

## RFP SER2012-01 Response to Written Questions

- 1. On page 7 of the RFP, the division is referred to as Arlington County Public Schools and Arlington School Division; which should we use for the RFP response?**

*Either is acceptable. The division is most commonly referred to as "Arlington Public Schools (APS)."*

- 2. Has the Superintendent (Dr. Pat Murphy) expressed any special areas of concern for the review?**

*The Superintendent has not yet expressed any special areas of concern for the review. These areas are typically identified at the kick-off meeting.*

- 3. Arlington Public Schools has issued RFP #01FY12 Consulting Services for Evaluation of APS Services for Students with Special Needs. Are there any areas of overlap, impact, or conflicts between that RFP and the DPB RFP? Will a successful vendor for one of the procurements be ineligible to bid on or be awarded the other RFP?**

*The Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) issued RFP SER2012-01 and as such, this procurement will be evaluated by DPB. RFP #01FY12 Consulting Services for Evaluation of APS Services for Students with Special Needs was issued by Arlington Public Schools (APS) and as such will be evaluated by APS. These two RFPs are not dependent procurement areas and as such they will be evaluated independently. If a vendor is successfully awarded one of these Requests for Proposals (RFPs), it will not impact their eligibility for the other procurement.*

*Some items of overlap exist between the two RFPs in that both ask consultants to conduct an evaluation of APS Services for Students with Special Needs. Evaluating services for students with special needs is the focus of RFP #01FY12. In RFP SER2012-01 consultants are asked to evaluate all non-instructional areas in order to channel identified savings into the classroom; special needs services is only one piece of this procurement.*

- 4. The Virginia School Efficiency Review Program Protocol referenced on page 4 is not included in the appendix section as stated. Can you provide?**

*The Protocol is not an attachment within the RFP itself. It can be found on the eVA website along with the RFP and the Summary of Changes FY12:*

- Go to <http://www.eva.state.va.us/>.
- Click on the link to Solicitations & Awards (VBO).
- In the Keyword Search, type "school efficiency."
- RFP SER-2012-01 will appear in the search findings. Click on the Details button under the listing.
- The Protocol is included as a Solicitation Attachment at the bottom of the screen.

**5. Can you provide the names of incumbent vendors that have performed past reviews for the Commonwealth?**

*The following vendors have performed school efficiency reviews for the Department of Planning and Budget:*

- *E.L. Hamm and Associates*
- *Evergreen Solutions, LLC*
- *Gibson Consulting*
- *MGT of America*
- *WCL Enterprises*

**6. Has the Commonwealth been satisfied with their work?**

*Yes. The Department of Planning and Budget has been satisfied with the work of all of the vendors that have performed school efficiency reviews under this program.*

**7. Has a budget for this work been established?**

*A budget has not yet been established for this school review and will be contingent on the winning Offeror's response to the cost requirements as described in the RFP.*

**8. What has been the budget for past Reviews?**

*Contract costs for the last ten reviews are as follows:*

<i>School Division</i>	<i>Cost of Contract</i>
<i>Hanover</i>	<i>\$129,773.00</i>
<i>Chesterfield</i>	<i>\$128,021.00</i>
<i>Martinsville</i>	<i>\$65,000.00</i>
<i>Hampton</i>	<i>\$124,185.00</i>
<i>Charlottesville</i>	<i>\$118,077.00</i>
<i>Loudoun</i>	<i>\$107,597.15</i>
<i>Norfolk</i>	<i>\$111,822.45</i>
<i>Franklin</i>	<i>\$98,718.85</i>
<i>Rappahannock</i>	<i>\$96,373.55</i>
<i>Prince Edward</i>	<i>\$85,000.00</i>

**Note: A second version of the eVA posting was issued due to a typographical error in the posting itself, which resulted in an e-mail notification. No substantive revisions were made to the RFP.**