

PROPOSAL

RFP # R0116

Peer Observation and Evaluation

May 11, 2007

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

RFP # R0116

Peer Observation and Evaluation

Submitted to:
New York City Department of Education
Division of Contracts and Purchasing
65 Court Street
Brooklyn NY 11201

Submitted by:
Lawrence Hirsch
RMC Research Corporation
The Lincoln Building, 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 1345
New York, NY 10165-1345
Phone: 212-972-4762
FAX: 212-972-4763
E-mail: lhirsch@rmcres.com

May 11, 2007



RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

May 11, 2007

New York City Department of Education
Division of Contracts and Purchasing
65 Court Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

RFP # 0116: Peer Observation and Evaluation

Dear Sir/Madam:

RMC Research Corporation is pleased to respond to RFP #0116 "Peer Observation and Evaluation" issued by the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), on behalf of the Division of Human Resources (DHR). We understand that the RFP is seeking high quality instructional experts to be "Peer Observers" for tenured teachers who are in danger of receiving disciplinary charges for incompetence.

RMC Research's proposal offers a plan to provide the requested instructional experts, experienced classroom teachers and professional coaches to be Peer Observers. They will: perform classroom observations of identified tenured teachers; develop individualized plans to assist the participating teachers; meet and confer with the teachers to provide ongoing guidance and direction in implementing the plan; and produce written reports of the observations along with assessments of competence which may be introduced in disciplinary hearings.

RMC is eager to bring its high quality and successful experiences in providing teacher evaluation frameworks and professional development to support the improvement of classroom instruction to New York City. If you have questions about the enclosed materials, please contact Lawrence Hirsch at 212-972-4762 or by e-mail at lhirsch@rmcres.com

Sincerely,

Dr. Everett Barnes, Jr.
President

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Contents

Letter of Transmittal

Appendix E1 – Proposal Form

Section 1: Company Information – RMC Research Corporation 1

Section 2: Minimum Qualifications..... 2

Section 3. Letters of Reference, **please see Section 5**..... 4

Program Plan/Narrative. As required in Section 4, Proposal Requirements, RMC has described the program plan narrative in E2 – as a separate file.

Section 4: Organizational Capacity 5

 RMC Corporate Facilities 6

 Project Organization 7

 Resumes of Key Proposed Staff for this Proposal 9

 Lawrence Hirsch, Director, RMC Research, New York..... 10

 Sandy Kase, Project Director/Liaison to NYCDOE 13

 Ellen Rosenbaum, Project Coordinator 18

 Shelly Billig, Expert Trainer 21

 Some Examples of Highly Qualified, Exemplary Teachers/Peer Observers. 39

 Nada Ben-Marzouk, Administrative Assistant/Support..... 71

Section 5 Demonstrated Effectiveness 73

 Letters of Reference 75

Section 6: Previous City Contracts 81

Section 7: Exceptions and Deviations Form 82

Section 8: Signature Sheet 83

Appendix E2: Section 4.1 Program Plan/Narrative

 Framework 84

 Quality of Peer Observers 88

 Use of Automobile 88

 Work Plan 89

 Peer Observation Protocol..... 91

Appendix F: Pricing 94

Vendex Certification of No Change 98

Certificate of Liability Insurance..... 99

Appendix A 5: RMC Research Corporation Affirmative Action Plan

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Exhibits

Appendix E1

Exhibit 4.2.1: RMC Research Corporation's Organizational Structure 5

Exhibit 4.2.1a: Project Organizational Chart 9

Appendix E2

Work Plan 89

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation**APPENDIX E1-Proposal Form**

The following template was created to facilitate the collection of information from Vendors. For each evaluation criteria, we have provided a format to submit relevant information for the Evaluation Committee to review. Please complete all sections of this template to the best of your abilities. **PLEASE NOTE: YOU MAY USE AS MUCH SPACE AS YOU NEED, THE BOXES SHOULD EXPAND, BUT MAY USE SPACE OUTSIDE THE BOX IF NECESSARY WHEN WRITING YOUR PROPOSAL.** You must use the electronic Microsoft Word version of this file and a paper version with your authorized representatives signature and title on this AND THE LAST PAGE.

Is the response printed on recycled paper containing the minimum percentage of recovered fiber content as requested by NYCDOE in the instructions to this solicitation? Yes No

Section 1. Company Information

LEGAL NAME OF COMPANY	RMC Research Corporation
STREET ADDRESS (MAIN OFFICE)	1000 Market St.
ROOM NUMBER	Building 2
CITY	Portsmouth
STATE	New Hampshire
ZIP CODE	03801
NYC DEPT. OF EDUCATION VENDOR NUMBER (If You have one)	
FEDERAL TAX IDENTIFICATION NO.	52-081-9071
CONTACT PERSON FOR THIS PROPOSAL	Dr. Everett W. Barnes, Jr.
CONTACT PERSON'S TELEPHONE	603-422-8888
CONTACT PERSON'S FAX	603-436-9166
CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL	ebarnes@rmcres.com
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE	
AUTHORIZED NAME AND TITLE	Everett Barnes, Jr., President
DATE OF SIGNATURE	May 10, 2007
ARE YOU A MINORITY OR WOMEN-OWNED ENTERPRISE?	No
IF YOU ARE A MINORITY OR WOMEN-OWNED ENTERPRISE (M/WBE) AND CERTIFIED AS SUCH, PLEASE SUBMIT A COPY OF YOUR CERTIFICATION WITH THIS PROPOSAL FORM.	

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Please indicate below the contact information should you receive a contract

CONTACT PERSON FOR THE CONTRACT	Larry Hirsch
STREET ADDRESS	RMC Research Corporation The Lincoln Building, 60 East 42nd Street,
ROOM NUMBER	Suite 1345
CITY	New York City
STATE	New York
ZIP CODE	10165-1345
CONTACT PERSON'S TELEPHONE	(212) 972 - 4762
CONTACT PERSON'S FAX	(212) 972 - 4763
CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL	lhirsch@rmcres.com

PLEASE NOTE: The company information that you include in your proposal must match the company information reflected in your Vendex Forms and Insurance Forms.

Section 2. Minimum Qualifications

Type your responses in the boxes provided below indicating the Minimum Qualification, Section 2 from the RFP, use as much space as necessary, and/or attach any supporting documentation at the end of this form when submitting your response.

- 2.1** Vendor may be for-profit or not-for-profit institutions. Individuals are not eligible to submit proposals for this RFP.
- 2.2** Vendors must document three (3) years of successful experience providing teacher evaluation frameworks, professional development, or other related experience that supports the improvement of classroom instruction. This experience may be with school districts other than the New York City Department of Education.
- 2.3** Vendors must submit two (2) letters of reference from organizations that paid the vendor for its services related to the improvement of classroom instructional practices or in teacher evaluation frameworks. These services must have been provided since January 1, 2003.

