal about the match of the content of the examinations to the needs of the states. We encourage states to ask specific questions about alignment as appropriate and desired.

Asking Vendors About New Ideas and Supporting Research

Some states wish to know the broader work of each organization related to teacher effectiveness and also want to give vendors the opportunity to describe ideas they can offer for innovation; in other words, they want to know what other services the vendor could offer the state beyond the testing program or how the testing program could benefit from other activities. While these kinds of issues are usually handled best via agenda items or RFIs, it is also possible to ask for such information in RFPs. Below we offer suggestions for handling this category of topics.

Research conducted by the vendor related to teacher effectiveness and teacher assessment is a topic for which some states like to elicit responses from vendors in order to get a broader view of the research on which the assessments are based and to gauge the likelihood that the state will benefit from continued research in the area of teacher assessment.

Alternative approaches for accomplishing the state's goals are sometimes welcomed by states. For example, the state might not know all the possible test or task design approaches in the field and may wish to hear about these from the different organizations. The state may also want to hear about technological advances and how they may benefit teacher assessment in the future. Requests such as these are best done via an RFI, since it is very difficult to provide solid pricing and work plans related to multiple possible options. If the state gathers such input via an RFI, the state can then decide which approach to use and issue specific requirements in an RFP.

Basic Information to Include When Soliciting Comparative Information

We offer the following list as a checklist of the central elements included in most teacher licensure programs. States should state any specific requirements, information, or needs related to these services.

- The test titles associated with each certificate area
- Current testing volumes for each title
- Additional titles needed
- The test materials (test forms and items) currently owned by the state
- Whether or not the state expects to own item or test forms for new items and forms developed
- Test support services, such as test preparation materials, work with higher education faculty, online services
- The targeted launch date or month of new assessments
- Expectations for the evolution of the assessments during the course of a contract

- Requirements related to the informational website and other information sources for stakeholders
- Requirements or service levels for scheduling, registration, and fee collection
- Accommodations services required
- Mode(s) of test administration (CBT and/or PBT) and whether the administration mode varies by test
- Expectations related to frequency of administrations
- Test sites – state expectations for number and location of sites
- Scoring services, including any expectations about human scoring for constructed response items
- Score reporting to candidates, IHEs, and state agencies
- Access to and security of data
- Research and/or data analysis services required
- Technical reports
- Any specific procurement requirements mandated by agency or state regulations; e.g., the use of HUB vendors and inclusion of in-state contractors, regulations concerning the ownership of materials developed by vendors in support of the contract, and the rules in place for the declaration and protection of a responding vendor's intellectual property.

Vendor Processes that States Should Ask Vendors to Describe

Many states want to base their decision about a program's suitability for their state in part by evaluating the processes that contribute to and maintain the validity of the test scores. This makes perfect sense, and we support this practice. The following processes are often cited in state requests:

- Test design
- Test development
- Standard setting
- Communication with stakeholders
- Informational Web site and other online services
- Test preparation
- Test administration
- Test security
- Item analysis
- Test equating
- Machine scoring
- Human scoring, including scorer recruitment, training, qualifying, monitoring
- Score reporting
- Transitioning a program from an incumbent vendor
- Working relationship with state agency
- Communication with state agency
- Ancillary services, including research

Organization of the RFP

We have found some RFPs to be organized in a way that unintentionally invites redundancy in the responses. For example, an RFP might start out by listing overall requirements such as “test development,” “equating of tests,” “standard setting,” etc. Then, later on, the RFP will contain a section on test development requirements, a section on equating, a section on standard setting, etc. It is helpful for avoiding long and repetitive response documents if the language of the RFP makes clear when a statement of general vision and approach is required about a topic such as test development and when a more detailed account of the test development process is desired.

Note that some states in their RFPs choose to impose a page-length limit on the total response or a limit on the page length of each section.

One possible organizational scheme might be:

High-level description of offering: Require an overall statement of compliance, with a commitment to the key deliverables of RFP, as well as an overall statement of vision and approach to fulfilling the intent of the RFP.

