

Questions: RFP #251-24-403 – Evaluation of Teacher & School Leader Incentive Program

Reference	Vendor Question	Answers
Scope of Work and Key Deliverables, Page 8	When the RFP uses the word “impact,” do you mean (1) changes in outcomes or (2) causal impact to be measured by an experimental or quasi-experimental design?	#2.
Proposal Requirements (iii) Proposed Budget Pages 8 & 9	Regarding the submission, could you kindly confirm if indirect costs are permitted? UNC has a federally approved rate of 55.5% that we must apply if we do not have any specific guidance from the sponsor. In this case, do you all have a specific indirect cost rate or policy that is applicable to grant opportunities? If so, please share that guidance with us. If not, are we expected to apply our federally negotiated rate?	Indirect costs are permitted so long as the total (direct plus indirect) costs do not exceed the overall cost cap.
RFP Section: N/A Page Number: N/A	Could you please provide the performance period dates, along with the projected duration of the project in years?	The grant runs from October 1, 2023, through September 30, 2026. There will be a 120-day period following the end to wrap up and submit final reports, etc.
Execution Pages 1 & 2	Additionally, we noticed a discrepancy regarding the submission requirements. While page 1 mentions a photocopy requirement, page 2 does not. Could you clarify what documentation needs to be submitted for our proposal?	Vendors should submit 1 original, 1 photocopy, and 1 copy on a flash drive with their proposal.
Scope of Work and Key Deliverables, p. 8	To ensure the offeror proposes a feasible design, can WCPSS confirm whether the contractor will have access to administrative data at the teacher level, and the years for which data are available?	Yes.
Terms and Conditions, p. 11 – 14	Is WCPSS open to negotiating the terms and conditions outlined in pages 11 – 14 of the solicitation with the organization selected for award? If so, should offerors identify any specific exceptions to the terms or highlight terms it intends to negotiate in their submission?	Any exceptions to WCPSS Terms & Conditions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Vendors should note any exceptions in their proposal.
Terms and Conditions, Section 19, p. 12	Can WCPSS please clarify if the awardee will be required to obtain a performance bond?	No, not for this service.
Terms and Conditions, Section 30, p. 12-13	If an offeror has insurance levels less than those identified, can umbrella insurance be used to cover the variance?	We are unable to answer this question until we can review the Vendor’s Certificate of Insurance with proof the umbrella extends over the needed lines of coverage that will provide the limits required. If the vendor would like to send an “Evidence Only” COI when their proposal is submitted we’d be happy to review.

Terms and Conditions, Section 41, p. 14	Are offerors required to be registered to do business in NC prior to the submission deadline?	No. That would be required upon award.
Terms and Conditions, p. 11 – 14	Is WCPSS open to introducing a term in the contract which limits the liability of the parties?	Any exceptions to WCPSS Terms & Conditions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
RFP Section: Components of the PBCS, Page 6 and Page 7	In the context of implementing performance-based compensation, how does the evaluation and observation of teachers in the classroom influence their eligibility for performance-based compensation?	It doesn't. Eligibility is based on past performance.
RFP Section: Implementation and Evaluation of a PBCS Page 5 and Page 6	How will the salary differentials be awarded - upon accepting a position and after so many years in the position?	Recruitment and retention bonuses are as follows: \$1,500 for teachers and APs and \$2,500 for principals employed on Oct. 1, 2024; \$1,500 for any teacher or AP and \$2,500 for any principal hired between Oct. 2, 2024-September 1, 2026. An additional \$1,500 for teachers and APs, and \$2,500 for principals who remain at school through Sept. 1, 2026
RFP Section: Scope of Work and Key Deliverables, Page 8	Are there any accessibility requirements for the Technical Report or Community-Facing Briefs?	Any product that is family-facing and will be shared digitally (like a PDF, or graphic) must meet Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG): https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG22/quickref/?versions=2.0
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	Can you provide more detail on what is meant by “an evaluation with formative and summative feedback loops”?	Vendors should not just provide a summative analysis (at the end of the project period), but also ongoing feedback to WCPSS (e.g., once per year).
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	Are there key metrics you're looking to track as part of this evaluation? How will the results be used?	Employee retention, student achievement.
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	Are there any prior program evaluations that the district has conducted that could serve as a model for this work?	None related to this work.
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	Is the budget ceiling mentioned (~495k) for a one-time evaluation or ongoing evaluation over multiple years?	It is a three-year project, and the study will use data from all three years (2024-25, 2025-26, and 2026-27).
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	What major milestones should we be aware of for this work (e.g., ideal start date, report delivery date, key stakeholder meetings, community briefing etc.)?	We are open to considering key milestones provided by the vendor.
Scope of work and key deliverables, page 8	Who are they key stakeholders or stakeholder groups that need to be engaged throughout this process and / or in the discussion of findings?	The district's Human Resources Department is a key stakeholder to be engaged throughout this process and in the discussion of findings.