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation**Section 5. Demonstrated Effectiveness**

Detail your background and experience in providing these services. Detail the methods used and results obtained by those methods. Provide objective data, if available. NYCDOE reserves the right to verify any experience presented.

Please describe your Demonstrated Effectiveness (use as much space as necessary)

RMC Research Corporation, founded in 1966, is a private, professional services and technical consulting firm specializing in research, evaluation, training, and technical assistance for educational and human service agencies at the federal, state, and local levels. RMC Research Corporation has earned the respect of educators throughout the country by contributing to the development and implementation of effective educational practice and delivery of quality technical assistance. RMC and its staff members have built a reputation for being thoughtful, creative, and practical contributors to the shaping of new ideas about education and learning.

In the past several years, RMC's contract awards from a variety of government agencies, community organizations, and private industry have totaled in excess of \$40 million. Clients have included various federal agencies and departments, including the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the Office of Planning and Evaluation, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs. RMC's clients have also included state education agencies, local schools and school districts, foundations, and private sector organizations such as the Annenberg Foundation, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, AT&T, the Pew Charitable Trust, the Rockefeller Foundation, Lila and De Witt Wallace Reader's Digest Foundations, and the Andy Warhol Foundation. The quality of RMC Research Corporation's performance is supported by the fact that more than two-thirds of current contacts represent re-competitions, contract option renewals, and new work awarded by former clients.

RMC Research Corporation has more than 35 years of experience conducting research, evaluation, consultation, and technical assistance with federal and state agencies, schools, and communities engaged in the process of educational reform and improvement. RMC's expertise is rooted in both research and evaluation in many issues related to educational quality and reform, as well as extensive work in the field through training, technical assistance and product development. Because RMC has program offices in Arlington, Virginia; Tampa, Florida; Denver, Colorado; Portland, Oregon; and Portsmouth, New Hampshire; we have the opportunity to work in extremely diverse urban and rural school and community settings, engage the talents and expertise of our staff from across offices, and provide efficient data collection reflecting a national perspective.

The hallmark of RMC Research Corporation's work has been a commitment to high quality education for children in elementary and secondary schools, and to the continuing improvement of instruction, assessment, teacher quality, professional development, and other factors that converge to create a highly functioning, achievement-oriented educational system. RMC has contracted with educators at all levels of the American education system, including federal agencies (e.g., operating major regional technical assistance centers and conducting national education studies), state education agencies (e.g., working with states to implement and evaluate initiatives), and local education agencies (providing grass roots support for administrators and teachers committed to ongoing improvement).

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

RMC has a long history of working with and providing technical assistance to NYSED and facilitating collaborative relationships between state networks and the state offices that fund the networks. RMC has leveraged its existing relationships within the state into an effective and coherent network of resources directed toward a single goal of providing high quality professional development services to high need districts and schools. Examples of our recent collaborative partnerships in New York State include the following:

RMC was a significant subcontractor and partner in the New York Technical Assistance Center (NYTAC) for over 10 years. Services were focused on high poverty, low performing districts and schools, schoolwide programs and support to state funded networks.

RMC Research Corporation also operates the NYS Mathematics Resource Center (MRC) Technical Assistance Center which provides professional development to support comprehensive and long-term changes in instructional practices; best practices that are rooted in scientifically or evidenced based research.

RMC has many years experience working with New York City Department of Education and other large Eastern urban school systems to provide evaluation services, school reform guidance, and technical assistance. Six such projects are described here:

Charter School Institute Third Year Inspection. To assess the school's progress towards achieving its Accountability Plan goals and to provide recommendations to help prepare for renewal as a result of a comprehensive site visit review, the Charter School Institute contracted RMC in 2006 and 2007 to conduct the Third Year Inspection. RMC uses highly qualified instructional experts to serve as team members on the charter school third year inspection visits. Third Year Inspection activities include meeting with school personnel and Trustees, data collection through classroom observations using a school quality rubric, individual and group interviews of faculty, students and parents, review of documents, team deliberations and exit conference. The team submits a written report that summarizes the evidence that supports the team's conclusions to the Charter School Institute for subsequent dissemination of the final report to the school.

Quality Reviews for Public Schools of Aurora, Colorado; Washoe County (Reno), Nevada; Dallas, Texas; Cheyenne, Wyoming; and rural school systems. (Also mentioned in Section 2.2) RMC Research was contracted throughout the past six years to conduct quality reviews for Aurora Schools, Washoe County Schools, Dallas Schools, Cheyenne Schools and other smaller venues that provided ratings and evidence on a number of research-based indicators associated with high academic performance. Each school district selected 30-40 constructs which became the indicators for the quality review. RMC Research used multiple measures including classroom observations, interviews, focus groups, and document review to collect evidence for ratings for each of the constructs selected. Teams of RMC staff collected data during site visits over a period of 2 to 4 days. Evidence collected by RMC staff was reviewed based on established rubrics. Aggregate and individual school reports were generated and shared with the principal and district office personnel. Information on instructional and organizational practices in use at each grade span illuminated differences between schools that have the highest and lowest academic success. Strategic plans to redirect efforts were developed.

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Evaluation of New York City Data Utilization Project. Between 1998 and 2000, RMC conducted an evaluation of the New York City Safe and Drug Free Schools Data Utilization project. This project was designed to improve the systems and skills of district SDFS program directors and staff for using data within the framework of the SDFS Principles of Excellence. RMC staff observed and interviewed SDFS middle school coordinators from eight community school districts who participated in this effort to develop forms and procedures for organizing and analyzing data being collected by NYC and the state.

NYCDOE Leadership and Public Engagement. Through the Laboratory at Brown University, one of ten regional education labs serving the Northeast and Islands regions, RMC has performed a number of research, policy, and technical assistance activities, including work in New York State and New York City. As part of our research and technical assistance on Leadership in Complex Environments, RMC was contracted to work with New York City Chancellor Rudy Crew and Deputy Chancellor Harry Spence in the roll-out of leadership teams in all the City's districts. Our staff spent an entire year working with the Board of Education to convene public engagement activities in all 43 NYC districts and the high school districts. We worked with local superintendents and their staff members to organize public meetings that involved administrators, teachers, and parents to design the school leadership model for City schools. Individualized reports were prepared for each district based on data collected through focus groups and questionnaires.

School Reform in the New Haven and Hartford CT Public Schools. As a major LAB partner, RMC has worked with Connecticut's two largest urban school systems on several projects related to low-performing schools. RMC staff conducted multi-year site visits to the identified low-performing schools in each city to document for the local school system and the state agency the types of reforms that schools were putting in place. Second year site visits included comparisons of the practices between schools that had made improvements in achievement over a two year period and those that had not. The reviews documented district-provided resources and supports to the schools and school perceptions of district office support. As a follow-up activity in New Haven, RMC and its LAB partner assessed the operational and instructional differences between those schools that were persistently low-performing and schools with similar student demographic profiles that were average to high achieving. New Haven recently used the information to implement changes in district policies and resources for low-performing schools.