Detailed plan, including process descriptions: Call for a detailed account of how the vendor will comply with each requirement and produce each deliverable. List each requirement in a logical order, for example:

- Gathering test requirements and creating test specifications
- Developing test questions
- Production of tests for the field
- Test administration
- Receiving and scoring the tests (including stat analysis work needed for scoring)
- Score reporting
- Technical reports

Description of key elements: If the state is looking for particularly innovative solutions related to assessment approach, standards alignment, delivery modes, scoring services, supporting research, or the like, we recommend that there be a clear indication where the vendor should describe their ideas within the RFP response.

Follow-up Presentation

Most states require an in-person presentation by vendors whose RFP submissions meet either a minimum level of evaluative points or some other initial evaluation screen. (Presentations are usually not required in an RFI process, but this is a state prerogative.) Some states choose to send each vendor a list of follow-up questions and ask them to focus on answers to those questions in their presentation. Other states ask each vendor to provide a summary of their offering. The state is free to organize the presentation at it wishes.

States differ as to whether the presentation is awarded points in the evaluation calculation or whether the presentation is considered a clarifying activity only. States also differ in the length of presentation, usually between one and three hours.

It is helpful if the state describes its plans for vendor presentations in the RFI or RFP so that vendors can plan for the presentation as they prepare their responses. The presentations may be of higher quality if the expectations are included in the RFI or RFP.

RFI/RFP Scheduling Issues

Responding to an RFI or RFP is an intense and time-consuming activity for vendors, just as writing the RFI or RFP is for states. Every RFI and RFP is unique and demands careful study and careful response planning and preparation. We offer below several recommendations about the timeline.

Q&A. It is typical to allow vendors the chance to ask questions of the state after the RFI or RFP is released, usually in one of three formats: written questions, conference call, or an in-person meeting. It is helpful to hold this session or set the written-question deadline about a week after the RFI or RFP is issued. If the state chooses a written format, be aware that responding to vendors' questions may require significant effort, and staff time should be reserved to devote to this activity. Receiving timely answers to questions is a godsend to vendors in preparing their offering and proposals. In additions, states should be aware that vendors may have follow-up questions after receiving answers from the state. It is very helpful to vendors if states plan for a brief second round of written questions and answers.

Proposal preparation. Providing adequate time for vendors to prepare their proposals supports improved clarity and completeness of the responses. Allowing 7 – 9 weeks for a response covering an entire testing program is ideal from the vendor's perspective. One or two weeks can be shaved off if the RFI or RFP covers only one aspect of a licensure assessment program.

Vendor presentation. If the state requires an in-person presentation for vendors who have passed the first round of evaluation, the schedule can be laid out in the RFP, indicating the likely window for presentations, or the state can reserve the right to contact vendors to schedule the presentation. If the latter approach is used, vendors appreciate at least two weeks to both make travel arrangements and prepare their presentations.

Overall Characteristics of a High Quality RFI or RFP

The specifications should be unambiguous and internally consistent. It is difficult for vendors when there are conflicting specifications within a single RFI or RFP. In addition, the specifications should cover everything that the state needs—it is sometimes easy to think that it is obvious that additional services would be needed for a full program, but completeness is helpful for those who are responding to the program and ultimately for those who are evaluating the responses and associated prices. We suggest that a staff member who did not draft the RFI or RFP review it with an eye to spotting any inconsistencies or missing information.

The state should specify its priorities for the requirements. Unless stated otherwise, vendors assume that all requirements are mandatory, so it is important to identify whether there are any requirements that are desirable and/or optional but not mandatory.



A risk associated with preparing a comprehensive RFP is that it can become too prescriptive and inhibit the vendor from proposing a solution that is more efficient, cost effective, or in some way stronger that the state may well want to consider. To avoid this potential risk, the state can include in the RFP a method for allowing vendors to take exception to certain requirements or to suggest alternative solutions without jeopardizing the compliance status of the proposal.

For Further Help

For a complementary set of recommendations related to procurement, we recommend Chapter 20, “Assessment Program Procurement,” from the publication *Operational Best Practices for Statewide Large-Scale Assessment Programs* (The Council of Chief State School Officers and the Association of Test Publishers, 2010). Although the publication focuses on student assessments, many of the issues are the same as or similar to teacher licensure assessments.

