

STATE OF ALASKA RFP 2014-0500-1985
AMENDMENT NUMBER 02



Department of Education and Early Development
Division of Education Support Services
801 W Tenth Street Suite 200
PO Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

RFP TITLE: STATE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT COACH PROGRAM

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: May 31, 2013

OPENING DATE AND TIME: 4:00 PM AST on Friday June 14, 2013.

NOTE: This amendment is for informational purposes only and need not be returned to the State.

E. The following questions have been asked; the answers follow the questions. The numbering continues from Amendment 01 and thus starts at #3.

- Question #4:

- The template is written using Goudy Old Style, yet once the offeror begins typing, the font changes to Courier New 11pt. Do we assume that Courier New 11pt is the required font to use to write our responses to attachments 12-14 [Note: it is attachments 10-12] and use of any other font would result in disqualification?

Answer to Question #4:

The intention in restricting in formatting is twofold:

- To provide an easy to read format for the Proposal Evaluation Committee: we expect to have approximately 40 proposals, which will mean approximately 240 pages of Q&A documents to read. For an example, imagine trying to fairly evaluate proposals written where one set is written in *Vijaya*, another in **Franklin Gothic Demi Cond**, and yet another in *Papyrus*.
- Some fonts could be used to expand the amount of space available to answer the question, for example *TrisUPC* is a denser font than *Courier New*; restricting the font and size means all offerors have the same amount of space to answer the questions.

- Question #5:

- I understand the clear instruction to NOT alter the template in any way. However, do we take this literally to also mean in our written responses that we cannot alter font size, or even use Bold, italics, or underline to emphasize separate training events for clarity while still using the required font style in our written response?

Answer to Question #5:

Use of **bold**, italics, or underlining is acceptable as long as the font is 11 pt. Courier New.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP 2014-0500-1985
AMENDMENT NUMBER 02

• **Question #6:**

As soon as you begin typing your response, the text is automatically highlighted in yellow. Is it permissible to turn the highlighter function off without disqualifying our application?

Answer to Question #6:

Yes, it is absolutely permissible to turn off the highlighting. That function was inadvertently turned on. Attachments 10-12 have been corrected.

• **Question #7:**

Is it acceptable to have a state official involved in the current SSOS CP provide a reference for me? They are uniquely able to attest to coaching traits. We [current SSOS coaches] are all speculating in emails, so feel free to send a group response.

Answer to Question #7:

A state official that provides a reference to an offeror cannot act in any role as an evaluator for offers to this RFP. Furthermore, it would create an appearance of a possible conflict if anyone in the supervisory or management role at EED were to act as a reference. EED personnel are aware of this.

The second issue "We [current SSOS coaches] are all speculating in emails..." is more concerning. Do not speculate-ask the questions you want to ask. Send them to robert.roys@alaska.gov. I will answer them either by directing you to the relevant section of the RFP or by issuing an amendment.

• **Question #8:**

I only have 4 years' experience here in Alaska, but 15 outside of Alaska. Does this automatically disqualify me from applying? I noted that in the RFP it states 5 years.

Answer to Question #8:

Per §2.08 "In order for offers to be considered responsive offerors must demonstrate the following:

- 1) Alaskan Type A, Type B Teaching Certificate or qualifications to obtain one;
- 2) At least 5 years of either classroom or administrative experience ***in Alaska*** [emphasis added]; and
- 3) Experience as a member of a school or district leadership team.

An offeror's failure to meet these minimum prior experience requirements will cause their proposal to be considered non-responsive and their proposal will be rejected."

A proposal that does not have evidence that the offeror meets the minimum prior experience requirements will be considered non-responsive and that proposal will be rejected.

<End of Amendment 02 Questions and Answers>



Robert Roys
Procurement Officer
PHONE: (907) 465-8654
TDD: (907) 465-2815
FAX: (907) 465-3254