School Improvement in Washington, DC. RMC has provided technical assistance for over ten years to the District of Columbia Public Schools, primarily under the auspices of the Region III Comprehensive Center and more recently under the National Center for Reading First Technical Assistance. Recently, RMC staff worked with 15 schools identified for improvement under the No Child Left Behind Act. RMC provided support for DCPS staff in assisting schools with analyzing data, assessing staff and students, and developing school improvement plans. RMC also developed rubrics for standards of practice in professional development for teachers, afterschool programs, research-based strategies, and other aspects of school improvement.

Letters of Reference Please see the letters from: 1) Robin Hood; 2) Charter Schools Institute; 3) State of Florida Even Start Coordinator; and 4) Lufkin Independent School District on the following pages.

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Section 6. Previous City Contracts

You must include a list of all City contracts held by your organization within the last 10 years, specifying the following information:

- City entity or department that administered the contract;
- Contract Number;
- Dollar amount of the contract;
- Dates and periods during which the contract was in effect;
- A short description of the services provided

1C407 – System-wide Early Childhood Professional Development

City entity or department that administered the contract: New York City Board of Education on behalf of the Office of Early Childhood

Contract Number: pending upon utilization of the contract – approved vendor

Dollar amount of the contract: est. annual amount of \$50,000 per calendar year if used as a vendor

Dates and periods during which the contract was in effect: September 1, 2005 – August 31, 2010

A short description of the services provided: “The purpose of this RFP is to provide professional development and support in comprehensive standards-based early childhood instruction from birth through grade 3 for teachers, social workers, early childhood consultants, educational assistants, family assistants, parent coordinators, teacher leaders, coaches, school and regional administrators.”

1C441 – System-wide Early Childhood Family Literacy

City entity or department that administered the contract: New York City Board of Education on behalf of the Office of Early Childhood

Contract Number: pending upon utilization of the contract – approved vendor

Dollar amount of the contract: est. annual amount of \$208,000 per calendar year if used as a vendor

Dates and periods during which the contract was in effect: September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2011

A short description of the services provided: “The purpose of this RFP is to provide family literacy services that will support comprehensive standards-based early childhood instruction from birth through age 8 (grade three) for parents, social workers, early childhood coordinators, teachers, educational assistants, family assistants, parent coordinators, coaches, school and regional administrators.”

1C369 – System-wide Program Evaluation Services

City entity or department that administered the contract: New York City Board of Education on behalf of the Division of Assessment and Accountability

Contract Number: pending upon utilization of the contract – approved vendor

Dollar amount of the contract: est. annual amount of \$165,000 per calendar year if used as a vendor

Dates and periods during which the contract was in effect: July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2008

A short description of the services provided: “The purpose of this request for proposals is to permit the selection of several contractors at agreed rates, whose services may be used by multiple DOE organizations during the term of the contract. The services to be performed by each selected contractor will be determined by the Regions, Districts and Central Offices.”

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Section 7. Exceptions and Deviations From RFP Form

Please sign only one of the sections below and return it with your proposal package.

Any exceptions or deviations from requirements, Terms and Conditions, or anything included in this RFP, or requirements that cannot be satisfied by the proposer, must be clearly identified and noted below by referring to the Section # and Subsection # of the RFP and clearly stating the item that cannot be met. Significant material deviations to the terms and conditions set forth in this RFP (including additional, inconsistent, conflicting or alternative terms) may render the proposal non-responsive and may result in rejection.

1 - If No Deviations...

If there are no deviations from and exceptions to this RFP, please sign below:

Signed: _____

Name & Title: Dr. Everett Barnes, Jr., President

Date: May 10, 2007

Company Name: RMC Research Corporation

2 - If Deviations...

If there are any deviations or exceptions, please describe them in the box below and sign where indicated:

<p>Describe deviations or exceptions in this box (use as much space as necessary) Use numbers to separate items in the box</p>

Listed in the above box are any and all deviations from and exceptions to the terms, conditions, requirements, and specifications furnished with RFP:

Signed: _____

Name & Title: _____

Date: _____

Company Name: _____

RFP # R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Signature Sheet

By signing this signature sheet, I am (we are) certifying that (i) I am (we are) authorized to submit this proposal on behalf of your company, (ii) I (we) understand and accept all requirements, and Terms and Conditions included in this RFP excluding the requirements, Terms and Conditions, or anything else noted in the Exceptions and Deviations.doc (if any), (iii) the information provided is true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge, (iv) failure to specifically answer the requirement(s) or question(s) may result in disqualification of our proposal, and (v) a materially false statement willfully or fraudulently made in connection with this RFP may result in being disqualified from this RFP process and future procurement opportunities with the New York City Department of Education.

Note that our subcontractors (or "partners" etc.) identified in our proposal also accept the above, to the extent that the proposal relates directly to the subcontractor. (If there are more subs than lines provided, please copy and paste in blank rows at the remainder of this document.)

Signed and accepted this 10th day of May, 2007

Signed: _____

Name & Title: Dr. Everett W. Barnes, Jr., President

Date: May 10, 2007

Company Name: RMC Research Corporation

Signed: _____

Name & Title: _____

Date: _____

Company Name: _____

Signed: _____

Name & Title: _____

Date: _____

Company Name: _____

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL/BAFO/RFP Q&A



THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JOEL I. KLEIN, *Chancellor*

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

52 Chamber Street – New York, NY 10007

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
FROM PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
APRIL 23, 2007
RFP # R0116 “PEER OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION”**

INTRODUCTION

This conference brought together representatives from the Division of Human Resources (DHR), the Deputy Chancellor's office and the Division of Contracts and Purchasing and interested service providers to discuss the Peer Observation and Evaluation (RFP). The Pre-proposal conference gave New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) staff and potential vendors the opportunity to exchange ideas and clarify issues pertaining to this RFP and the New York City Department of Education's procurement process.

The NYCDOE anticipates entering into a requirements agreement with one (1) vendor.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), on behalf of the Division of Human Resources (DHR), is seeking proposals from educational organizations, professional development companies or other vendors that can provide high quality instructional experts to be “Peer Observers” for tenured teachers who are in danger of receiving disciplinary charges for incompetence. Qualified individuals employed by the chosen vendor will be assigned caseloads of identified tenured teachers (approximately 200-300 yearly). The services to be provided will include classroom observations by Peer Observers, development of individualized plans to assist participating teachers and production of written reports of observations with assessments of competence to be introduced in disciplinary hearings, where applicable. It is expected that the typical period of observation time and review will range from a minimum of three (3) months to a maximum of six (6) months.