Conclusion

Comparing teacher licensure assessment programs is a state’s responsibility; choosing the right approach and framing the right questions is the state team’s challenge. Whatever way is chosen to carry out a comparison—internal staff research, board agenda item, RFI, or RFP—we hope that this document has provided some useful information so that staff can execute their due diligence in an effective and efficient manner.



Appendix A

High-Level Comparison Template. The template emphasizes *evidence* about capabilities and features.

Testing Program Features and Capabilities that are Critical to the State (examples)	Evidence from Vendor A	Evidence from Vendor B
High quality assessments and legally defensible scores		
Assessments aligned with CCSS, state content standards, NCATE standards, state teaching standards, and/or other relevant standards		
Assessments kept current through regular reconsideration of content by educators and other stakeholders and through continual improvements in assessment theory and practice		
Convenient access to PBT and/or CBT test centers and testing opportunities		
Cost of licensure: affordability and value		
National availability of the assessments to give the State access to the largest pool of potential teachers		
Comprehensive support to the State, including program, research, and legal support		
Method and availability of customization to meet state requirements and/or broader state vision		



Appendix B

Detailed Comparison Template. The template emphasizes *how* the vendor will address the State’s certification and licensure requirements.

State Requirements (examples)	Vendor A Solution	Vendor B Solution
<p>Valid and legally defensible scores</p> <p>The vendor should describe how valid and defensible scores for each certification area will be produced, including the contributions of each segment of the assessment process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of test frameworks and content specifications • Test design • Item development • Test form development • Standard setting • Test delivery • Item exposure • Test security • Item analysis • Equating • Human and machine scoring • Score reporting 		
<p>Continual improvement</p> <p>The vendor should describe how the assessment program will continue to improve through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advances in assessment theory and practice • Feedback from the state, candidates, and other stakeholders • Process improvement 		
<p>Access</p> <p>The vendor should describe how appropriate test access will be created and, once created, how it will be maintained over the course of the contract, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper based (PBT) and/or computer based test (CBT) centers and their capacity • Frequency of PBT and/or CBT administrations by test 		



<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Testing students with disabilities• Test fees that balance affordability and good value		
<p>Customer (test taker) service</p> <p>The vendor should describe how test takers will be provided appropriate, accurate, and timely services, information and assistance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registration, scheduling, and eligibility• Test information and preparation• Score Receipt and Retrieval• Score interpretation• Problem resolution		
<p>Client Service</p> <p>The vendor should describe how it will support the State through information and services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Title II reporting• Stakeholder communications and support• Program research and data analyses• Technical reports• Handling special client requests for information, problem resolution, etc.		



Appendix C

Pricing Template: Test Fees. The design of the template should yield unambiguous information to support the State’s fair and confident evaluation and comparison of vendors’ prices.

Test Title	Delivery Mode	Estimated Annual Volume	Test Fee	Additional Fee Assessed? (yes/no)
Test A (has both CBT and PBT administrations)	CBT	2000	\$X.xx	no
	PBT	1000	\$Y.yy	yes
Test B	PBT	1000	\$Y.yy	yes
Test C	PBT	3000	\$Y.yy	yes
and so on				

Pricing Template: Additional Fees and Special Services Fees.

Additional and Special Fees	Fee	Comment (Vendor should describe when the fee is assessed)
Registration (list)		
Surcharges (list)		
Special Services (list)		



Pricing Scenario Template. Vendors’ prices can be complex and difficult to compare. We suggest that in addition to populating the fee schedules above, the vendor should provide the **total price** for each of the following scenarios using Tests A, B, and C priced above.

Pricing Scenarios	Total Price of the Scenario
Scenario 1. In one testing year, a candidate takes Test A (CBT)	
Scenario 2. In one testing year, a candidate takes Test B (PBT)	
Scenario 3. In one testing year, a candidate takes Test A (CBT) twice	
Scenario 4. In one testing year, a candidate takes Test B (PBT) and Test C (PBT) on different administration dates	
Scenario 5. In one testing year, a candidate takes Test A (CBT) and Test B (PBT)	