



*Accelerate Progress for Students*

Charlotte Gensler, CPO  
Executive Director

Scott Elder  
Superintendent

**DATE: 06/12/2023**

**RFP NUMBER: 23-091 RR**

**RFP TITLE: Professional Development Services**

**ADDENDUM NUMBER: 1**

See Question and Answers

**Question 1:** What is the district's PD Budget for the 23-24 School Year?

**Response:** We do not have a set amount for our Professional Development.

**Question 2:** Is there an opportunity to submit supplemental materials that go along with PD under this RFP?

**Response:** Yes, include in a link or supplemental information.

**Question 3:** Is the district interested in seeing both in-person and only/virtual PD within this RFP?

**Response:** Yes

**Question 4:** These questionnaires are 3 pages long, and we have in the neighborhood of 50 different courses that align to the topics specified in your Scope of Work. That would be 150 pages of course information. The Proposal Format states the proposal shall not exceed 60 pages total. Am I wrong in interpreting the PD services questionnaires need to be part of the 60 pages?

**Response:** It does not need to be included as part of the 60 pages, but please include as supplemental information or link.

**Question 5:** What are the dates that APS is looking for vendors to perform the service?

**Response:** Estimated start date is August of 2023.

**Question 6:** Is APS looking for more than 1 service provider to perform the service?

**Response:** Yes

**Question 7:** Would you consider this RFP more of a general vendor application or does APS require specific services to take place in SY23/24?

**Response:** We desire to have the vendor offer their specific services that they can provide to APS.

**Question 8:** Is Attachment A - Fee Proposal a required form along with the proposal submission? If so, is it required to submit Attachment A for each individual service offered in the proposal?

**Response:** Yes, the Fee proposal is required with the submission, however you can list multiple services with the proposal if the costs are the same, but also list additional proposals for different service fees.

**Question 9:** Does this RFP include professional development services for teachers teaching prekindergarten?

**Response:** Please submit any development services that you offer for the district to review.

**Question 10:** Our group is currently working with the City of Peoria, AZ on a Workforce Development Program, but we have not worked with a school district before. We are wondering if this takes us out of the conversation, or merely affects our scoring?

**Response:** You will not be considered non-responsive, so please submit your offer to be reviewed.

**Question 11:** What information is expected in the Evaluation Criteria Documentation?

**Response:** Please reference criteria that is listed in page 26 of the RFP Documents

**Question 12:** The proposal requires alignment to NM state standards and APS Goals and Guideposts. Is that alignment to be included extensively on Form A, within the proposal itself, or both?

**Response:** APS desires that you include both.

**Question 13:** Can you please provide the number of FTE for Kindergarten-grade 5 staff for APS?

**Response:** The number of FTE for Kindergarten - Grade 5 Staff is currently 2,022 records.

**Question 14:** Regarding being able to provide a “detailed description of professional development/specialized training,” we want to ensure the level of detail expected here in terms of the flexibility we would or would not have in terms of customizing the professional development workshops to meet local needs and goals of participants, including intentional pivots we might make even on a daily basis in consultation with our APS workshop coordinator. This, for example, is something we did in collaboration with our APS coordinator regarding the workshops done recently as part of the APS Summer STEAM Workshop we did recently (PO 222323029) and got really good feedback from that approach. Note that in that case, none of the pivots were outside the scope of the contract (e.g. moving one activity for another), but that was because we had not listed the work to that high degree of detail. We just want to be sure that we are able to take a similar approach here and clearly understand the degree of freedom that is expected under this RFP. If we indeed can, then we believe it provides a higher level of flexible service that targets participant just-in-time needs. Please note that we understand that any curricular development and planning time per such modifications would not be paid for as part of this RFP.

**Response:** You have the freedom to offer APS your services, but make sure that your services are contained within your offer.