It is anticipated that the DOE will enter into a requirements agreement with one vendor commencing July 1, 2007, for a contract term of three years. However, the DOE reserves the right to enter into agreements with multiple vendors.

Questions & Answers

1. What is the anticipated legal or liability exposure that a vendor or observer can expect to be involved with in the process?

Based on the current peer observation/assessment system, there does not appear to be any significant liability with regard to the observer or vendor. Since substantial/thorough due processes would still be guaranteed to the tenured teacher, the peer observer would only be a part of the overall case against the teacher brought up on charges. The likelihood of an independent observer being subjected to legal issues would be small, since DOE is responsible for any adverse employment action that may result from an independent observer's evaluation.

2. In situations where an observer may have previously worked for the DOE and is still a UFT member, does this pose a possible conflict or do they have to be excluded as possible observers?

DOE anticipates selection of Peer Observers that are both independent and objective third parties. A former UFT member would not be excluded as a potential observer, but DOE stresses the need for independent evaluators/observers as a primary goal.

3. When will a bidder be notified regarding the status of their bid?

It is anticipated that this will be no later than August, 2007.

4. There was a mention of utilizing/developing a model for the Peer Observers. Is there any strategy regarding the development model?

An observer would typically spend 2-3 hours on an observation session per week. This would involve an initial meeting with a principal/assistant principal, the observation itself,, and a follow-up meeting with the teacher within 1-2 weeks of the observation. However, no specific time schedule is defined for this program as this will be dealt with on an individual basis.

5. How do you suggest we think about setting prices for the service?

DOE would like to see a focus on helping teachers to help themselves in improving the identified problems. This involves encouraging the teachers to move towards remedial action. As a starting point, it is suggested that the vendor aim for a once-a-week observation and calculate a per-case or per-week price.

6. To what extent does the vendor work with UFT in the program?

The program itself is a collaborative effort with the DOE and the UFT. However, the vendor is focused on the observation/evaluation aspect. The DoE does not anticipate the vendor dealing with the UFT.

7. With regard to employees/tenured teachers, can they choose not to participate in the program?

Participation in the program is voluntary but teachers are encouraged to do so. A refusal to participate is admissible in any disciplinary proceedings.

8. Can you please state when the Q&A will be posted by DOE?

The Q&A document will be posted by the beginning of May.

9. How much emphasis is placed on seeing actual improvement as opposed to drastic resolution such as termination of employment?

The goal of the program is to improve teacher quality in the New York City public schools. The program is targeted towards assisting and improving the classroom skills of identified tenured teachers who are in danger of receiving disciplinary charges. However, in that the targeted population is tenured teachers in danger of being charged with incompetence, substantial improvement will likely be necessary to avoid disciplinary charges.

10. Please talk about the communication between principals in this process. How does the observer communicate to the different parties?

The key is to foster a protocol for effectively communicating with the teacher and the principal. The observer will communicate with the principal when an observation visit is being arranged. Depending on whether the observation is formal (pre-arranged with the teacher in advance) or informal (the observer arrives without letting the teacher know in advance), communication may occur with the teacher as well prior to the visit. The principal or assistant principal will help the observer focus on what other communicative actions are necessary. The observer will communicate with the teacher involved in preparing individualized improvement plans for the teacher.

11. Is there a defined pattern of the location where problems are more common?

No. Problems exist at varying degrees in each borough, grade level etc. There is no particular geographic location with greater frequency of teacher performance issues.

12. Before an observer visits a school, how much information is at the disposal of the observer and can the observer have time with the teacher and/or principal beforehand?

Initial contact at a school will be made through the principal/assistant principal. Past documentation on the teacher will be made available at this meeting so that the observer understands which performance areas have been identified as problematic. An observer should aim to brief the principal/assistant principal at least every two weeks on the progress of the teacher.

13. Are you looking for an observer who resides in the same district, or is it based on a model that works regardless of the origin of the observer? For example, can the vendor offer the service through a partnership venture?

DOE will be open to any model or solution that works towards the main goals of the program. It is anticipated that one vendor will be offered a contract. Peer Observers should be knowledgeable about content and instructional strategies for the subject area in which the observed teacher specializes. Observers may come from NYC or anywhere else.

14. How long is the engagement?

The awarded vendor will be given a three year contract with the DOE having the option to extend the contract for two additional one year periods. .

15. How does the vendor receive payment from DOE?

After your contract is registered with the Comptroller's Office, invoices are generally submitted on a monthly basis.

REMEMBER THE PROPOSAL IS DUE ON MAY 11, 2007, AT 11:30 AM, ROOM 1201, 65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, NY 11201.

FOR DIRECTIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT WWW.NYCENET.EDU/OPM.

RFP

**THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JOEL I. KLEIN, *Chancellor***



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
No.
RFP # R0116
PEER OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION**

Sealed proposals will be received by the
Division of Contracts and Purchasing, Department of Education,
City of New York, 65 Court Street, Room 1202, Brooklyn, New York 11201

Until: 11: 30 A.M. On: _____

PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN THE ABOVE DUE DATE AND TIME

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE WILL BE HELD ON:

Please bring a copy of the RFP with you to the Conference.

**FOR ADDITIONAL PROCUREMENT INFORMATION SEE OUR
WEBSITE: <http://schools.nyc.gov/dcp>**

This Request for Proposals is issued by the
Division of Contracts and Purchasing
65 Court Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201
Telephone: (718) 935 72300 * Fax: (718) 935-5117

**EACH ENVELOPE SUBMITTED MUST BE LABELED AND EVERY
LABEL MUST REFERENCE THE RFP NUMBER**

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #

Table of Contents

	Page
Section 1	
Program Summary, Background and Purpose of the RFP.....	3
Section 2	
Minimum Qualifications.....	4
Section 3	
Scope of Services.....	5
Section 4	
Proposal Submission Requirements.....	7
Section 5	
Proposal Evaluation Process.....	8
Section 6	
Proposal Package Format.....	9
Section 7	
RFP Timetable & General Information.....	11
Section 8	
Contract Term.....	15
Section 9	
Type of Contract.....	15
Appendices	
Appendices A1 – A5	No Proposal Response Form, Insurance, Price Certification, Web-Based Application Requirements, and Minority and Women Owned Business Entities Participation
Appendix B -	Terms and Conditions
Appendix C -	Work Order Form
Appendix D -	Invoice Form
Appendix E1 -	Proposal Form
Appendix E2 -	Program Plan-Narrative
Appendix F -	Pricing

FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS RFP, "WE," "US" OR "OUR" SHALL MEAN THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NYCDOE), AND "YOU" OR "YOUR" SHALL MEAN THE ENTITY SUBMITTING THE PROPOSAL TO THE NYCDOE. ALTHOUGH THIS AGENCY IS BEING REFERRED TO AS THE NYCDOE, FOR CONTRACT AND INSURANCE PURPOSES, THE AGENCY IS STILL THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

SECTION 1 PROGRAM SUMMARY, BACKGROUND, AND PURPOSE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

1.1 PROGRAM SUMMARY

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), on behalf of the Division of Human Resources (DHR), is seeking proposals from educational organizations, professional development companies or other vendors that can provide high quality instructional experts to be "Peer Observers" for tenured teachers who have been identified in need of classroom assistance. Qualified individuals will be employed by the chosen vendors will be assigned caseloads of identified tenured teachers (approximately 200-300 yearly) who are in danger of receiving charges pursuant to Education Law § 3020-a for incompetence. The services to be provided will include classroom observations by Peer Observers, development of individualized plans to assist participating teachers and production of written reports of observations with assessments of competence to be introduced in disciplinary hearings, where applicable. It is expected that the typical period of observation time and review will range from a minimum of three (3) months to a maximum of six (6) months.

It is anticipated that the DOE will enter into a requirements agreement with one vendor commencing July 1, 2007, for a contract term of three years. However, the DOE reserves the right to enter into agreements with multiple vendors.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The NYCDOE strives to continually improve teacher quality as a means of driving improved student achievement. With this in mind, the DOE is seeking proposals from educational organizations, professional development companies or other institutions that can provide high quality instructional experts who are experienced classroom teachers and professional coaches to be peer observers and provide instructional support for tenured teachers in danger of receiving charges for incompetence who volunteer to participate in the program.

Peer Observers will observe participating teachers and develop plans to assist them, meet and confer with the teachers to provide ongoing guidance and direction in implementing the plan and will produce written reports of observations with assessments of competence to be introduced in disciplinary hearings, where applicable.

Peer Observers will also conference periodically with school-based supervisors on teachers' performance and will be asked to make recommendations to principals on the continued employment for those on their caseload. The Peer Observers provided by the awarded vendor(s)

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

under this RFP will fill the NYCDOE's needs for staff that cannot be internally provided. An estimated staff of 30-40 Peer Observers will be needed annually with a caseload to be determined.

This initiative will:

- 1.2.1 Be part of a collaborative effort by the United Federation of Teachers and the Department of Education to improve teacher quality by providing support to tenured teachers in danger of receiving charges pursuant to Education Law § 3020-a for incompetence;
- 1.2.2 Contribute to a more rigorous approach to evaluating the instructional delivery of tenured teachers in danger of receiving charges for incompetence;
- 1.2.3 Support principals and assistant principals in the objective assessment of teachers in danger of receiving charges for incompetence;
- 1.2.4 During disciplinary hearings and reviews, provide a richer description of a teacher's competence by both a direct supervisor and an objective third party.

SECTION 2 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

All proposals received on or before the proposal due date and time and at the location specified in the Request for Proposals, will be evaluated to determine whether or not they meet the following Minimum Qualifications:

- 2.1 Vendors may be for-profit or not-for-profit institutions. Individuals are not eligible to submit proposals for this RFP.
- 2.2 Vendors must document three (3) years of successful experience providing teacher evaluation frameworks, professional development, or other related experience that supports the improvement of classroom instruction. This experience may be with school districts other than the New York City Department of Education.
- 2.3 Vendors must submit two (2) letters of reference from organizations that paid you for your services related to the improvement of classroom instructional practices or in teacher evaluation frameworks. These services must have been provided since January 1, 2003.

IF YOUR PROPOSAL DOES NOT CLEARLY EXHIBIT ALL OF THE ABOVE, THEN YOUR PROPOSAL WILL NOT BE FURTHER EVALUATED.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

SECTION 3 SCOPES OF SERVICES

The successful Proposer(s) shall be required to perform **all** the following services:

3.1 Provide Peer Observers to support New York City public school administrators and identified tenured teachers assigned to classroom grades K-12 in danger of receiving charges pursuant to Education Law § 3020-a for incompetence.

Peer Observers will:

3.1.1 Develop and support a culture of reflective practice and improvement among teachers served.

3.1.2 Coach teachers on collaboratively developed specific goals, model lessons and provide feedback to teachers served on their instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment of students, planning for instruction, maintaining positive relationships with students and parents, or other areas.

3.1.3 Differentiate support for teachers served based upon demonstrated need.

3.1.4 Conference with school administrators on teachers' progress, and concluding assessments of competence.

3.1.5 Write observation reports and other summary documents to be shared with the teacher and school supervisors and administrators, and to be used in disciplinary hearings when appropriate.

3.1.6 Maintain required records and reports to document use of time throughout the school year, including tracking their time spent with each teacher on their caseload.

3.1.7 Provide services during the school day. Services may also be provided after-school, weekends, evenings, and/or during the recesses and summer months, as required by the NYCDOE.

3.2 Peer Observers should possess the following:

3.2.1 Master's Degree in education and/or their subject area.

3.2.2 Minimum of five (5) years successful experience as a teacher in a public or private K-12 school working with high needs students and/ or large school systems

3.2.3 Valid state teaching certification in New York preferred or certification in any other state.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

- 3.2.4 Teaching credentials and expertise should be in the instructional area relevant to the particular caseload assignment.
- 3.2.5 Ability to communicate effectively (written and oral).
- 3.2.6 Understanding of standards-based teaching, learning, and assessment.
- 3.2.7 Ability to model lessons.
- 3.2.8 Success in working collaboratively with professional staff on instructional issues.
- 3.2.9 Commitment to continuous professional development and lifelong learning.
- 3.2.10 May not have been employed by the Department of Education or be a member or employee of the United Federation of Teachers within the last year.
- 3.2.11 Peer Observers must be available to testify at 3020-a hearings if needed.
- 3.3 **The awarded vendor will work with the Division of Human Resources (DHR) who will manage the system and will refer identified teachers in danger of receiving charges pursuant to Education Law § 3020-a to be assigned by the vendor to the Peer Observers' caseloads; a joint NYCDOE/UFT committee will monitor the program.**
 - 3.3.1 Caseloads may vary in number based on the needs of the NYCDOE and on the number of cases a Peer Observer wishes to carry.
 - 3.3.2 Peer Observers will be compensated by the awarded vendors they work for.
- 3.4 Peer Observers are subject to NYCDOE security clearance procedures, including fingerprinting and background investigation, paid for by their employer.
- 3.5 The contracted vendor will be responsible for providing a framework for instructional best practices that aligns with the Professional Teaching Standards (as published by the University of California, Santa Cruz New Teacher Center) currently in use in several arenas in the Department of Education (e.g., new teacher mentoring and school quality reviews). The framework presented should be integrated in the

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

observation instruments, the observation and feedback reports, the overall training for Peer Observers and the measures used to ensure quality work done by Peer Observers. The Department of Education reserves the right to adapt and approve the framework presented by the vendor.