	Is there a desire to engage with other districts who have done this work?	Engagement with other districts might be beneficial. Please describe in your application what this engagement looks like.
BACKGROUND: CONTEXT AND AWARD, Page 5	The RFP mentions a subset of 24 high need schools were selected to participate in Project LEADERS. The grant proposal states that the 24 were selected at random from a set of 60 eligible schools. Could you describe in more detail how the random selection worked? For example, was there a stratification by school level or other factors?	Random assignment was at the school-level and based on the Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) growth index, percent of economically disadvantaged students, and grade span (i.e., elementary, middle).
BACKGROUND: CONTEXT AND AWARD, Page 7	Could you provide more specifics on how the performance compensation will be allocated to principals and teachers? For example, will principals be rewarded based on school EVAAS results? Will teachers be rewarded based on school or classroom EVAAS results?	Student growth-based compensation based on EVAAS scores: \$2,000 bonus for individual teachers who exceed growth; \$2,000 bonus for principals/APs if school exceeds growth.
BACKGROUND: CONTEXT AND AWARD, Page 7	May we assume that all or most of the information used to award the performance-based compensation will be provided by a State of North Carolina data system? If not, will the data come from a Wake County data system?	Yes – the evaluator will not need to make those determinations. Compensation eligibility will be determined by state and local data systems.
BACKGROUND: CONTEXT AND AWARD, Page 7	Which vendors provide Wake County’s student and human resources data systems? Is the student data system Ed-Fi compliant?	Student information comes from the state’s statewide instance of PowerSchool. HR data systems are Oracle. Neither is Ed-Fi compliant.
SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8	The first three preliminary research questions reference the impact of three components of Project LEADERS on recruitment, retention, and educator quality. Given that these three might be expected to work synergistically to impact these outcomes, it would appear difficult to separate the impact of each component. Would Wake County be open to some variations in implementation of the incentives to allow better estimation of separate impacts?	No.
SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8	The logic model linked to the RFP implies that the first year the performance-based compensation will be in effect will be the 2024-25 school year, the second, the 2025-26 school year, and the third the 2026-27 school year. Is that correct?	Yes.
SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8	The logic model references conducting annual participant surveys for teachers and school leaders. Will administering such surveys be the responsibility of the evaluator? Does the District currently conduct annual surveys of teachers and leaders?	Yes, and yes. But the evaluator should not assume that existing district surveys will necessarily capture the information needed for the study.
SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8	The logic model references a long-range outcome of teachers and school leaders having opportunities to receive North Carolina performance-based compensation bonuses. We assume this refers to	Yes, that refers to bonuses under the Session Law.

	<p>bonuses under Session Law 2022 -74 Section 7A.2. Is this correct? How does Wake County see these bonuses as being integrated with the performance-based compensation under the grant?</p>	
<p>SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8</p>	<p>The Project LEADERS grant proposal we downloaded from the US Department of Education website mentions that on page 34 that WCDPSS will contact with an external evaluator/applied research firm to “Implement a web-based decision support solution that includes dashboarding, visualizations, and tools to enable WCPSS to [a] identify specific talent needs at the subset of high-need schools selected for participation in Project LEADERS; [b] strategically manage the placement of leaders and teachers; [c] track year-over-year educator performance using a customizable model of educator evaluation and educator effectiveness predicated on multiple performance measures (e.g., student achievement and growth outcomes, observational outcomes, and summative performance evaluations); and [d] monitor program implementation and impact. “These tasks are not explicitly mentioned in the RFP. Does Wake County consider them in the scope and budget for he the project the RFP covers? If not, will a separate RFP be used to contract for these tasks?</p>	<p>A separate RFP has been issued for those tasks.</p>
<p>SCOPE OF WORK AND KEY DELIVERABLES, Page 8</p>	<p>The Project LEADERS grant proposal we downloaded from the US Department of Education website includes this paragraph on page 34 stating that the evaluator would “3. Design, develop, and produce [a] the educator and school-level performance measures, outcomes, and profiles; [b] program implementation and impact metrics and measures; and [c] other salient analytics requisites of Project LEADERS and the decision-support solution, from raw data collection, compilation, and diagnostics to summative educator evaluation scoring and reporting.” These tasks are not explicitly mentioned in the RFP. Does Wake County consider them in the scope and budget for he the project the RFP covers? If not, will a separate RFP be used to contract for these tasks?</p>	<p>A separate RFP has been issued for those tasks.</p>
	<p>Which vendors provide Wake County’s student and human resources data systems? Is the student data system Ed-Fi compliant?</p>	<p>Student information comes from the state’s statewide instance of PowerSchool. HR data systems are Oracle. Neither is Ed-Fi compliant.</p>