**Question 15:** Based on the work we began per the APS Summer STEAM Workshop this spring (see above), feedback from participating teachers and district personnel was quite positive and alluded to a goal of continuing such work, just on a larger scale, as well as ensuring what was learned in these workshops could be sustained into the participating teachers’ schools and classrooms. It is on the basis of this feedback that we are excited about providing a proposal for this RFP. As such, our inclination is that we focus only on a limited number of the categories under the Scope of Work section (i.e. the primary focus areas of the above contract such as K-8 redesign, STEM/STEAM, digital integration, etc.) and not explicitly list other categories that we might be qualified to provide, but are not specific to the replicating and scaling of what we did in the existing contract. We just want to be sure that taking such a relatively narrow approach would not put us at a disadvantage.

**Response:** This is a business decision but you must include all services that you wish to have APS consider.

**Question 16:** Related to the above question, would it be preferred that we specifically list additional key elements of the current project under “other related categories,” given that these will obviously be a significant portion of our proposal (items such as makerspaces, coding, PBL, and design thinking, etc.), even if they are not explicitly listed in the categories under the Scope of Work section?

**Response:** This is a business decision but you must include all services that you wish to have APS consider.

**Question 17:** Can you please clarify this phrase that is found in the Scope of Work section under Face-to-Face Training and Virtual Training (ideally with an example)? “The proposed fee of the Face to Face Training should include the fee to cover the adequate number of instructors to provide the training. APS will not pay the proposed fee for each individual instructor but will only pay the negotiated fee for the face to face training with the adequate number of instructors.”

**Response:** This will be listed as a per training for the Service, not a per instructor. Offers should include the number of instructors needed to complete the training for the number of teachers and staff.

**Question 18:** We were able to locate the APS Goals & Guardrails per the link provided in the Evaluation Criteria section of the RFP. However, we were not able to find specific reference to the "Strategic Master Academic Plan" or specific reference to the APS "Instructional Framework." Can you provide a reference in the APS website where these resources might be located?

**Response:** There is not an official publication at this time.

**Question 19:** Apart from what is required per the Fee Proposal section of the RFP, are we correct in understanding that the following items will be required prior to a potential contract award, but are not required for this RFP: Description of training, Date(s) of training, Location of training, Specific individuals who will be providing the training, Agenda (other than sample agendas), and Deliverables?

**Response:** You need to follow the criteria of what is listed in the RFP, your services should be fully described.

**Question 20:** Regarding the Company Profile section of the Evaluation form, given that we are an education nonprofit (501(c) 3), will the last three years’ worth of 990 forms be sufficient to address the organization’s financial status?

**Response:** Yes, that will be sufficient.

**Question 21:** Regarding the “Proposed Length of Session” point in the Fee Proposal criteria, would this refer to the length of an entire program that will be the focus of the RFP (per what was mentioned in question 1 & 2) or is this the length of a typical workshop that we would do under that overarching program?

**Response:** a typical workshop or distinct workshop engagement.

**Question 22:** Regarding the insurance requirements listed in the Terms & Conditions section, per feedback from our insurance provider and given the nature of our nonhazardous consulting work, we currently do not have a General Liability Insurance at \$1,000,000 (like a contractor doing physical work that exposed themselves to injury or harm might have). Moreover, because we do not work directly with students, we do not have a Professional Liability Insurance policy at \$2M, which might be needed if we were actually teaching students or provided training that could lead to long-term harm or injury. We can add to our current policies to meet these requirements, if needed, but we also wanted to see if the nature of the work in this RFP might warrant the application for a waiver or "exception" per section 13 of the General Instructions.

**Response:** This is our standard insurance policy, and must be adhered to as a minimum.

**ACKNOWLEDGE ADDENDUM WITH SUBMITTED PROPOSAL, AND SEE UPDATED EVALUATION CRITERIA IN THIS DOCUMENT:**  
**Addenda not signed and returned may consider the RFP non-responsive and May be Rejected.**

---

**COMPANY/FIRM NAME**

---

**SIGNATURE**

---

**DATE**