- 3.6 Services must be aligned with the NY State standards so that feedback provided to teachers on their instructional delivery and assessment of students utilizes information from those standards.
- 3.7 Provide regular management and attendance reports in electronic form or as the DOE requires that will enable NYCDOE to better manage, and evaluate the services provided. Invoices must be substantiated using processes set forth by the NYCDOE.

SECTION 4 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Your proposal must address all of the Scopes of Services listed in Section 3, above. And, using Appendices E1, E2 and F, see (Section 6.2 and section 6.3 below), organize your proposal in the following four sections:

4.1 Program Plan/ Narrative

The Program Plan must be a clear and concise description of how the Proposer program will provide the Peer Evaluation services required in the Scopes of Services in Section 3, above. It should show a clear understanding of the needs noted in this RFP and demonstrate how your plan will meet the goals and objectives of this particular RFP. Proposals must contain a work plan and timeline for the school year.

4.2 Organizational Capacity

In this section you will show evidence of adequate human, organizational, technical, and professional resources and abilities to meet the needs of this RFP. Include, but do not limit yourselves to, the following:

- 4.2.1 An organizational chart of the overall company responding to this RFP showing the specific titles and, if available, employees who will be slated to work on this project.
- 4.2.2 Proposers must notify the Department of Education if they make any changes to key personnel after submitting their proposal and before the DOE makes award recommendations.
- 4.2.3 Proposer must provide to the DOE a realistic projection of the number of Peer Observers their organization can supply under the terms of this RFP. If you are awarded a contract and are unable to provide the projected number of Peer Observers, the DOE will consider this failure a material breach of the contract.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

4.3 Demonstrated Effectiveness

You shall include a description of all prior experience in the execution of these or similar services and, in addition to the information submitted to meet the Minimum Qualifications required in Section 2, above, include:

4.3.1 Details of your background and experience in providing these specific or related services.

4.3.2 Letters of reference from at least two (2) organizations that paid for your services in supporting the improvement of classroom instruction, developing materials and instruments that support such improvement by classroom teachers and any training developed and implemented by your organization in school districts. Letters should cite dates and locations.

4.4 Pricing/Charges

Proposers must submit a Pricing/Charges form for the services to be provided. This form will be reviewed for rates associated with your services. Please refer to the Pricing/Charges Form, included as a separate Word file (Appendix F). If you are selected, the NYCDOE reserves the right to review your records used for your cost calculations that support your prices before entering into a contract with you.

Systemwide, the Department of Education anticipates 200-300 tenured teachers to undergo the peer evaluation process annually.

**SECTION 5 PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS
EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

All proposals received will be reviewed to determine if they meet all of the submission and Minimum Qualifications prescribed in this Request for Proposals. Proposals meeting these requirements will be jointly evaluated and rated by an Evaluation Committee that includes United Federation of Teachers (UFT) designees, applying the evaluation criteria prescribed below. The DOE and the UFT will jointly decide on the vendor or vendors selected. The Evaluation Committee reserves the right to conduct site visits to verify facility or other information contained in a proposal and may require a Proposer to make a demonstration/presentation of their services or submit additional written material in support of a proposal.

The Evaluation Committee makes every attempt to match the submitted capacities of the highest rated firms with projected needs and reserves the right to award vendors whose capacity exceeds the projected needs in case other contracts are terminated. The Evaluation Committee also reserves the right to award vendors whose capacity does not meet projected needs in case many vendors receive low ratings.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION**RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation****EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The scoring table (below) will be used to evaluate each submitted proposal. The closer your proposal achieves the Desired Characteristics, the higher points it will receive in each related Response Category.

<u>Response Category</u>	<u>Desired Characteristics</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Program Plan	Program content, methodology and program design meet the DOE's Peer Observation and Evaluation needs.	30 Points
Organizational Capacity	Evidence of strong organizational resources (human, organizational, technical) required to provide services.	15 Points
Demonstrated Effectiveness	Evidence of prior successful experiences in the provision of services that support the improvement of classroom instruction, including letters of reference, and experience working in urban public school environments	15 Points
Prices/Charges	The lowest reasonable price.	40 Points
	Total Maximum Points	100 Points

SECTION 6 PROPOSAL PACKAGE FORMAT

Each Proposal must be submitted in Microsoft Word '98 or a later version. Additionally, this RFP has three (3) forms for you to use in your proposal, Appendices E1, E2 and Appendix F, that **must** be downloaded from our website, <http://schools.nyc.gov/Offices/DCP/Vendor/RFP>. These forms are in Microsoft Word. Qualified and interested vendors are invited to respond, provided they use these forms to submit responses to the NYCDOE no later than **DATE AND TIME**.

6.1 Proposal Form Instructions

Proposers **must** prepare their Proposals in the format and sequence supplied below. Failure to comply with this stipulation could be a basis for Proposal disqualification. Supplemental information about the Proposer's products or Services may be included as an addendum to the Proposal but not in place of the requirements listed below. See, however, Section

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

6.7, below. This list of submission requirements is to help Proposers insure that their responses to this RFP are complete

6.2 Proposal Form (Appendix E1)

Please review each of the following sections and subsections and respond accordingly:

1. Company Information
2. Minimum Qualifications
3. References (copies of or actual letters, not references)
4. Organizational Capacity
5. Demonstrated Effectiveness
6. Abstract
7. Exceptions and Deviations Form
8. Signature Page
9. Other Supplemental Information (**Optional, but not encouraged. See Section 6.7 below.**)

6.3 Program Plan-Narrative Form (Appendix E2)

As required in Section 4.1 of the RFP, on Appendix E2, describe in detail your program and methods to accomplish the services proposed. Include a work plan indicating approximate dates and frequency of services. Use as much space as need, **but please be concise.**

6.4 Pricing information must be entered in the Pricing/Charges Form included as a separate Word File (Appendix F). This template has been developed to standardize pricing submissions. Carefully read and follow the directions on the form.

6.5 Proposals must include a cover letter, Table of Contents, and page numbers. There is no specific limit on the number of pages applications may contain but **please be concise.**

6.6 Submit one (1) written original copy, with original signatures, six (6) paper photocopies, and one electronic copy using Microsoft Word formats on one 3.5" diskette or CD in one computer folder. YOU MAY HAVE TO CONVERT SOME OF YOUR RESUMES OR LETTERS OF REFERENCE TO THE MICROSOFT WORD FORMAT. Please note: the hard copy of the RFP must contain the proposal form as well as the pricing form. Only one original set of Vendex forms are required with the proposals (see section 6.8).

6.7 Proposals may not include audio/video demonstrations on tapes, diskettes, CDs, PowerPoint files, etc., or samples of materials unless otherwise specified.

6.8 Applicants are also required to submit current Vendor Information Exchange System (VENDEX) forms WITH THE PROPOSAL. The City is

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

legally required to use this computerized data system to help it make well informed decisions when selecting a vendor.

Vendex provides the City with comprehensive management information so that it may better serve the needs of the citizens of New York City. These forms are located at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Offices/DCP/Vendor/VendexGuide/Default.htm>

Please note: notwithstanding the instruction in the second bullet on page 3 of the Vendor's Guide to Vendex, you must include original Vendex forms WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

Please **DO NOT SUBMIT MULTIPLE COPIES** of the Vendex forms with your proposals. We only require **ONE ORIGINAL set**.

- 6.9** If submitted separately, the envelope containing the original written and diskette proposal should be labeled "Original Proposal" and the envelope containing the photocopies should be labeled "Duplicate Proposals." Each envelope submitted in response to the RFP **must** be addressed as follows:

FROM: Proposer Name/Address
TO: New York City Department of Education
Division of Contracts and Purchasing
65 Court Street
Brooklyn NY 11201
RFP # PEER OBSERVATION AND
EVALUATION

- 6.10** You must include in your proposal a list of all DOE contracts for similar services held by your organization within the last 5 years, specifying the following information:

- Dates and periods during which the contract was in effect;
- A short description of the services provided

SECTION 7 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TIMETABLE AND GENERAL INFORMATION

7.1 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) TIMETABLE

PROPOSALS ARE DUE NO LATER THAN --

DATE:

TIME:

AT THE LOCATION LISTED IN SECTION 6.9 ABOVE.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Proposals received after the specified date and time will not be considered / accepted.

7.2 GENERAL INFORMATION

7.3 REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION AND ADDENDA

Any inquiry regarding this solicitation must be made in writing, with the exception being oral inquiries that are addressed at the Pre-Proposal Conference if such a conference is scheduled and conducted by the NYCDOE. No telephone calls will be accepted regarding this RFP. All written inquiries may be e-mailed to the following authorized contact person:

Marvin Spruck
NYC Dept. of Education
e-mail: mspruck@schools.nyc.gov

The deadline for questions on this RFP is _____

Proposers should not rely on any representations, statements, or clarifications not made in this RFP, a formal addendum, or at the pre-proposal conference. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the NYCDOE issues an addendum with a digest of the inquiries made and answers given at the pre-proposal conference, proposers shall rely on the information contained in such addendum rather than those given orally at the conference.

7.4 Pre-Proposal Conference

A pre-proposal conference, at which vendors will have the opportunity to ask questions related to this RFP, will be held on _____ at _____. Specific questions concerning this RFP should be submitted in writing to the above address prior to the pre-proposal conference. Written questions should reference the RFP by page and paragraph numbers. If possible, these questions will be answered at the pre-proposal conference and additional questions may be submitted orally at the conference.

7.5 Incurring Costs

The NYCDOE shall not be held liable for any pre-contract activity or costs incurred by Proposers in the preparation of their proposals or during any negotiations on proposed contracts or for any work performed or materials provided in connection therewith.

7.6 Oral Presentations/Demonstrations

The Evaluation Committee may require Proposers to give oral presentations after the Closing Date regarding their proposals. At such presentations, Proposers may be required to demonstrate or exhibit aspects relating to their proposal as requested by the NYCDOE.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

7.7 Negotiations

The Evaluation Committee reserves the right to: (i) reject all proposals submitted; (ii) accept any proposal or alternate as submitted without negotiations; (iii) accept or negotiate on all proposals submitted which fall within a competitive range; (iv) require revisions to, corrections of, or other changes to any proposal submitted as a condition to its being given any further consideration; (v) select for negotiations only the overall best proposal or alternate submitted, as determined by the Evaluation Committee; (vi) negotiate with one or more Proposers in any manner it deems fit, (such negotiations may be concurrent or sequential as the Evaluation Committee determines); (vii) following the conclusion of any such negotiations, the Evaluation Committee may solicit Best and Final Offers (BAFO) utilizing an appropriate procedure; (viii) re-open negotiations after the BAFO procedure, if it is in the Evaluation Committee's best interest to do so. No Proposer shall have any rights against the Evaluation Committee arising at any stage of the solicitation from any negotiations that take place, or from the fact that the Evaluation Committee does not select a Proposer for negotiations.

7.8 Withdrawal Of Bids

After the opening of proposals, a request by a proposer to the New York City Department of Education for consent to the withdrawal of their proposal, because of an error made by said proposer, will be considered only under the following terms and conditions:

Request to withdraw proposal must be received in writing providing reasons for the request. This request is to be sent to the Administrator, Division of Contracts and Purchasing, within three (3) business days following the date and time set for the opening of proposals.

Whenever any proposer requests the consent of The New York City Department of Education to the withdrawal of their proposal, The New York City Department of Education may grant or reject such request in any case which it deems just and proper. This request shall be made and such consent to withdraw shall be accepted by the proposer upon the express condition that said proposer shall be excluded from proposing again for the re-advertisement of proposals for the same item or proposal should no award be made. Should any proposer request the withdrawal of more than one proposal in any twelve (12) month period, they shall be disqualified from proposing for The Department of Education work for a period of one (1) year from the date of the second request.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

Any request for a Withdrawal of proposal within three (3) business days must be accompanied by a certified check made payable to The New York City Department of Education, Administrator of Business Affairs, to defray the cost of the processing. Such checks shall be in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500) for bids of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or greater. Where the bid is less than fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) a two hundred fifty dollar (\$250) check is required. Such fees are non-refundable.

Following the three (3) business days after the proposal opening, a proposer may not withdraw their proposal before the expiration of ninety (90) calendar days from the date of proposal opening. A proposer may withdraw their proposal after that date only if they state such intent in writing prior to the mailing by The New York City Department of Education of a Purchase Order, Notice of Award, or Acceptance of Bids.

The Administrator for Contract Management will make the determination with respect to request for the withdrawal of proposals and that determination shall be final and binding. **Any withdrawal of a proposal must be in its entirety (no partial withdrawals will be permitted)**, whether the withdrawal is within three (3) business days after the proposal opening or after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the date of proposal opening.

7.9 Terms and Conditions

All contracts resulting from this RFP shall be subject to the attached General Terms and Conditions (Appendix B: Department of Education, Terms and Conditions).

7.10 Contract Award

The New York City Department of Education, with the approval of the UFT, reserves the right to award a contract(s) to other than the proposer(s) offering the lowest overall cost. The contract(s) resulting from this solicitation shall be awarded to the qualified proposer(s) whose proposal(s) the New York City Department of Education, with the approval of the UFT, has determined to be the most advantageous, based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals (RFP). All contracts resulting from this RFP shall be signed by the proposer(s) within a reasonable time upon receipt, which period shall not exceed 30 days. Thereafter the proposer(s) is (are) deemed delinquent, at the NYCDOE's option, with the approval of the UFT, the contract(s) may be voided.

Contract award (s) shall be subject to the following conditions, where applicable. They are not required to be part of your proposal submission.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

7.10.1 Completion and submission of an appropriate Office of Equal Opportunity form. e.g. Workforce profile or Company's Equal Opportunities Work plan; does **not** apply to M/WBE certification (See Checklist-Section 10, second Bullet)

7.10.2 Completion and submission of the Affirmation Sheet.

7.10.3 Submission of an appropriate Certificate of Insurance.

7.11 Termination of Contract

Any contract(s) resulting from this RFP may be terminated at any time upon thirty days written notice, by the Chancellor, and/or his designee, after consultation with the UFT. No claim for damages will be made by, or allowed to, the Contractor because of such termination.

7.13 Prohibition of Communication During RFP Evaluation Period

After the submittal of proposals and continuing until a contract has been awarded, all DOE Personnel involved in the project will be specifically directed against holding any meetings, conferences or technical discussions with any proposer regarding this RFP except as provided in the RFP. Proposers shall not initiate communication in any manner with DOE personnel regarding this RFP or the proposals during this period of time, unless authorized, in advance, by the selection committee. Failure to comply with this requirement will automatically terminate further consideration of that firm's or individual's proposal.

SECTION 8 CONTRACT TERM

The contract(s) resulting from this RFP will be for a term of three (3) years with the DOE having the option to option to extend the contract(s) for two additional one year periods.

SECTION 9 TYPE OF CONTRACT

This RFP may result in the award of one or more requirements agreements.

Requirements agreements are not commitments to purchase. Only a purchase order issued by a school, district, or central office constitutes such a commitment.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

The estimated contract award for a requirements contract is based upon the NYCDOE's estimated requirement for that service over the contract period. NYCDOE may purchase all, none, part, or more than the estimated quantity identified.

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

SECTION 10 PROPOSER CHECKLIST

Please ensure that you have received each of the following documents for your response. The attachments include:

- Request for Proposals
- Proposal Form (Appendix E1, Microsoft Word File)
- Program Plan-Narrative (Appendix E2, Microsoft Word File)
- Prices/Charges Form (Appendix F, Microsoft Word File)

Also please be sure to:

- Review the entire Request for Proposals to ensure you understand the scope of the requirements and the role of each of the attached forms. Please review the Scope of Services for this RFP carefully before completing the response sections.
- View the Terms & Conditions (Appendix B) in this document. Some of the Terms & Conditions may have changed since the last RFP.
- Attend the Pre-Proposal Conference.

RFP# Requirements

APPENDIX A1

RFP Number and Title: _____

Proposal Opening Date: _____

NO-PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORM

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THIS FORM IF YOU WILL NOT BE SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL BUT WISH TO REMAIN ON THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S BIDDERS LIST.

The preparation and mailing of REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS is time consuming and expensive. In instances where proposers fail to respond or notify the New York City Department of Education of their future intentions, the preparation and mailing of the Request for Proposals package represents an unnecessary expense to the New York City Department of Education. Feedback from proposers is also encouraged so that any reasons for not proposing may be evaluated with the intention of improving future solicitations for this commodity or service in the hopes of encouraging and expanding the field of competition.

All proposers who respond with a "No Response" response or choose not to propose are requested to provide the information below and return this form in time for the proposal opening.

REASONS FOR NOT PROPOSING AT THIS TIME:

DO YOU WISH TO RECEIVE REQUESTS FOR THIS PARTICULAR PRODUCT OR SERVICE IN THE FUTURE? YES NO

PROPOSER NAME AND ADDRESS:

SIGNED: _____ **TITLE:** _____ **DATE:** _____

DRAFT DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

RFP# R0116-Peer Observation and Evaluation

APPENDIX A2

INSURANCE

The Contractor **shall** maintain during the period(s) of this contract, inclusive of guarantee periods when applicable, insurance(s) covering the personnel employed by the contractor, equipment (vehicles) used, public servants, and property of the Department of Education while the supplies, equipment, goods, products, etc. called for herein are being delivered or while the services/work outlined herein is being performed.

If a proposal is selected for potential contract negotiations, the proposer will be required to submit certifications(s) from acceptable insurers, licensed by the State of New York, or any other licensing authority thereon to the effect that said insurers, will furnish to the proposer the insurance coverage listed. In addition, certifications submitted must name the New York City Department of Education and the City of New York as additionally insured. Failure by the proposer to furnish the above certification(s) may result in rejection of the proposal.

The most common form used to transmit this information is entitled ACORD Certificate of Insurance (form ACORD 25-S (7/90))

The policies mentioned herein shall insure the New York City Department of Education and the City of New York against claims outlined in the coverage's mentioned herein in the same amounts as are required in specifications for the Contractor or Subcontractor when applicable. Such coverage may be by separate policies or by endorsement to this effect on existing policies.

The policies mentioned herein, insuring the New York City Department of Education and the City of New York against claims arising out of negligence of the Contractor or Subcontractor when applicable, shall contain, by rider attached to such policies, the following provisions:

- a) Notice under this policy by the Insurance Company should be addressed to the Executive Director, Division of Contracts and Purchasing, 65 Court Street 12th Floor Brooklyn NY 11201.
- b) Notice of accident should be given by the insured to Insurance Company within sixty (60) days after notice to the said Executive Director, Division of Contracts and Purchasing of such accidents.
- c) Notice of claim against the insured shall be given to the Insurance Company within sixty (60) days after such claims shall be filed with said Executive Director, Division of Contracts and Purchasing.
- d) The policy shall not be canceled, terminated, modified or changed by the Insurance Company unless thirty (30) days prior written notice is sent to the insured by registered mail and addressed to the Executive Director, Division of Contracts and Purchasing, nor shall it be canceled, terminated, modified or changed by the Contractor securing such policy without the prior consent by the Department of Education of the City of New York.
- e) The policy shall not be invalidated by reason of any violation of any of the terms of any policy issued by the Insurance Company to the Contractor.

If a proposal is selected for potential contract negotiation, the proposer will be required to submit, the following insurance policies. Failure to do so may result in rejection of your proposal. Delivery of such insurance policies to the Department of Education shall be a condition precedent to the right of the Contractor to demand any payments hereunder.

In the event contract is to be extended, Contractor must submit proof of continuing compliance at least thirty (30) days prior to the ensuing contract period.